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ABSTRACT

DISSERTATION PROJECT: Student Perceptions of Academic Advising and Influence on Retention: A study of First-Semester, First-Generation and Continuing-Generation College Students at a Liberal Arts College
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COLLEGE: Teachers College

DATE: May 2015

PAGES: 171

This study examined a full cohort of first-time, full-time college students to better understand perceptions, preferences, and satisfaction with academic advising and influence of these factors on intent to persist. Early in the transition to college, students are at risk for departure; more so for those whose parents did not attend college.

A quantitative research design was used to investigate the relationship of advising styles, generational status, and the influence of advisors on intent to persist. Post-hoc analysis of open-ended responses to students’ persistence decisions provided additional insights for institutional persistence strategies. The research was conducted at a small, Midwest, private, four-year institution that relies on faculty to provide academic advising. Students enrolled in a required first-year experience course were surveyed ($n = 304$) using a modified version of Winston and Sandor’s (1984b) Academic Advising Inventory (AAI).

This study contributes to a growing body of knowledge on first-semester student advising, and first-generation students at a time when both are more closely examined in order to improve retention and success. By studying a full cohort of students, this study provides a well-
rounded view of first-year students. The research found that those who perceive and prefer developmental advising are more satisfied and likely to persist. Generational status was not a factor in advising perceptions, satisfaction, or preference. The results reinforced previous research that the majority of college students preferred developmental advising, but contradicted previous results that freshmen, at-risk or under resourced students preferred prescriptive advising. Recommendations for future research are provided.
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CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

As colleges and universities continue to grapple with retention and graduation, academic advising is an often overlooked, valuable resource. An integral part of institutional services, advising has the potential to increase the number of students who finish their degree, but is not fully utilized. Even though schools have developed many other types of support services, current efforts are not effective. Hundreds of millions of dollars have been spent on completion strategies since 2006 (Newman, 2014), yet graduation rates are not increasing. According to recent statistics from the National Student Clearinghouse Research Center (NSCRC, 2013), 54% of first-time enrolled students in 2007 graduated from a two- or four-year college; the same percentage as the previous year. The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES, 2013a) provides a slightly higher rate of 59% when examining six-year data from full-time, first-time students at four-year institutions who began seeking a bachelor’s degree in the 2006-2007 school year. Still, this was only up less than one percent from the previous year.

While there are many factors that affect graduation rates, one reason may be the increasing number of disadvantaged students who are going to college. More low-income and diverse students have enrolled in college (NCES, 2013b). Six-year data showed African-American (51%) and Hispanic (52%) graduation rates at four-year institutions were lower than those students of two or more races (66%), Whites (73%), and Asians (76%). Overall, graduation rates for additional at-risk populations, such as low-income or those who are first in their family to go to college, continue to be lower as well, but are difficult to track (Mangan, 2013). These are the very students who need support services such as academic advising the most. Aligning advising with student needs may increase satisfaction and decisions to remain and graduate.
Funding, Graduation, and Retention

Regardless of the student circumstances, graduation rates are becoming a significant factor related to institutional funding. Thus, these statistics have become a priority for all sides of the higher education equation. Overall, state appropriations account for 20.9% of four-year public college revenue while tuition and fees account for 21.1% (NSCRC, 2013). In 14 states, student outcomes are tied to a portion of government appropriations (Doubleday, 2013). For example, the state of Indiana has initiated the Performance Funding Formula for public institutions, which is impacted by four factors including retention and graduation rates (Indiana Commission for Higher Education, 2013). At the federal level, the White House’s College Scorecard includes graduation rates as one indicator in the online tool to help prospective students and families review colleges and universities (Doubleday, 2013). These factors together are forcing more higher education institutions to closely examine how many students stay and graduate in a timely manner.

Another measure of institutional success is retention rates. Although the decision to leave college is often voluntary by a large number of students (Tinto, 1985), there are a number of personal and external factors which influence students’ decisions to persist including personal development, institutional fit, grades, and financial resources (Swing & Skipper, 2007; Tinto, 1993; Upcraft, Gardner & Associates, 1989). Tinto (1993) posited four reasons why students choose to leave: ideological differences, tumultuous campus conditions, student feelings of oppression under the institutional structure, and when students fail to transition from one life stage to another (e.g., high school to college). These factors are impactful early in the college experience. Students are more likely to leave between their first and second years of school (Noel, 1985; Tinto, 1987). More specifically, Tinto (1988) argued that the forces, which affect
persistence, are different in the first six months than during the rest of college when the critical nature of separation, transition, and incorporation processes are crucial; especially for those whose parents did not attend college. In the most recent data from 2010, the retention rate for first-time, full-time students from the first to the second year is 62% for open admission, four-year public institutions and 63% for private ones (NCES, 2013c).

**Academic Advising**

Academic advising is a centuries old practice, which has evolved with higher education and is sometimes overlooked despite its influence on educational outcomes. Inherent in its nature, advising provides connectedness to the institution and its community. Tinto (2012) argued that institutions need to look at existing practices such as academic advising to increase retention and graduation rates rather than simply adding new programs. While there are many factors that affect persistence to graduation, researchers have found strong connections between satisfaction with the college experience, including advising, and intent to remain at the institution. The 2005 National Survey for Student Engagement (NSSE) found that “the quality of academic advising is the single most powerful predictor of satisfaction with the campus environment for students at four-year schools” (p. 6). Thus, Campbell and Nutt (2008) argued that advising increases students’ opportunities to learn, grow, and engage on campus which leads to better retention and graduation rates. Similarly, Light (2001) stated, “good advisors may be the single most underestimated characteristic of a successful college experience” (p. 81).

Historically the focus of academic advising had been on helping students choose a major or occupation. Academic advisors may work with students on routine tasks such as how to meet graduation requirements, and give advice on courses, majors, and career goals. In more complex relationships, academic advisors may act as advocates, conflict mediators, rules navigators, and
active interveners when issues arise for students (Habley & Bloom, 2007). In fact, the leading advising professional organization defines academic advising as intentional and curriculum-based with pedagogical undercurrents and learning outcomes (National Academic Advising Association, 2006). This type of holistic support is often referred to as developmental advising and defined within the preeminent theoretical framework. Burns Crookston (1972) defined two types of advising relationships. The first is prescriptive, based on authority where an advisor gives recommendations executed by the student. Students also see themselves as getting an answer from an authority and do not feel responsible for executing bad advice. The second type, developmental advising, focuses on personal growth, academic success, shared responsibility, and mutual learning. Crookston argued that there are ten central components of the relationship, which include abilities, motivation, rewards, maturity, initiative, control, responsibility, learning output, evaluation, and the relationship itself. More will be explained in Chapter 2.

Student Populations and Generational Status

Recent advising research has focused on first-year students because of their increased risk of departure from higher education institutions (Bai & Pan, 2009-2010; Glenn, 2007; Lau, 2003; Light, 2001; Upcraft, Gardner, & Barefoot, 2005). In general, first-year students present unique challenges because they want to succeed but also struggle with independence and the loss of familiar ties (Smith, 2002). These issues can often be exacerbated in first-generation college students. There is a wide range of definitions, even in scholarly research, of the term first-generation college student (FGS), ranging from those whose parents never attended any post-secondary institution, with less than a bachelor’s degree, and those who have taken courses toward a bachelor’s degree but did not finish. These definitions do not account for siblings or close relatives who may have post-secondary coursework and/or degrees. For the purposes of
this study, FGS are defined as those whose parents do not have a four-year college degree (Ishitani, 2006; Pike & Kuh, 2005). This is the same definition used by the federal government including the TRIO programs created by the Federal Higher Education Act and this study’s research site. In general, FGS are more likely to be older, be of diverse ethnicities, have lower incomes, be married with dependents, and have lower persistence and completion rates than continuing generation college students (CGS). Those FGS whose parents have no post-secondary experience are nearly nine times more likely to leave college after the first year than those whose parents attended at least some college (Ishitani, 2006).

How all first-year students, regardless of generational status, are advised can vary by institution: from professional advisors, to faculty members, to hybrid models using both. Carlstrom and Miller (2013) found that, in general, there is no one specific model used for advising but about 60% of institutions used some combination of professionals and faculty members. Faculty-only advising is most common at small, private undergraduate-only colleges. Hemwall and Trachte (2005) pointed out that the faculty-centered systems at small colleges and universities often require certain touch points within the semester such as personal contact for course registrations and schedule changes. This forces advisor/advisee interactions when students need it the most. Yet, most schools do not understand the true effectiveness of this relationship because student satisfaction surveys are often the only tool used to evaluate advising. This data alone does not go far enough to determine what students want from their academic advisor and if the advising process is influencing their decision to persist (Cuseo, 2008; Miller & Williams, 2003).
**Problem Statement**

Academic advisors can have a positive impact on retention, development, and success of first-semester students. Yet this critical period is a little researched area, especially among FGS and with full cohorts. More focus has been placed on first-year to second-year persistence and few studies have examined advising and generational status in the crucial first weeks of the college transition. The empirical investigation of these factors could provide important insights about what students prefer from academic advisors in the first semester, which could help determine how better to serve this student population from the first day of school. Personal questions related to the researcher’s own advising experiences as a first-generation student drove interest in better understanding the perceptions, satisfaction, and preferences of advising styles that influence intent to persist. A literature review suggested generational status may affect these factors, but more data were needed, especially at small, private, nonprofit institutions.

The study used a quantitative research design to investigate the relationship of advising styles, generational status, and the influence of advisors on intent to persist. The Academic Advising Inventory or AAI (see Appendix A) is the predominant research tool for academic advising research. It was developed to examine advising relationships, frequency of activities and student satisfaction (Winston & Sandor, 2002); all are important to the understanding of academic advising. Utilizing a modified version of the AAI, to include persistence-related questions, this study adds to the global body of knowledge regarding academic advising and retention of first-semester students.

**Study Purpose**

The purpose of this study was to better understand the role of academic advising during a critical transition phase as students begin their college experience. It compared the relationships
between the students’ generational status, advising style satisfaction, preferences, and needs as well as intent to persist within a faculty-led academic advising environment at a four-year liberal arts college. The theoretical framework for the study was built from two streams of literature: Crookston’s (1972) theory on developmental advising and Tinto’s Theory of College Student Departure (1975, 1987, 1993). Crookston (1972) posited that advising should be holistic with shared responsibility, and incorporate advice on both education and personal development. Tinto (1975, 1987, 1993) argued that all college students have a variety of factors which influence decisions to remain or leave college; however the more interaction with the institution and those connected to it, the more likely they are to remain and graduate. Both are important to the understanding of academic advising, but must be based in current advising perceptions and its underlying purpose (Schulenberg & Lindhorst, 2010). Therefore, the questions were designed to examine multiple factors that influence perceptions, satisfaction, and needs with the influence on intent to persist.

**Research Questions**

RQ1: Will college students’ perceptions of advising, preferred style, and satisfaction differ as a function of their generational status?

RQ2: Will college students who perceive their advising needs and preferences are met have higher satisfaction with academic advising?

RQ3: If college students believe they are satisfied with advising, will they be more likely to indicate intent to persist?

**Research Hypotheses**

The following hypotheses were tested in this study.
H1: College students’ advising perceptions, satisfaction, and preferences, will differ as a function of their generational status.

H2: College students who believe their advising needs and preferences are met will have higher satisfaction with academic advising.

H3: College students who believe their advising needs and preferences are met will be more likely to indicate intent to persist.

Significance of the Study to the Field

This study has relevance because it examined one of the first relationships developed in college and how advising might affect future life-altering decisions. A critical gap in research was addressed by evaluating first-semester student perceptions, satisfaction, preferences, and influence of academic advising at four-year institutions, especially among first-generation college students. This study contributes to a growing body of knowledge on first-semester student advising and first-generation students at a time when both sub-populations are closely examined to improve retention and success. More than one-third (36%) of post-secondary institutions in the United States are private, nonprofit colleges and universities (National Association of College and Universities, n.d.). The research site, Franklin College, typifies a small, private liberal arts college in multiple ways. This study leads to a better understanding of the role of faculty advisors at such institutions.

Definition of Terms

Academic advising — A form of advising “based in the teaching and learning mission of higher education, is a series of intentional interactions with a curriculum, a pedagogy, and a set of student learning outcomes” (NACADA, 2006, para. 11).
Cohort — A specific group of students identified and tracked over time, based on the year that the group of full-time, first-time students began attending college (Knapp, Kelly-Reid, & Ginder, 2012).

Developmental advising — A collaborative type of advising where the advisor and advisee share and negotiate the responsibility of the advising tasks (Ender, Winston, & Miller, 1984.)

Faculty advisors — Faculty members whose primary role is to teach and who have a secondary role as academic advisors.

First-generation college students — Students whose parents did not obtain a college degree (Ishitani, 2006; Pike & Kuh, 2005).

First-year students — Those students who entered Franklin College in Fall 2014 as first-time, full-time college students.

LA 100 — A one-credit, letter-graded, required course called “Liberal Arts Seminar” for first-time students attending Franklin College and designed to help them transition to college.

Persistence — Continued enrollment at an institution (Lohfink & Paulsen, 2005).

Prescriptive advising — The advisor is in control of the advising relationship and makes academic decisions for the student (Crookston, 1972).

Retention Rate — Percentage of students who return to the college to continue their studies in the fall (NCES, 2013c).

Summary and Organization of the Study

This study is organized into five chapters. This chapter, an introduction, has introduced the major concepts of the study. The second chapter is a review of the relevant literature on academic advising, retention, and student characteristics. Chapter three outlines the
methodology. The fourth chapter includes the findings and the fifth is an extended discussion of the results, implications, limitations and suggestions for future study. References and tables follow.
CHAPTER II: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Study Summary

With increasing efforts to improve retention and graduation rates of college students, research points to an increasing need to understand the impact of academic advising especially early in the first year and with those who are most likely to leave. Therefore, this study examined the relationships among students’ generational status, advising style satisfaction and preferences as well as intent to persist within a faculty-led academic advising environment at a four-year liberal arts college.

Theoretical Framework

The philosophical underpinnings for the study rest in two separate but related literature streams. The first is the literature related to persistence to graduation, grounded in much of the enrollment literature. Generally, college student development, persistence, and success are often attributed to two key factors: involvement and integration. This study, which examined some of the institutional and personal factors involved in persistence, was based on Vincent Tinto’s work (1975, 1985, 1987, 1993, 1999, 2004, 2006/2007, 2007, 2010, 2012), primarily the Theory of Student Departure (1975, 1987, 1993). The Theory of Student Departure seeks to explain why students leave college and is perhaps the most used theoretical framework in understanding student persistence (Metz, 2004; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). Primarily developed from sociological and anthropological perspectives on suicide and life stage transitions, Tinto described his theory as an “interactive model of student departure” (1993, p. 112, emphasis added). He posited that all students who enter college have a variety of academic, family, as well as personal characteristics and skills, which influence goals including college attendance. As students continually interact with the institution and those connected to it, their goals and
commitment to higher education change. When students are involved in some component of the collegiate setting, they are more likely to persist and graduate. Otherwise, if students do not feel like they belong, they are more likely to drop out in the first or second year.

In his model, Tinto (1975, 1987, 1993) also hypothesized why social and academic integration impacts persistence and departure based on sociological perspectives of Emile Durkheim related to suicide and Arnold Van Gennep’s anthropological-based developmental theory about the three phases in which people go through when moving from one life stage to the next (separation, transition and integration). Tinto first proposed his concept in 1975, and then expanded upon more than a decade later. Tinto (1987) identified three major sources of institutional withdrawal: a) academic challenges, b) inability to resolve personal educational and occupational goals, and c) failure to become integrated into the academic and social lives of the campus. The model was modified six years later (1993) when he added failure to negotiate the rites of passage which included a successful negotiation of a new student’s disassociation with communities such as family, high school classmates, and those known while growing up, while rejecting past attitudes and values. The students would then commit themselves to identifying and engaging with the values of the students and faculty at college. Once students negotiate this stage, they transition and ultimately incorporate themselves into the campus culture. Separation may be particularly challenging for those whose past communities are not supportive of entering college such as first-generation college students (FGS).

Throughout his career, Tinto continued to build upon his theory revising, expanding, and offering recommendations for implementation. In 2012, he authored *Completing College: Rethinking Institutional Action* with suggestions on how institutions can use his model as a foundation for student retention, thus extending its usability. Those steps were based on the four
conditions he outlined in 2010, on how students are more likely to remain at the institution: clear, high self and institutional expectations; academic, social, and possibly financial support; assessment; and feedback, as well as involvement. While all four years of college are important, Tinto argued that the first year is critical, because students are more responsive to institutional interventions that help them become more engaged academically and socially, which increases involvement in their education. Thus, he saw four opportunities to impact retention: recruitment where students are encouraged to choose the right school, orientation where new students learn about institutional life and its requirements, pre-entry placement that places students in appropriate courses, and support services to the first year of college where a first-year experience course can help smooth the transition. These services, which encompass counseling and advising, monitoring and early warning academic involvement, and support as well as transition assistance, can all improve retention.

While Tinto’s model is frequently used in research and discussions about student departure, the first major criticisms of the model began in the late 1980’s. More recently, there are calls for revisions to and/or overhauls to the model to include economic, psychological, and organizational perspectives as well as student satisfaction, personal sense of usefulness, and stress (Attinasi, 1989; Braxton, Hirschy, & McClendon, 2004; Braxton, Sullivan, & Johnson, 1997; Elkins, Braxton, and James, 2000; Tierney, 1992). Attinasi (1989) who studied departures of Mexican-American college students posited that Tinto’s model had limited success. He criticized the grounding of the model in social or socio-psychological phenomena from a different context (other than education) and should better understand cultural impacts. He did not believe that dropping out of college was similar to committing suicide or leaving a job. Tierney (1992) supported Tinto’s model for examining culture as a framework but he criticized Tinto’s
model for misinterpretation of anthropological notions of ritual and that in some cases diversity and differences should be celebrated instead of supporting a move toward a homogenous campus culture. Additionally, Tinto focused on the individual instead of groups or cultures, which Tierney believed was reverse of most anthropological viewpoints. He also criticized Tinto for building the model from a faculty, rather than a student’s, point of view. Braxton, Sullivan and Johnson (1997) found only weak to moderate support for portions of Tinto’s model. At single institutional studies, there was strong support for four underlying propositions: a) level of initial commitment to the institution is affected by student entry characteristics, b) greater levels of social integration increases the level of institutional commitment, c) initial level of institutional commitment affects subsequent levels of institutional commitment, and d) the greater level of subsequent commitment, the higher likelihood of student persistence. They did not find evidence that Attinasi’s constructs would be any more helpful in explaining the cultural aspects of student departures or that Tierney’s suggestion of critical theory would be any more helpful without having a model to examine. Another aspect of criticism regarding Tinto’s model is that he developed it as a faculty member at a Predominately White Institution (PWI). While he revised the original model twice since it was first developed in 1975, Tinto still noted limitations to the improvements, primarily involving non-White cultures. Guiffrida (2006) noted that Tinto argued that students needed to separate themselves from past associations and traditions in order to make new ones. Those who point to flaws in the model argue that this is an example of Critical Race Theory (Ladings-Billings, 1998) where racism is the norm and actions primarily benefit White cultures; in this case, students. For example, some populations such as Hispanics heavily emphasize family and continued connections while deemphasizing separation, which contradicts Tinto’s model. Many Hispanic students attend PWIs where cultural values are not recognized or
understood. These cultural norms for the ethnicity may be the opposite of programs supporting the separation, transition, and incorporation phases in Tinto’s model. The norms may be further defined by gender (male-hyper masculinity, female, virtue, humility, and nurturance) (Cerzo, McWhirter, Valdez, and Buston, 2013).

Similar to Tinto’s work are those of Astin (1984) and Bean and Eaton (2001). Astin’s (1984) Theory of Involvement, which is based on his research of college dropouts, posited that students get more from college when they invest more effort, both quantitatively and qualitatively. There are three elements to the theory: a) inputs which consist of demographics, student background, and previous experiences, b) environment which includes a range of experiences encountered during college, and c) outcomes which include characteristics, knowledge, attitudes, beliefs, and values that exist after college. Within the theory, there are also five postulates including 1) investment of psychosocial and physical energy, 2) continuous involvement, 3) students invest varying amounts of energy at different times, 4) there are both qualitative and quantitative benefits directly proportional to the quality and the amount of involvement, and 5) the educational effectiveness is related to the level of student involvement. Astin (1993) further clarified that varying amounts of student involvement in both academic and social integration could impact persistence. The more they are engaged, the more they get from the college experience, and the more likely they are to stay. Using behavioral measures based on Astin’s (1984) Theory of Involvement and Tinto’s (1993) Theory on Student Departure, Berger and Milem (1997) demonstrated that student behaviors and perceptions impact their academic and social integration.

The Psychological Model of Student Retention proposed by Bean and Eaton (2001), is similar to Tinto’s (1993) theory because it is based on the concept that voluntary or involuntary
decisions to remain or withdraw from college are personal ones. The model linked retention to similar past behavior, normative values, attitudes, and intentions by integrating additional variables such as academic factors, student intent, goals, expectations, and internal environmental factors. The Bean and Eaton (2001) model differs from Tinto’s (1993) model, because it is more complex. Students enter college with a set of experiences, abilities, and self-assessments (e.g., self-confidence, ability to cope, locus of control), then interact with the institution, its faculty, staff, and administrators as well as other students while continuing to act with those from their past (e.g., family, high school classmates). The authors included academic results (e.g., grade point average), organizational fit, and loyalty to the institution as strong indicators of a student’s intent to remain and graduate from the school. Together these three theories help us understand why retention programs succeed or fail.

The second literature stream rests in the academic and student support literature, specifically as it relates to the role and function of academic advising. Burns Crookston’s (1972) seminal work on developmental advising was based on student development theories, including those put forth by Chickering (1969). Crookston’s (1972) theory, well supported and the basis of many academic advising programs, is still being practiced around the world (Robbins & Shaffer, 2012). This theory is focused on the whole person and is grounded in cognitive development, psychosocial, and person-environment theories (Creamer, 2000; Winston, Ender, & Miller, 1982). Developmental advising is a form of advising that is not only concerned with the process of receiving an education, but personal development as well (Crookston, 1972). This increases students’ growth and development through cognitive development, interpersonal skills, behavior awareness, problem solving, decision-making, and evaluative skills. This form of advising is important because there is solid evidence that it influences retention and graduation (Winston,
Miller, Ender & Grites, 1984). Crookston (1972) defined two types of advising relationships: authority based and student based. The first is prescriptive, based on authority where an advisor believes the student should carry out the advice and a student sees him/herself as going to an authority to get answers. He compared it to a physician-patient relationship. The second concentrated on student development and includes a series of tasks with varying degrees of learning by both advisor and advisee with joint responsibility for the advising process.

Developmental advising focused on the needs, values, and career goals. Typical advising sessions involve information about curriculum, courses, and graduation requirements (Kuhn, Gordon, & Webber, 2006). Developmental academic advising would incorporate more teaching and learning activities that would help students while helping them grow and navigate the administrative aspects of attending college (Winston et al., 1984). Developmental advising puts the focus on student-decision making and student responsibility; the advisor’s role is to guide the student to make appropriate choices. “Advising is not an exact science, and the theories do not support a pristine approach on guiding students toward making good academic and life decisions” (Roufs, 2007, p. 37). Developmental advising is about growth of the person in which the advising is an active learning process with dialogue, and higher order thinking skills are utilized (Hemwall & Trachte, 2005). Crookston (1972) posited 10 dimensions, which differentiate prescriptive and developmental advising including abilities, motivation, rewards, maturity, control, and responsibility. An advisor who follows the developmental model sees the student as self-directed and continually moves toward transferring more and more responsibility for academic planning to him or her. This transfer ultimately helps students develop decision-making and problem-solving skills.
What type of advising do students perceive they receive and need? There are multiple ways to examine this, but the predominant measurement instrument for determining prescriptive and advising style preferences is the Academic Advising Inventory (Winston & Sandor, 1984a) which is designed to measure five aspects of academic advising: the nature of the relationship, the type and frequency of activities during the advising session, student demographic information, students’ particular advising situation, and the ideal academic advisor. Research does not provide a clear-cut answer to whether prescriptive or developmental is better, but a series of studies related to student and institutional variables have provided some clues. Jordan (2000) challenged the notion of the inventory by arguing that students may not feel comfortable with making developmental decisions, thus should not determine what type of advising they should receive. Fielstein (1987) argued that not all students want a personal relationship with the advisor, and Yarbrough (2010) found that students concentrate on the advising situation, rather than the advising style.

Advising preferences are often related to student characteristics, but in some cases, are not clear. There is a wide range of studies with varying results. In general, most prefer the developmental approach (Crockett, 1985, Frost, 1990; Winston et al., 1982; Winston & Sandor, 1984b). Female students are significantly more likely to prefer developmental advising rather than prescriptive advising (Chando, 1997; Milburn, 1994) and find relational values to be more important than male students do (Mottarella, Fritzsche, & Cerabino, 2004). Yet another study by Jaffe and Huba (1990) observed no clear-cut results regarding gender among engineering students. Research is mixed when it comes to the age of the student. Fielstein (1992) discovered traditional age students placed more value on developmental advising than non-traditional students, while Winston and Sandor (1984b) realized students, regardless of age, preferred
developmental advising. Other researchers have found students’ advising style preference changes throughout their years in higher education. Brown and Rivas (1994) discovered that students initially need prescriptive advising to get acclimated to the advising relationship itself, especially students of color, international, and first-generation college students. Subsequently, those students may be better served with developmental advising. Duckworth’s (2008) research showed that under-resourced students wanted prescriptive advising, but thought they were receiving developmental advising. Yet, they were marginally satisfied with advising during their first semester and agreed their advisor played a role in their intent to persist into the second semester of their first year. Jordan (2000) argued that instead of one or the other, advising needed to be a continuum from prescriptive to developmental depending on student needs. Lowenstein (1999) posited that students need both types and one form should not be chosen over another. Beyond age, Crockett and Crawford (1989) looked at personality variables and advising preferences using the Academic Advising Inventory (AAI) and the Myers Briggs test and found “intuitive” persons preferred more developmental approach than “thinking” persons.

Congruence is also important. Students are more satisfied with advising when they perceive they are getting the style they prefer. First-year students who preferred developmental advising were more satisfied when they received it throughout the first semester (Muedking, 2006). There was also significantly higher satisfaction with those who prefer developmental advising and received it than those who had a conflict between need and perceived advising (Hale, Graham, & Johnson, 2009).

Even though Crookston (1972) identified developmental advising as a form of teaching and even included it in the title of his article, advisors and researchers focused on the developmental aspect initially, not his vision of a student-centered process that focused on
personal development and achievement (Winston, 1994). Grites and Gordon (2000) argued advising needed to return to a focus on the whole person. For other researchers, that is not enough and they argue academic advising needs to be based on multiple frameworks (Laff, 1994; Lowenstein, 1999; Pardee, 1994). Laff (1994) recognized that the developmental advising model is not easily managed and underutilized because often advisors do not have enough time to work through complex challenges and issues in short appointments. Yet, others have argued there is a balance within Crookston’s model. Hagen and Jordan (2008) contended that Crookston set parameters about limits and responsibilities as part of the relationship and effective advising could be attained within the model.

Terry O’Banion (1972) published a complementary theory on academic advising. While initially published in separate publications that year, both Crookston (1972) and O’Banion (1972) were reprinted in the same NACADA Journal in 1994 to mark advances in academic advising theory. O’Banion’s (1972) model also reflected the move toward developmental advising. He saw advising as a dynamic, continuous process with a larger role for students in the advising process and conjectured what the steps should be as well as who (e.g., student peer, professional advisor, faculty member) is best equipped to advise at different steps in the process. While the model was developed for community colleges, O’Banion felt it would work for four-year colleges as well. Like Crookston, he considered it vital for students; “academic advising is a central and important activity in the process of education” (O’Banion, 2013, p. 10). There is some overlap in each step of his sequential model, but the logical sequence of the five steps included: (1) life goal exploration, (2) career goals, (3) program decisions, (4) course choice, and (5) course scheduling. Thus, if a student did not explore life goals, he or she would not be able to decide how to choose the best vocation for his or her skills and interests. He argued that
academic advising programs fail because they start at the third step, program choice, rather than with life goals. Like Crookston, he felt students should be responsible for making decisions (O’Banion, 1972). One way that the Crookston and O’Banion models differ is that O’Banion recommended professional advisors for the first two steps, faculty for the third and fourth, and student assistants for course scheduling. Crookston saw advising as an extension of teaching, thus an activity appropriate for faculty all of the time. O’Banion argued that faculty lacked enough time and preparation to assist with life and career goals, but he saw the value of faculty-student interactions so faculty get to know students better, could integrate advising into curriculum and teaching, and increase knowledge of the institution and the students. In advocating for his hybrid model of professional advisors, faculty, and student peers, O’Banion contended some institutions have a faculty-based program simply because of perceived lower costs.

In Robbins and Shaffer’s (2012) introduction to the Fall 2012 NACADA Journal, Grites noted his own use of both models in his doctoral dissertation. Referring to the Crookston and O’Banion models, Grites “visualized each as providing an axis for graphic representation of the advising process. O’Banion provided the horizontal axis along which each individual student progressed in this endeavor” (p. 3). The vertical axis represented Crookston’s developmental continuum. Since the explosion of interest in developmental advising, researchers and practitioners have expounded upon it, refuted it, and developed additional models. Yarbrough (2002) took developmental advising further positing that the relationship goes beyond responsibility; ideally there is a mutual learning process for both advisor and advisee based on areas of shared interest. Glennen (1975) expanded developmental advising to what he called “intrusive advising” where the advisor intervenes when the student might not seek help.
Some theorists suggest other models may be more effective. Strengths-based advising personalizes advising process to include building upon students’ current skills set for both selecting a major and succeeding in college (Schreiner & Anderson, 2005). A variation is appreciative advising which is more focused on student passions to design goals for school, career, and personal lives (Bloom, Huston, & He, 2008). Integrative advising is based on NACADA’s core values and a prescriptive advising structure while providing a holistic approach to education incorporating identifying career goals and a schedule to align with these interests. It also includes a critical trait of student approval – recognizing that student satisfaction is paramount. In fact, the model is based on the belief that the advisor will follow the core values of NACADA as well as three main areas: requirements to graduate, reception of a quality education, and student satisfaction (Church, 2005). Therefore, while multiple models exist, Crookston’s (1972) model continues to be the foundation for most of academic advising theory.

**Retention in Higher Education**

Retention and persistence to graduation remains a key challenge of higher education for institutional, personal, public opinion, and national policy reasons. Student retention may be defined as the “ability of an institution to keep a student from admission through graduation” (Campbell & Nutt, 2010, p. 9). Legislators (and key funders) have taken steps to mandate increased graduation rates, at the same time higher education administrators recognize that persistence positively impacts institutional programming, reduces recruitment needs, and that keeping students provides additional resources for other programs. In the latest statistics from the National Center for Education Statistics (2013), only about 59% of full-time, first-time students who began a bachelor’s degree program in 2005 at a four-year institution graduated by 2011 or within six years.
There is also a shift in responsibility for failure from primarily students to shared responsibility of the students and the institutions. Yet only 64.1% of campuses have identified an individual responsible for coordinating retention strategies, almost 40% of campuses have yet to establish an improvement goal for retention of students from the first to second year, and only 38.7% of campuses have established a goal for improved degree completion (Habley & McClanahan, 2004). The student success issue is even more complex because there is not a one-size-fits all solution (Davidson, Beck, & Milligan, 2009; Tinto, 1985, 2006/2007). In most cases, when a student leaves college it is an individual decision. In fact, nearly 85% of departures are voluntary, not necessarily grade-related and “may involve many of the brightest and more creative students on campus, individuals whose grade point averages often exceed those of the average persister” (Tinto, 1985, p. 32). The decision to leave has more to do with “the result of the individual’s intentions and commitments and the nature of personal experiences in the academic and social communities of the college” (p. 32).

Tinto (1999) argued that retention was not about new programs, but about existing programs, services, and support that impact attrition. “Students need to understand the road map to completion and know how to use it to decide upon and achieve personal goals” (p. 5). He identified four institutional conditions needed for persistence: information/advice, support, involvement, and learning in which academic advising plays a critical role. Understanding student retention is complicated, involving multiple factors including student demographics, campus culture, institutional type, and admission criteria (Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991; Tinto, 1987). Building upon Tinto’s work, Davidson et al. (2009) identified three enrollment status predictors for persistence to the sophomore year: institutional commitment, academic integration, and academic conscientiousness. From a student’s perspective, Titus (2006) identified four
behaviors that impact persistence: academic performance, declaration of a major, residential campus living, and campus involvement.

One key support area is academic integration including institutional relationships. Student-university relationships also influence student retention and reflect the need for efforts to build relationships (Bruning, 2002). Satisfaction with this relationship is a primary predictor of persistence (Noel & Levitz, 1995). Tinto (2004) claimed that retention was positively affected when institutions focused on at-risk groups such as first-generation students as well students who are undecided about their majors or change their majors. Another aspect of persistence is a sense of belonging. Hausmann, Ye, Schofield, and Woods (2009) argued that a supportive campus climate improves retention by creating an environment where involvement occurs and actions are interpreted. Family and friend relationships are important to social integration. In an empirical study at a four-year public institution, Elkins, Braxton, and James (2000) found four student characteristics to be positive influences on the decision to remain in college: gender, race, parent income, and high school academic achievement. More specifically, female and White students were more likely to receive support to stay in school than male students or those belonging to an ethnic or racial minority. Additionally, the higher the parent income and high school grade point average, the more likely students received support to attend college. The study supported Tinto’s (1993) assertion that those from ethnic or racial groups may find more challenge in separating from the past. The researchers concluded that first-semester students who successfully complete the separation phase are more likely to persist to the second semester and those with support are more likely to do so as well.
Retention and Academic Advising

As data continue to mount, the importance of academic advising continues to grow. More and more research points to a strong connection between quality academic advising and student success including retention (Campbell & Nutt, 2008, 2010; Habley, 1981; Habley & McClanahan, 2004; Kuh, Kinzie, Schuh, & Whitt, 2005; Light, 2001; Metzner, 1989). Academic advising can be tied to student retention through its impact on factors strongly connected to persistence: student satisfaction, educational/career planning, utilization of campus support services, student/faculty interaction, and student mentoring. In data from the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), students who reported the highest degree of satisfaction with academic advising were more likely to engage at the school at the highest levels (Kuh, 2003). The institutional commitment to advising quality reflects its overall commitment to student success (Campbell & Nutt, 2010). In 2004, researchers for ACT, Inc. studied existing literature on student persistence and found motivation and academic self-confidence were important factors in college persistence and academic advising was advocated as a way to increase both. Student satisfaction and the perception of met needs correlates with positive impact on persistence (Lotkowski, Robbins, & Noeth, 2004). Light (2001) conducted more than 10 years of research, visiting almost 100 institutions including large and small, public and private, and all over the country in order to examine persistence issues. He found the provision of quality in academic advising to be the top concern by students and advisors. High engagement can come with the student-faculty relationship in academic advising, and is empirically associated with student retention (Astin, 1993; Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991; Tinto, 1993). Thus, there is also a connection between the quality of academic advising, student engagement, and ultimately persistence.
At the same time, ensuring quality is a challenge. Students see advising as the biggest challenge to receiving a quality educational experience (Winston, et al., 1982). More than 20 years later, the 2005 National Survey for Student Engagement (NSSE, 2005) found that the quality of academic advising predicted high campus satisfaction, which correlated with Metzner’s (1989) findings that good advising had not only a direct effect on satisfaction but positive impact on intent to leave and grade point average (GPA). Researchers in NSSE’s (2005) longitudinal survey found that students who perceived the academic advising to be of “good quality” withdrew from the public university at a rate that was 25% less than those who perceived the academic advising as “poor quality.” Additionally, “good quality” academic advising had a statistically significant, indirect effect on student persistence by having a positive association with student satisfaction and a negative association with intent to leave.

Academic advising can also improve degree completion time. Guillén (2010) found significant correlations between student satisfaction with advising, number of advising sessions, and the time between entering and completing college. At the same time, the number of advising sessions also had positive correlations in other research. NSSE (2005) found that the more students met with their advisor, the more they were satisfied with the advising experience. Vander Schee’s (2007) corresponding study found student performance increased when students met with an academic advisor three to eight times a semester compared to those who met with an advisor zero to two times a semester. Seidman’s (2007) research the same year with community college students discovered those who received three academic advising touch points within the first semester were 20% more likely to persist than those who only went to orientation.

Habley (1981) focused on a critical link between advising and retention through the advising-retention model. In order to positively impact retention, advising must be both
developmental and student-centered while student development needed to be a priority in the advising system. Campbell and Nutt (2008) argued that as a result of research such as this, advising needed to become much more than an exchange of information from an advisor to an advisee; developmental, quality advising could also positively impact student learning outcomes and thus persistence to graduation. Other research concurs. For example, Tinto (2007) also indicated that high expectations for students, strong support levels, and academic advising were among the factors that had direct effects on student success. There is also more research to support a financial connection for institutions. Glennen, Farren, and Vowell (1996) reported that after Emporia State University increased its focus on advising, it increased retention and the school’s revenue by $7.54 million over 10 years.

Quality advising, which includes students’ involvement in their education, increases retention among at-risk students. “Advisors can help underprepared students clarify their career and life goals and assist them to see how the courses they take will aid in meeting their goals” (Harding & Miller, 2013, p. 15). Advisors can also help with academic language, with terms such as credit hours, degree requirements, and registration, which can be overwhelming for at-risk students.

**Academic Advising**

Often, there is a perception that academic advising is a perfunctory part of academic bureaucracy. But when done well, it can have a tremendous impact on both students and the institutions (Tinto, 2012). Advisors are one consistent connection for students who also act as liaisons with the institution (Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education, 2011). Multiple research studies point to positive results; academic advising has been identified as one of several key factors in student success that leads to persistence and retention among
high performing institutions (Kuh et al., 2005; Tinto 2012). Yet, with this impact, advising is not always an institutional priority, leaving room for improvement, which could ultimately impact persistence to graduation, especially with at-risk populations.

The National Academic Advising Association (NACADA) defined the concept of academic advising as “based in the teaching and learning mission of higher education, is a series of intentional interactions with a curriculum, a pedagogy, and a set of student learning outcomes” (NACADA, 2006, para. 11). This holistic approach is contrary to a long held belief by some that the role is a narrow one, focused on meeting degree and graduation requirements. As institutions become more focused on student retention, advisors are one consistent connection for students who also act as liaisons with the institution (CAS, 2011). Academic advising is already one of the most learner-centered activities on campus and “when done well, academic advising approaches each student as an individual, and assures that the goals and aspirations of that student are addressed and hopefully, achieved” (White, McCalla-Wriggins, & Hunter, 2007, p. 227). Through dialogic advising, students learn higher order thinking skills, think critically, and learn to meet goals; thus, it is important for the advisor to know the learner and adjust accordingly (Hemwall & Trachte, 2005). Habley and Bloom (2007) identified several roles for academic advisors including service as a consumer advocate so the students make smart choices, actively intervening when necessary (intrusive advising), and orchestrating efforts to make maximum impact, which means the advisors need a personal relationship with the student and need to know the programs, policies, and resources of the institution. At the same time, the advisor must often serve as a conflict mediator when college expectations and experiences collide, yet also know when to create conflict in order to challenge students and expand boundaries. Advisors also help students navigate written and unwritten rules including
counseling on behaviors and etiquette, know when policies or courses could negatively impact student growth or goals, and serve as a student advocate within the institution by bringing issues to governance and policy bodies. Habley and Bloom also believed academic advisors should have a basic understanding of student development theory.

However, the role of an academic advisor varies from institution to institution. Kuhn et al., (2006) identified advisors as part-time and full-time professional staff, faculty, peer advisors, graduate assistants, administrators, and dual position staff who provide either academic and career counseling or academic and mental health counseling. While some may still cling to this model, students’ backgrounds, needs, and expectations are different today because of an increasing number of females, racially diverse students, and first-generation college students with differing social, emotional, and academic support needs. Thus, Kuhn (2008) offered a broader definition of academic advising as “situations in which an institutional representative gives insight or direction to a college student about an academic, social, or personal matter” (p. 3). Many also have responsibilities outside of advising to fulfill teaching, research, and service commitments.

Advising is part of a complex student-centered system that includes choosing courses, majors, and residential life concerns (Light, 2001). Light spent more than a decade examining how students can get the most from the college experience. The findings came from in-depth interviews – more than 1,600 at 90 institutions including highly selective to those with open admittance policies, public and private, as well as small and large campuses. More than 80% of students identified a situation outside the classroom where a major event such as advising helped change them. Advisors can often ask unexpected questions about life and academic goals, which can positively impact success. Bigger ideas are important, and one of the most mentioned was
one that forced students to think about the relationship of their academic work with their personal lives. Those who simply get a signature on an advising form miss a key part of the advising process.

Young women and men arriving at college immediately confront a set of decisions. Which courses to choose? What subject to specialize in? What activities to join? How much to study? Such decisions are intensely personal. Often they are made with little information. Yet their consequences can be enormous. A subject that is bypassed or study habits that are mismatched for certain classes, can result in limited options, reduced opportunities, or closed doors. Advisors play a critical role. They can ask a broad array of questions, and make a few suggestions, that can affect students in a profound and continuing way. (p. 84)

Thus, quality advising is a critical piece of the educational puzzle, which can strongly impact persistence and retention.

**History of Academic Advising**

Frost (2000) categorized three periods of evolution of academic advising. The first period was from the founding of Harvard University in 1636 to the late 19th century. Before the Revolutionary War, faculty taught, but also mentored, disciplined, advised, and acted as parents. Harvard offered a simple advising program which was fairly perfunctory involving helping students choose electives and sign course registration cards (Kuhn, 2008). During this time period there were also two significant events that impacted advising: a gap began to widen between students and faculty and there was a growth of women being admitted from 1790 to 1850.
This era also included the time frame right after the Civil War and was connected to the Morrill Land Grant Acts of 1862 and 1890 which created new universities and supported previously excluded Historically Black College and Universities as well as White institutions in southern states. Together, these actions increased access to college and expanded faculty roles in research and service, away from student academic and moral development. At the same time, students began to have choices within the curriculum. Between increasing new demands on faculty time and the new needs of students, advising was focused on appropriate course selection (Thurmond, 2007). As students had choices, administrators recognized the need to discuss those choices with an institutional representative (Schulenberg & Lindhorst, 2010). This time period also marked the use of three educational philosophies: utility (practical), liberal culture (learning for the sake of learning, based on classics) and research, based on German institutions (where faculty focused on research and did not talk to students on a personal basis) (Frost, 2000). As faculty shifted to focusing more on research or knowledge creation rather than knowledge transmission, some viewed advising as an inappropriate use of their time thus treated it superficially (Schulenberg & Lindhorst, 2010).

The second period in academic advising ran from the late 1800s to the 1970s as higher education structures became larger, more formal, and more complex. There was also enhanced distance between students and faculty. A system of academic advising introduced at Johns Hopkins in 1889 connected students and faculty to discuss courses (Frost, 2000). Daniel Coit Gilman, President of Johns Hopkins University, used the word “advisor” but also defined the responsibilities to listen, counsel, serve as an advocate and make sure student’s education stayed on track (Kuhn, 2008). Other schools such as Columbia, Wesleyan, Alfred, and Syracuse also adopted similar systems. Additionally, Alfred and Wesleyan’s programs included developmental
goals to examine students’ life and career interests. Syracuse used an integrated approach to help support students adjustment to college. During this time period, advising was primarily the function of student affairs (Frost, 2000), but also shifted to focus on the need to foster student maturity (Schulenberg & Lindhorst, 2010). Student support systems including academic advising grew in the 1930s and 1940s and became more student-centered (Kuhn, 2008). At the same time, the establishment of the National Science Foundation amplified faculty research activity. There was also an even more diverse student body because of a growing number of female students (Frost, 2000). The most growth occurred after The Serviceman’s Readjustment Act (GI Bill) was passed post-World War II, which provided educational access to some who had not previously been able to attend college including war veterans and other nontraditional students as well as more women and minorities. Many services including advising changed to meet student needs. Rapid growth meant faculty could not handle research, teaching, service, and all of the advising. As a result of all of these changes, administrative staff at the colleges and universities began assuming advising roles.

The third period is defined as the 1970s until today. The 1970s were significant for several reasons including the complementary advising models proposed by Crookston and O’Banion in different publications in 1972, a high demand for higher education, and efforts to contain costs as well as retain students (Frost, 2000). Coincidently emphasis on first-year support also began around the same time as advising. In the early 1970s, the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education recognized the importance of advising within the academic realm and drove efforts to formalize practices (Roufs, 2007). At this time, the faculty advisor/student relationship was characterized by a series of mundane tasks, rather than student engagement (Schulenberg & Lindhorst, 2010). In order to better focus on this issue, the National
Academic Advising Association (NACADA) was formed in 1979 and is comprised of faculty and professional advisors as well as administrators who are affiliated with academic advising in higher education institutions. The NACADA Statement of Core Values on Academic Advising includes 20 values that provide guidance on quality advising (NACADA, 2005). Aside from NACADA, programs like the National Resource Center for The First-Year Experience and Students in Transition offer guidelines on advising for some special populations (National Resource Center, 2013). The Council for the Advancement of Standards for Higher Education (CAS) promotes voluntary, quality measures including those for academic advising (CAS, 2011).

During mid to late 1900s, institutional leaders recognized the more important role that advising could play and created administrative models using professional advisors to fulfill unmet need. They used Crookston (1972) and O’Banion’s (1972) theories on developmental advising to help define the new academic advising profession, which included personal, psychological, and career development models (Schulenberg & Lindhorst, 2010). Around the beginning of the 21st century, academic advising was refocused on as an educative function, rediscovering Crookston’s aspect of this in his original 1972 theory, which was ultimately highlighted in the Concept of Academic Advising adopted by NACADA in 2006.

**Advising Structures, Assessments, and Evaluation**

Given the abundant theories, institutional types, and those who advise, there is not a dominant advising structure, assessment tool, or evaluative program. Academic advising is unique because of the wide range of practitioners with varying academic backgrounds (Hagen & Jordan, 2008), but programs are built upon what works best in the specific situation (Robbins, 2010).
Structural models differ based on type and size of institution and are mostly based on available resources, but human relationships are still a critical aspect (Light, 2001). There are multiple advising models and reporting structures including those that report to the provost, student affairs, or within academic departments. Often the structure is a result of the institutional mission, vision, and priorities (Thurmond, 2007). Factors that influence the structure of academic advising include: a) institutional mission including type of institution (public, private, proprietary), level of education (associate, bachelor’s, graduate), type of program (vocational, liberal arts, technical, professional), and selectivity of the student body; b) student body itself; c) faculty; and (d) programs and policies (King & Kerr, 2005).

Habley (1983) identified seven models of advising: faculty only, supplementary, split, dual, total intake, satellite, and self-contained. Later he narrowed it to three main models of advising delivery: centralized, where advisors are housed in one academic unit and are more likely professional advisors; decentralized, where advisors are within academic departments (more likely faculty); and shared, where some students are advised through a central academic center (i.e., “first-year students”) and others are advised within the major department (both professional and faculty). Habley and Morales (1998) found that any of the three models could be effective. According to 2003 data from the Sixth National Survey on Academic Advising (Habley, 2004), 55% of the institutions reported using a shared model of advising delivery compared with 45% of centralized and decentralized structures.

Delivery of academic advising is also changing. Technological advances mean some advising occurs outside of face-to-face settings. Gravel (2012) used the Academic Advising Inventory with online students to better understand satisfaction and needs. Data showed students felt the online advising was prescriptive and wanted prompt, personal attention which was more
developmental in nature. The results of this study indicated the need to establish practices and tools to make online student-advisor interaction more developmental. From a different perspective, Gaines (2014) examined online advising for students who are on a residential campus. She found the human element, whether face-to-face or electronic, remained critical. Using tools such as Skype, FaceTime, Google Hangout, and Adobe Connect offered the chance for students and advisors to capitalize on visual as well as verbal clues throughout the communications. Results showed students expressed strong interest for information dissemination through email rather than social media. Yet, most respondents chose face-to-face for interacting with academic advisors, followed by phone appointments, then email exchanges and conferencing tools such as Skype as least preferred. Like Gravel (2012), advisor accessibility was important, no matter what the communication mode.

Advising might be in the job description, but there may be little training, evaluation, and extrinsic reward. Fiddler and Alicea (1996) found that many new faculty members received insufficient training and more experienced advisors did not receive all of the relevant updates on course changes and graduation requirements. There is also little support once faculty begin advising and evaluative systems have been slow to catch up with the research. Hester (2008) argued that a more comprehensive evaluation system is needed if advising becomes part of the promotion and tenure process. But such a change can move slowly. “Formal changes in assessment and reward systems have lagged behind the national shifts in mission by a decade or more” (McGillin, 2003, p. 91).

Enhancing or designing a system to promote student success begins with national guidelines for academic advising developed by NACADA and CAS. These guidelines correlate with Crookston’s (1972) developmental advising model. One of NACADA’s strategic goals is to
“champion the educational role of academic advising to enhance student learning and development in a diverse world” (NACADA, 2005, para. 2). CAS (2011) defined academic advising expectations in 13 areas including mission, program, leadership, organization, ethics, as well as assessment and evaluation. Yet the only way to ensure advising programs meet expectations is through the process of assessment; however, most institutions fall short on how they examine their advising programs. Habley and Morales (1998) found that less than one-third of faculty advisors did not receive evaluations, recognition, or reward for their advising work. Of those who were evaluated, the process was often inconsistent within institutions, and often focused on student satisfaction and report of contact volume which presents limited information and in some cases, only applied to some advisors (Aiken-Wisniewski et al., 2010).

Effective advising programs include both evaluation and assessment in order to better understand the advising process and how to improve it. While sometimes used interchangeably, evaluation and assessment can have different connotations. Evaluation as defined by Robbins (2010) is an episodic process, usually performed on individual advisors. Program assessment in academic advising is more than measurement, it is meant to be an ongoing, positive, systemic, systematic process focused on accountability and outcomes. To counteract this and encourage positive change, Campbell and Nutt (2010) suggested a more formative process. Cuseo (2008) agreed, yet also added that evaluation should also include summative processes, which could prove impact or value as well. But ultimately assessment “is to be used toward the goal of improving student learning and development” (Campbell & Nutt, 2010, p. 10). Results can be used to improve the academic advising process as well overall program effectiveness, thus leading to stronger impacts on persistence to graduation.
Four major components were identified by Campbell and Nutt (2010) for effective academic advising program assessment: the purpose of an assessment; primary stakeholders; key values of the advising program; and identification of the vision, mission, goals, and programmatic objectives for academic advising. Once those are identified, outcome measurements for advising processes and student learning can be determined. More specifically, three general areas of program effectiveness were outlined by Troxel (2008) to evaluate efficiency, effectiveness, and impact; all of which should be ultimately tied to the organization’s goals. She defined aspects of efficiency as caseload and use of allocated resources while effectiveness refers to the goals of the program and posited that the two cannot be measured in isolation because they are interconnected. The third area, impact, is often the least examined because of the complexity of the time it takes to accrue the data and analyze it. Beyond that, Campbell and Nutt (2010) argued that the institutions must also clearly define what persistence, retention, and student success mean on their respective campuses and how this should be incorporated into practice, programming, and assessment. Valuable assessment systems collect data at every stage in the process and provide feedback as part of an integrated curriculum and as part of the larger student support system (Troxel, 2008).

Since every institution has unique characteristics, culture, advising models, and desired outcomes, each needs to design its own assessment program. But there are basic characteristics of effective program assessments that can be applied to all. Cuseo (2008) argued that multiplicity is a single word which summarizes effective assessment, by serving “multiple purposes, measures multiple outcomes, draws from multiple data sources, and uses multiple methods of measurement” (p. 370). As far as measuring those multiple outcomes, they can be summarized in the form of an “ABC” mnemonic: where “A= Affective outcomes (e.g., student
perceptions of advisor effectiveness), B=Behavioral outcomes (e.g., student use of campus resources), and C=Cognitive outcomes (e.g., student self-knowledge and curricular knowledge)” (p. 370-371).

Cuseo (2008) observed that both successful program assessment and advisor evaluations begin with effective advising practices such as a clear definition of academic advising, strong advising development, and a useful reward system. Such programs have a direct link to retention (Miller & Williams, 2003). Cuseo (2008) argued that individual advisor evaluations could be based on advising portfolios and include six items: a personal advising philosophy, personal advising practices, advising syllabus, responses to student evaluations, advising materials, and professional development activities. This portfolio along with student evaluations and advising director and peer assessments can provide comprehensive, formative, and summative feedback. Peer assessment can be powerful because it comes from someone facing similar circumstances. The advising leader can provide high-level insight of the data and spot themes that could provide opportunities for improvement to the advisor and for the system as a whole.

Student evaluations need to go beyond merely satisfaction in order to be successful. They do not need to be complicated and can be developed by the institution or purchased. Structurally, it should be short, no more than a 20-item survey, with open-ended questions for advisor strengths and improvement suggestions. Survey items should “reflect specific advisor characteristics and behaviors that the institution deems indicative of high-quality academic advising” (Cuseo, 2008, p. 371). It should also include items to measure learning outcomes as well as items in which the students report their own behavior and assess their own effort. Additionally there should be a chance for students to write comments explaining their rating for each item. The quantitative data from the survey can provide individual and peer results to
advisors. The qualitative data (written comments) can provide more in-depth information. Institutions can also choose to conduct focus groups after the individual student evaluations to provide additional in-depth data on perceptions, attitudes, and ideas. Combined, the results from these multiple tools can be used to identify overall needs for professional development, individual advisor opportunities for improvement, opportunities for best practice sharing, and advisor feedback of the system as a whole.

**Role of faculty.** Faculty, especially at small institutions, provide the majority of academic advising. Thus professors can play an important role in retention (Habley, 2004). It is more than the information advisors provide; it is the relationship (Bruning, 2002) and opportunity for faculty-student interaction (Tinto, 1993). In Lynch’s (2004) analysis of a decentralized academic advising system, students accessed faculty advising at a higher rate than advising centers. Historical challenges remain though; there remains a premium on faculty time, priorities, and accessibility as well as the changing environment in which they work. Full-time faculty who are secure in their positions are more likely to be engaged, which in turn benefits students. However, the current trend is toward fewer tenured and tenure-track positions. Since 1975, when 56.8% of faculty were full-time tenured or tenure-track, the number has steadily decreased. In 2007, only 30.2% fit into those two categories (American Association of University Professors, 2007). Finkelstein and Schuster (2001) examined the changing profile of professors and found that new faculty members in the 21st century are more likely to be female, of diverse ethnicities, and increasingly on non-tenure tracks. They also pointed out that contract and part-time faculty were far less likely to spend time with students outside of the classroom. Pisani and Stott’s (1998) research data from a private urban comprehensive Midwest university showed that part-time faculty satisfaction impacted developmental advising practices. Even if
full time, Milem, Berger, and Dey (2000) found that professors spent a statistically more significant amount of time on teaching and researching and lacked more informal interaction time with students.

Understanding the pressures on faculty is important in academic advising. Faculty members have many demands on their time outside of the classroom, institutional governance, and academic research. They often help to recruit students, stay abreast of issues in their field, and learn new technology. Faculty members also bring a variety of skills for advising and may enjoy the teaching aspects but might be uncomfortable with counseling (Reynolds, 2003). Colleges need to recognize the importance of the activity, assign reasonable advising loads, use only qualified professors, utilize referrals to professionals when needed, and use a solid method of evaluation. O’Banion (2013) recommended a team approach with professionals and faculty with student responsibility for decision making and no more than 15 advisees without a reduced teaching load.

While faculty were generally interested in advising, and were generally satisfied with their advising, there were gaps in what they felt they were providing and what the students needed, specifically in the areas of degree requirements, policies, and procedures. Yet, Allen and Smith (2008) also found that faculty believed that connections at the institution and within the major were part of their responsibility as advisors. Additionally, faculty felt that advising was undervalued by the administration. Both students and faculty agree on many important aspects of academic advising, but faculty advisors do not necessarily assume responsibility for those they and students deem important.

Often, there is little advising preparation for faculty; training can be brief and heavily focused on sharing information (Gordon & Habley, 2000). In a national study, faculty who
indicated they handled the majority of advising, did not feel adequately trained, and the advising function meant multiple time-consuming tasks outside of the face-to-face contact with students (Swanson, 2006), which they valued the most. They can also have little incentive to gain tremendous knowledge that is needed to share with students (Dillon & Fisher, 2000).

In the faculty-student relationship, the professor can take on multiple roles as an advisor: counselor, scheduler, and teacher. Those assuming “counselor” are more likely to ask developmental questions such as those related to Chickering and Reisser’s (1993) vectors. Schedulers are more focused on policy, procedures, and available resources. Teachers approach from a learning outcomes perspective for both educational and personal issues. Yet no matter what the structure, advising takes time to administer, learn, and build relationships (Duller, Creamer, & Creamer, 1997). Whether in a teaching or advising role, faculty relationships with students impact retention. The key point is the relationship (Bruning, 2002; Mottarella et al., 2004). “Relationship” is a general term used in many different situations and circumstances. Individual relationships can be described as a series of interpersonal, dynamic interactions that ultimately form a continually evolving structure in which both parties have perceptions and expectations of each other (Broom, Casey, & Ritchey, 2000). While faculty-student relationships might be considered individual in nature, faculty actually enter into the relationship as an institutional representative; thus they are part of an organization-public relationship where the former is the college or university and the student is a key public who has an interest or a value in an organization (Wilcox & Cameron, 2009). An organization-public relationship (OPR) is slightly different than an interpersonal one in that it includes attributes distinct from the individuals involved, yet still is characterized by commitment, trust, satisfaction, and interdependence (Broom et al., 2000). These are similar characteristics to a relationship between
an institution and its students. Relationship management theory is the ability to generate benefit for both the organization and the publics while attaining the organization’s goals (Ledingham, 2006). In higher education, this mutual benefit can mean that the student receives an education and a path to future employment while the institution benefits financially from his or her attendance and lifelong support.

Additionally, there is a correlation between relational commitment and effort to keep and maintain the relationship. This model is an important part of understanding other relationship management theories. Waters and Bortree (2012) found perceptions of quality when there were trust and satisfaction. Some of the same characteristics also apply to faculty-student relationships. Reynolds (2003) argued that trust, satisfaction, and mutuality are hallmarks of both good teaching and advising relationships. At small colleges and universities, faculty members are often responsible for both. The size of the institution has a “more pronounced enabling influence on the frequency, quality, and impact of a student’s relationship with faculty” (Pascarella, Wolniak, Seifert, Cruce, & Blaich, 2005, p. 88). Often faculty members are some of the first OPRs on campus and develop relationships through the theoretical framework of student development. Crookston’s (1972) theory on developmental advising focused on the whole person including a level of mutuality through collaboration between advisor and advisee that fosters relationship growth. These attributes foster a strong relationship between advisor and advisee, leading to personal growth for both parties.

Since Crookston’s (1972) theory is built on a premise of advising as teaching, his theory also applies to faculty-student relationships in general, which are important aspects of student life at small colleges and universities. Hemwall and Trachte (2005) pointed to the “individual attention given to students, small class sizes, favorable faculty-student ratios, and the integration
of learning opportunities” (p. 7) as characteristics often attributed to smaller institutions. Faculty-student relationships can lead to higher involvement on campus. Astin’s involvement theory (1984) and Tinto’s (1993) theory on student departure posited that students who get involved with people, organizations, student life or other aspects of college are more likely to persist to graduation. Additional research by Astin (1993), as well as Pascarella and Terenzini (1991), supported the idea that smaller institutions can improve student outcomes through increased interactions with faculty both inside and outside of the classroom. Astin also noted that the most productive interactions are those that center on educationally meaningful relationships. Others accept it is both; it is the quantity as well as the type of student-faculty interaction that has the greatest impact on students (Kuh & Hu, 2001; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005; Sax, 2008). The more interaction with faculty means the more positive the impact on the students (Kuh & Hu, 2001). Out of class contact appeared to more positively shape students’ perceptions of the campus environment, which directly impacted the effort they put forth (Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). Simple social exchanges have less impact than those that have an intellectual or substantive focus. Ultimately student-faculty interaction positively impacts student learning and effort on other educational-related activities. Sax (2008) interpreted these and other results to be that the quality of the interaction was much more important than the quantity of interactions. These studies add to the body of knowledge supporting Tinto’s (1993) theory.

Bailey, Bauman, and Lata (1998) found four factors that were significantly different between those who did and did not persist at 14 Pennsylvania institutions: overall experience, campus community, faculty, and advising. Advising could play a role in three: overall experience, faculty, and advising. Furthermore student perceptions of advising were more
favorable when their academic advisor also taught their first-year seminar course (Bitz, 2011). Strayhorn and Sadler (2009) confirmed that there is a correlation between faculty/student mentoring and college satisfaction while Fischer (2007) found formal academic ties such as connectedness with professors were positively related to grade point average. Part of his argument included data from National Longitudinal Survey of Freshmen showing that more connections with faculty (both formal and informal) were more satisfied and more likely to persist.

Faculty interaction improved student learning and development regardless of gender, race, social class, and first-generation status (Kim & Sax, 2009). African American students were less likely to be involved in research-related faculty connections and were less likely to approach faculty because they were concerned faculty would view them as simply needing help because of their race (Schwitzer, Griffin, Ancis, & Thomas, 1999). This seems to indicate that African American students are more likely to need formal relationships or initial contact from professors. And those at predominately White institutions (PWIs) benefited from having a faculty mentor who has already navigated such an environment (Davis, 2010).

Gender can also play a role in faculty-student relationships. Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, and Tarule (1986) argued that a sense of connectedness is important to women’s intellectual, moral, and identity development. “Educators can help women develop their own authentic voices if they emphasize connection over separations, understanding, and acceptance over assessment and collaboration over debate” (p. 229). Despite earlier research to the contrary, Drew and Work (1998) completed an extensive analysis of data from multiple institutions and showed women were not impacted from a chilly classroom climate first described in the 1980s. They attributed this difference to an increasing number of women faculty and administrators as
well as societal attitude changes toward women since the earlier studies were published. The researchers also found that female students reported more interactions with faculty than men and higher participation in class and generally reported making the same or greater gains in personal and intellectual development. Five years later, findings from Whitt, Pascarella, Nesheim, Marth, and Pierson (2003) reinforced that there remained educational differences between men and women. As a result, institutions and faculty need to be committed to gender equity in experiences and outcomes. Research from Sax, Bryant, and Harper (2005) concurred, finding men’s and women’s interactions with faculty differ even though the role played by faculty was similar. These gender-based differences included political engagement, social activism, gender role attitudes, as well as physical and psychological well-being.

There are also differences in interactions based on the gender of the faculty member. The percentage of women faculty, general faculty support, and hours per week talking with faculty outside of the class are important for both genders (Sax, 2008). Young and Sax (2009) examined the effects of student-faculty interactions on a range of outcomes including college GPA, degree aspiration, and satisfaction with college student experience differences in the frequency of faculty-student interaction across student gender, race, social class, and first-generation status. They observed that male students may receive greater benefits related to degree aspiration than female students, female students tended to prefer to interact with faculty one-on-one (i.e., communication with faculty by e-mail or in person), and females as well as Whites, upper-class students, and non-first-generation students were more satisfied with their interaction with faculty than male, non-White, lower-class, and first-generation students. Increased academic engagement can enhance both male and female confidence, which can come from student-faculty interaction in and out of class (Sax, 2008). However, the larger the campus, the harder it may be
to know faculty, thus small colleges and universities present more opportunities for such relationships.

The gender of the faculty can also impact the outcomes of the relationships. As the numbers of female faculty members continue to grow, they are changing the role of faculty. More students ask female faculty members for time and help because they perceive women as more available and approachable than men. Bartlett (2005) examined this phenomenon after receiving evaluations that described her as “nice” and she wrote, “it seems that women academics must negotiate their performance of gender in ways that men do not” (p, 196). Thus they face additional burdens of their time that men do not. Sax (2008) also found that “the presence of academically confident and successful female faculty may strengthen women’s views of their own academic abilities” (p. 82). While Komarovsky (1985) argued that male faculty are viewed as providing intellectual stimulation for women students and female faculty were perceived as encouraging students personally.

**Advising Student Populations**

As the student population in higher education grows, there are increasing numbers of non-traditional, part-time, financially independent, and working students. Students are also less likely to live on campus and experience even greater influence by parents and family than before. The stereotype is changing. “It’s no longer true that college students are mostly eighteen-year-old, middle-class, white, heterosexual males who recently graduated from high school and plan to attend college full-time and graduate in four years” (Kennedy & Crissman Ishler, 2008, p. 123). The student body is also more culturally diverse, made up of more women and first-generation students (Keup & Kinzie, 2007). Millennials are currently moving toward and through higher education and are comprised of 80 million Americans, the largest age group in
American history. The Millennials were born in or after 1982 until 2002, and now numbering more than Boomers (born between 1943 and 1960) and Gen Xers (born between 1961 and 1981) (Stein, 2013).

Regardless of the size of the generation, Howe and Strauss (2000) found Millennials are also more academically oriented, more likely to go to college to improve job prospects, and are more likely to struggle to finance their education than generations before. In fact, nearly three-fourths (70%) worry about finding a good job. As perhaps the most watched over generation, Millennials generally possess several traits: they perceive themselves as special (some use the phrase “trophy children,” optimistic, confident, team-oriented, achieving, pressured, and conventional). They are also more likely to accept authority and follow the rules. As far as intelligence, aptitude scores regardless of race or ethnicity have risen since the 1990s.

Since Millennials have a high regard for adults, especially parents, it is important for advisors to understand Millennials’ views on education and their future plans (Bigger, 2005). They may have clear goals, but may be unsure how to get there. Those who are undecided or undeclared regarding an academic major may want majors chosen for them. Millennials may also lack crucial analytical and thinking skills because of the highly structured nature of K-12 education. They could easily be overwhelmed or unmotivated because they are not sure how to measure objectives. Since they are used to receiving information, they may prefer prescriptive advising, but may actually need developmental advising.

Keeling (2003) identified key characteristics of the generation aside from its size: “more affluent, better educated, and more ethnically diverse” (p. 35). At the same time, Keup and Kinzie (2007) also pointed out that Millennials are also less engaged and spend less time on task in high school than other generations, and these patterns continue into the first year of college.
They have unrealistic expectations of what college life will be like, often turn to their peers for help, and often underuse programs and services available. Montag, Campo, Weissman, Walmsley, and Snell (2012) examined the relationship between Millennial characteristics, advising experiences, and students’ majors. They recommended that academic advisors be mindful of Millennial characteristics and adapt tactics to better assist them including: individual attention; clear guidance regarding degree completion; acknowledgement of career-related optimism; recognition of close, but pressured parental relationships; desire for careers with community interaction; and struggles with failure. Students are also challenged cognitively with the large amount of information they need to absorb in order to choose a career, a major, college courses and time management. Jukes, McCaine, and Crockett (2010) posited that the Millennials’ constant exposure to information through digital media has changed the way they process and use information in that they cognitively process information in a parallel rather than a sequential processing. Face-to-face interpersonal interaction skills impact brain and interpersonal skill development. Multitasking has negatively impacted the ability to maintain and engage in long complex arguments. Instantaneous access to information, people, and entertainment has also increased expectations of instant gratification.

**Year in school.** Recognizing the importance of the first year in college, there has been an explosive growth in research, programs, policies, and structure of the first-year experience, including academic advising, to increase freshman success (Upcraft et al., 2005). More institutional support needs to be provided to develop a stronger sense of purpose for the first year, while continuing to increase success rates including persistence. At the same time, the focus needs to remain on student learning, not on retention itself. Freshman success is “determined by some combination of who students were and where they came from before
college, the type of institution they selected, and what happened to them after they enrolled” (Upcraft et al., 1989, pp. 6-7).

First-year students are faced with issues about “identity, autonomy, and purpose as they enter higher education” (Swing & Skipper, 2007, p. 369), as well as feelings of incompetence, self-confidence, higher levels of stress, and depression. While advising during all four years matters, the first year of college is the most critical (Tinto, 1993). During this year, there should be a focus on individual students and needs which can include intent to attend graduate school, part-time status, economic pressures, as well as traditional demographic factors (gender, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, generational status). Themes for first-year include becoming familiar with academic life, setting goals, making commitments, using resources, and setting expectations/responsibilities. In addition to student diversity and developmental stages, there are other factors to consider with first-year students. Kramer (2000) used descriptors such as “vulnerable,” “unsophisticated,” and “unaware” to describe them while at the same time using “caring,” “knowledgeable,” “accurate,” and “competent” to define the type of advising services they expect (p. 98).

Glenn (2007) examined the academic advising factor more specifically and found that intentional, first-year, and required academic advising was important for retention from freshman to sophomore years. In fact, Bai and Pan (2009-2010) found that advising during the first year had a stronger impact on retention than did general institutional orientation programs. Lau (2003) found that freshman needed more advising supports than those in their later years in college. First-year students do not understand how institutions operate and often just want to be told what to do. They want authority figures, but it is up to academic advisors to encourage students to grow, develop and take on more responsibility for themselves and their success.
During the process of academic advising, where the student is the focus of the learning experience, (a) the first-year student’s experience is normalized, (b) the student has a set of frameworks to think about college learning and the first-year experience, (c) the student better understands the problems faced by most first-year students as well as personal issues, (d) the academic advisor is actively engaged in teaching, and (e) the student understands better how to interact with advisors as teachers during the first-year transition and beyond. (Darling & Woodside, 2007, p. 16)

As a result, students arrive at college with many needs and a wide range of skills. They need advisors who can help them learn about institution identity and fit so they can be successful (Kramer, 2000). In turn, advisors may rely on their teaching style to better help students understand more about the college experience and grow personally (Darling & Woodside, 2007).

The first year is a key period in student learning and retention (Barefoot et al., 2005; Upcraft et al., 2005). About 75% of dropouts occur during the first year, many during the first semester (Tinto, 1987). Even today, only about two-thirds of first-year students persist to the second year (ACT, 2013). The most critical period for academic advising, like retention, is in the first year. Efforts to increase satisfaction with academic advising should increase institutional satisfaction, and thus retention (Cuseo, 2012). If quality academic advising is provided during the first year, students may make better first choices about majors and course selection which will in turn promote retention, especially among at-risk students.

Both the National Academic Advising Association and the National Resource Center for the First-Year Experience and Students in Transition advocate for academic advising as a factor in first-year student persistence. In 2004, ACT published a report called “What Works in Student Retention” (Habley & McClanahan, 2004) which found that the top three institutional practices
that impacted retention included first year programs that included academic advising, freshman seminars, and learning support. Academic advising practices that contributed to retention included advising interventions with select students increased staffing, and integration of first-year advising with first-year programs. Those that separated high-performing (retention and degree completion) with low-performing private four-year colleges included integration of advising with FYE programs, increased staffing, and academic advising center. Five years later, ACT conducted similar data-gathering research. Published in 2010, by Habley, Valiga, McClanahan, and Burkum, the data were reported in a slightly different manner. College administrators identified advising interventions with selected student populations as a top campus practice that impacted retention at both four-year public and private institutions. The median first-year to second-year retention rate reported by private four-year colleges was 75% while the mean was 73%. The median degree-completion rate was 57% while the mean was 58%. Slightly more than half of the institutions had a specific goal for first-year to second-year retention while only about one-third had a goal for student-degree completion rate (six-year timeframe).

While some researchers have focused on the first-year, others argue the critical period is much shorter. The first six weeks have been linked with persistence because it is critical to establish relationships and one-to-one faculty/student contacts which will contribute to student success and satisfaction (Noel, 1985). Many institutions encourage advisors to meet with freshman students three times during the first semester and delivery of high-quality advising during the first semester to increase student commitment and retention (Cuseo, 2012).
Generational Status

Transition into college is a critical step for all college students (Choy, 2001; Tinto, 1993; Upcraft et al., 2005). Yet, that transition for first-generation students (FGS) is more difficult, both academically and non-academically. As a result, they can benefit more from orientation, advising, and on-campus programs than continuing generation students (Choy, 2001; Cuseo, 2012; Darling, & Scandlyn Smith, 2007; Engle, Bermeo, & O’Brien 2006). They also have additional challenges during their first year because of their past experiences and lack of those related to higher education (Somers, Woodhouse, & Cofer, 2004).

The definition of FGS varies from parents with no college experience to those without a four-year degree (Choy, 2001; Ishitani, 2006; Pascarella, Pierson, Wolniak, & Terenzini, 2004; Pike & Kuh, 2005). In general, Choy (2001) found that FGS were more likely to be older, be of diverse ethnicities, have lower incomes, be married with dependents, and have lower persistence and completion rates than those whose parents graduated from college or continuing generation students (CGS). Overall, 60% of FGS leave colleges and universities before graduating (Engle & Tinto, 2008). Pike and Kuh (2005) attributed this to “differences in the precollege characteristics of first- and second-generation students” (p. 277). Ishitani (2006) found FGS were nearly nine times more likely to leave college after the first year, but the risk declined over the four years. But if they do ultimately earn a bachelor’s degree, statistics show FGS earn comparable salaries and are employed in similar occupations (“Characteristics,” 1998).

First-generation students also arrive at college with differing characteristics than CGS including family support levels, basic understanding about college, and personal commitment (Sy, Fong, Carter, Boehme, & Alpert, 2011). They believe they have less emotional and informational support from parents than CGS, may lack academic skills, social abilities, and
cultural experiences that CGS are more likely to have. Terenzini, Springer, Yaeger, and Pascarella (1996) found FGS were more likely to have weaker cognitive and critical thinking skills as well as have less parental support to enroll. Tinto (1987) believed that first-generation status could be an additional factor that impacts students’ ability to separate from past lives and become part of the campus community. Once they were attending college, they took fewer humanities courses and fine arts, were less likely to be in honors programs, and reported studying fewer hours, all factors that can affect persistence and graduation (Pike & Kuh, 2005). Pratt and Skaggs (1989) compared two (FGS and CGS) different populations on the four constructs of Tinto’s model (institutional commitment, goal commitment, academic integration, and social integration) and found few differences in the latter three. However, more FGS limited their aspirations to an undergraduate degree and more FGS only applied to the institution they attended. Elkins (1996) examined first to second semester persistence departure of first-time, full-time freshman at a four-year public institution. At the time, separation stage, which may be particularly challenging for FGS, was not widely examined. Her research questions were focused on whether FGS were at greater risk of attrition during first semester than CGS and if so, what were the underlying dimensions of separation? She found that FGS were not at greater risk of attrition. Three underlying dimensions of separation – support, rejection of attitudes and values, and interactions with partner/spouse – were found to significantly affect decision to leave or stay (along with high school average grade). Yet, there is a statistically significant difference (at the .05 level) in the persistence of FGS and CGS, which indicates the possibility that more FGS withdrew earlier in the semester or did not continue in the study. An additional interesting concept was that the decision to persist or withdraw was greatly influenced by the factor of support.
Even though there are general assumptions about who FGS are, it is difficult to identify group members because of their wide range of backgrounds and experiences. Paulsen and Griswold (2009) called socioeconomic status “the biggest factor that distinguishes the majority of FGS from their peers” (p. 75). As a result, they may not participate in some of the available options such as study abroad programs, extracurricular activities, and on-campus living; ultimately affecting the quality of their college life. Overall, first-generation students are less engaged, less likely to have a full college experience, and more likely to perceive a less supportive environment.

Another issue is the lack of cultural capital among FGS. Oldfield (2009) defined this as “the knowledge, skills, education, and other advantages a person has that make the educational system a comfortable, familiar environment” (p. 59) in which students can succeed. Cultural capital can also include “the families’ tastes, preferences, norms, and way of spending recreational time” (Winkle-Wagner, 2010, p. 66). Students whose parents have attended college are able to learn from them and seek advice throughout the admissions process, career choices, and course selection as well as general adjustments in the college experience. As a result, FGS may rely more on faculty and peers than parents and be less successful. That lack of cultural capital has a significant impact on student success (Davis, 2010). Becker, Krodel, and Tucker (2009) pointed out that college in general can be intimidating, even more so to at-risk students such as those with first-generation status. Even so, they do not ask for help and do not know where to turn to learn many of the hidden rules, personal responsibility, as well as relationship and analytical skills. Institutional interactions, such as those with academic advisors, can provide that much needed information in order to increase the likelihood they will persist. Kirk-Kuwaye and Nishida (2001) found that high-involvement strategies were more effective with at-
risk students (as opposed to low-involvement ones) for improving outcomes of students on academic probation. Moreover, Swecker, Fifolt, and Searby’s (2013) research indicated that for every meeting with an academic advisor, the chances the student persisted increased by 13%; supporting retention theories that student interaction, engagement and involvement lead to higher persistence rates.

Collier and Morgan (2008) found the impact of self-esteem, motivation, and peer support are also critical in minority FGS. Their personal/career-related motivation to attend college in the fall positively predicted college adjustment in the following semester. Another important factor is whether or not FGS can understand faculty expectations as well as their CGS peers. Since FGS lack cultural capital, the problem disproportionately affects this group, which in turn, negatively impacts persistence to graduation (Pascarella et al., 2004). Even if FGS have similar pre-college characteristics as their CGS peers in aptitude, their college success is determined by more than academic success; it also involves their ability to fit into the role of college student (Ward, Siegel, & Davenport, 2012). All students, regardless of generational status must complete transitional steps (personal, social, academic) into college, but self-efficacy may be lower in FGS. In general, college student development, persistence, and success are often attributed to two key factors, involvement and integration. FGS are at higher risk for attrition for several reasons including lack of academic preparation, demographic variables, socioeconomic status, and parental involvement (Ishitani, 2006; Lohfink & Paulsen, 2005; McCarron & Inkelas, 2006; Pike & Kuh, 2005). Murphy and Hicks (2006) found FGS entering college had a lower expectation rate of leaving that institution or transferring to another compared to those whose parents graduated from college or continuing generation students (CGS). Despite efforts since FGS were first identified as a distinct sub-population more than
two decades ago, graduation rates remain lower than the overall student population. Unger (2010) attributed this to a lack of resources, even though research shows there are proven ways to improve persistence. He attributed some of the challenges students faced to a lack of preparation before entering college and more nonacademic demands on their time.

Astin’s involvement theory (1984) posited that students get more from college when they invest more effort both quantitatively and qualitatively. That involvement, according to Tinto’s (1993) theory of student departure, means the students are more likely to persist and graduate. Otherwise, if they do not feel like they belong, they are likely to drop out in the first or second year. This is part of the challenge with FGS. Eimers and Pike (1997) found that Tinto’s theory applied similarly to both minorities and non-minorities. Hertel (2002) found that FGS were more likely to be involved in fewer organizations than in high school and be connected to an off-campus social network, both signs of risk for departure. They also derive greater educational benefit from involvement in academia and the classroom. Pascarella et al. (2004) argued that this increases positive outcomes in critical thinking, writing skills, openness to diversity, learning for self-understanding, internal locus of control, and degree planning. Previously developed survival skills may get them to college, but they often lack a sense of community with smaller groups of peers, therefore the campus environment in general is a stronger influence on their development. That survival instinct was also shown by Hicks (2005), who investigated differences between FGS and CGS goals and motivations for attending college. He found that FGS were more likely to believe they live their own lives, make their own choices, and own their own accomplishments. The study also showed that the students are aware they are at a disadvantage and are making efforts to succeed. Hicks (2005) examined the differences in college attendance goals and attitudes between FGS and CGS and found that FGS were more
motivated to achieve specific academic and life goals. He argued they might believe they are at a disadvantage and need to overcome it. In a qualitative study to look at experiences of primarily rural students, Shultz (2004) found that they were generally unaware about the need to build new relationships to help cope with a very different academic culture than what they had experienced.

Faculty advisors are one solution to improve persistence among FGS because they can create a supportive environment that promotes acceptance and student success (Woosley & Shepler, 2011). Watson et al. (2002) found that the most significant factor that influences academic performance of African American college students is the ability or inability to connect to someone or something at an institution. Yet, many FGS of all ethnicities are not connected to people or organizations. Hicks (2003) observed FGS were less likely to join organizations on campus and were more likely to rely on off-campus friends for social support, both challenges to theories of involvement. McMurray and Sorrells (2009) identified five strategies for instructors to support first-generation students. However, the authors pointed out that the methods are not quantifiable. The first is to be aware of the demographics; instructors should inquire about student backgrounds to help identify FGS. Secondly, illustrative examples should be incorporated into discussions as much as possible to help students, especially FGS, relate to the material, and develop professional identities. Thirdly, use laughter and humor in the classroom as a strategy to reduce fears and anxiety. Fourthly, provide opportunities to correct errors in order to increase risk tolerance. And finally, create a sense of community in the classroom to increase the chance for success.

Summary

As institutions focus more on student retention, academic advising can be a significant factor. Tinto’s (1975, 1987, 1993) Theory of Student Departure posits that the more students are
involved and integrated, the more likely they are to remain at the institution. Crookston’s (1972) theory on academic advising focused on the impact of developmental advising on the whole student and subsequent research has connected it with increases in retention. As the focus shifts to a shared responsibility (students and institutions) for student success, quality academic advising, especially within the first year and with at-risk populations such as first-generation college students can be a critically important factor in persistence to graduation.
CHAPTER III: METHODS

Study Summary

The current research investigated the relationship among first-year, first-generation college students and the association among advising satisfaction, needs, and preferences with the intent to persist. The results of this study will help higher administrators and academic advisors better understand the needs of first-year, first-generation (FGS) and continuing generation (CGS) students in their first semester of college.

Chapter one served as an introduction to the problem. Chapter two provided a review of relevant literature. Chapter three is a description of the methods used including specific information about the design of the study, setting, data collection procedures, statistical design and analysis, and a plan for data presentation.

Study Design

A quantitative design was chosen for this study. Gay, Mills, and Airasian (2009) defined quantitative research as “the collection and analysis of numerical data to describe, explain, predict, or control phenomena of interest” (p. 7). The emphasis is on numbers, measurement, design, and statistical analysis. It is also deductive in nature, using predetermined hypotheses, specific approaches to limit bias, and can (but does not necessarily have to) involve large numbers of cases, which can offer generalizability (Creswell, 2009). One principle underlying perspective is positivism defined as “the philosophical belief or assumption that we inhabit a relatively stable, uniform, and coherent world that we can measure, understand, and generalize about” (Gay, et al., 2009, p. 7). Quantitative researchers believe that truth can be discovered, that research can be designed and executed to minimize researcher bias in order to ensure accurate interpretation of findings (Smith & Hinderleiter Ortloff, 2010). In turn, it allows for
testing of objective theories by examining the relationship among variables (Creswell, 2009). Quantitative methods are predetermined with an instrument based on the research questions to collect performance, attitude, observational, or census data. The data are then analyzed and interpreted statistically. Quantitative studies are generally reported in five sections: introduction, literature review, methodology, results, and discussion (Coladarci, Cobb, Minium, & Clarke, 2008). With a positivist perspective and questions that focus on correlations among variables suggested earlier, a quantitative approach would be appropriate for this study.

Furthermore, this study uses a causal comparative design, which is a form of descriptive research in which the researcher “attempts to explain phenomena that already have taken place. Such studies do not predict events in the future; rather they seek results indicating the relationship that may point to a cause” (Merriam & Simpson, 2000, p. 61). This design could suggest that there is a relationship between the independent and dependent variables, which would suggest cause. There are advantages to this design: it is easy-to-use and produces accurate, representative data which to examine relationships or events and due to the exploratory natures, allows for the discovery of additional variables which may lead to the discovery of new information. The main disadvantage is that there is a lack of predictive power.

**Study Purpose**

Therefore, this study focused on better understanding the role of academic advising during a critical transition phase as students begin their college experience. It compared the relationships between the students’ generational status, advising style satisfaction, preferences, and needs as well as intent to persist within a faculty-led academic advising environment at a four-year liberal arts college. The theoretical framework for the study is built from two streams of literature: Crookston’s (1972) theory on developmental advising and Tinto’s Theory of
College Student Departure (1975, 1987, 1993). Crookston (1972) posited that advising is holistic and incorporates advice on both education and personal development. Tinto (1975, 1987, 1993) argued that all college students have a variety of factors which influence decisions to remain or leave college; however the more interaction with the institution and those connected to it, the more likely they are to remain and graduate. Both are important to the understanding of academic advising but must be based in current advising perceptions and its underlying purpose (Schulenberg & Lindhorst, 2010). Therefore, the questions were designed to examine multiple factors which influence perceptions, satisfaction, and needs with the influence on intent to persist.

**Research Questions**

RQ1: Will college students’ perceptions of advising, preferred style, and satisfaction differ as a function of their generational status?

RQ2: Will college students who perceive their advising needs and preferences are met have higher satisfaction with academic advising?

RQ3: If college students believe they are satisfied with advising, will they be more likely to indicate intent to persist?

**Research Hypotheses**

The following hypotheses were tested in this study:

H1: College students’ advising perceptions, satisfaction, and preferences, will differ as a function of their generational status.

H2: College students who believe their advising needs and preferences are met will have higher satisfaction with academic advising.
H3: College students who believe their advising needs and preferences are met will be more likely to indicate intent to persist.

**Research Method and Approach**

Because this study examined a relationship between variables, the researcher was a detached observer, and since the goal was to establish generalizations about the population, a quantitative approach was appropriate. In relational designs, relationships are shown through statistical correlations among independent and dependent variables using descriptive and inferential statistics (Troxel & Campbell, 2010). Coladarci et al. (2008) explained that “descriptive statistics can help provide a meaningful and convenient way of characterizing and portraying important features of the data” (p. 2), while inferential statistics “permit conclusions about a population, based on the characteristics of a sample of the population” (p. 3).

Descriptive research questions allow the researcher to understand relationships between and among variables (Troxel & Campbell, 2010). The instrument is the research tool itself, often resulting in little personal interaction between the researcher and the participants (Gay et al., 2009).

**Instrumentation**

The instrument used in this study is a modified version of the Academic Advising Inventory (See Appendix A). Roger Winston and Janet Sandor (2002) initially developed the tool in 1983 to measure three aspects of college student advising: the nature of advising relationships, the frequency of activities taking place during advising sessions, and student satisfaction with advising. A fourth part captures demographic information.

Part I is comprised of 14 statement pairs which help identify the students’ current advising situation (prescriptive or developmental) using a continuum scale. Participants are
given two scenarios about the type of advising received. Each statement is designed to be either developmental or prescriptive. Based on the participant’s perceptions of advising relationships, he or she first selects a statement that is believed to best describe advising sessions then the participant determines the strength of the belief in the statement, then chooses a response using a four-point Likert scale. There are three subscales associated with Part I, Personalizing Education (PE), Academic Decision-Making (ADM), and Selecting Courses (SC). There are eight questions related to PE and focus on the student’s personal development. Four questions address ADM, which is concerned with determining the primary person responsible for students’ academic decision making. Lastly, there are two questions related to SC and students’ course planning (Winston & Sandor, 2002).

In Part II, participants review a list of possible advising activities (e.g., discussing college policies, getting to know each other, discussing career alternatives). They are asked to identify the frequency of activities (from zero to five or more times). Part III consists of five statements related to satisfaction with academic advising. Participants are asked to evaluate on a four-point scale (i.e., strongly disagree, disagree, agree, strongly agree). Part IV contains a series of demographic questions. Part V uses the same statement pairs as Part I, but asks participants to identify the “ideal academic advisor,” then determine the importance of that statement to him or herself.

The researcher had permission to use the AAI and modify Part IV as a part of her membership in the National Academic Advising Association (NACADA, 2013). Under these terms, NACADA requires that Parts I and II must be used in their entirety. Items in Parts III and IV may be altered or eliminated to fit the needs of the research.
**Reliability and validity.** Reliability in quantitative research “is the degree to which a test consistently measures whatever it is measuring” (Gay et al., 2009, p. 158). This internal consistency measurement was determined by Winston and Sandor (2002) using a Cronbach alpha statistic. Tests were run to determine the reliability of the scales. For all scales, high scores indicate preference for developmental advising behaviors, while low scores indicate preference for prescriptive advising behaviors. Winston and Sandor reported internal consistency reliability for the overall scale and its subscales. The coefficient alpha was .78 for the overall Developmental-Prescriptive scale. For subscales, coefficient alphas were .81 for Personalizing Education, .66 for Academic Decision-Making, and .42 for Selecting Courses. Using the Pearson r statistics, the authors also found relative independence among subscale variables. Mottarella, Fritzsche, and Cerabino (2004) reported internal-consistency reliability coefficients as .78 for the Developmental-Prescriptive scale, .75 for Personalizing Education, .65 for Academic Decision-Making, and .45 for Selecting Courses.

Validity involves whether the test measures what it is supposed to and allows for appropriate interpretation of scores. The most important is construct validity because it “reflects the degree to which a test measures an intended hypothetical construct” (Gay et al., 2009, p. 157). Winston and Sandor (2002) admitted that initially there was difficulty in establishing validity because no other existing scales measured developmental or prescriptive advising methods. To address validity, the authors tested two groups they believed were receiving categorically different advising. One group was perceived to be receiving developmental advising through an intrusive advising program for high-risk students and the other group was receiving advising through a standard advising office. These students did report significantly different advising experiences based on the Developmental-Prescriptive Advising scale (t (115) =
6.57, p < .001) and the Personalizing Education subscale (t (122) = 8.36, p < .001). In addition, Winston and Sandor (1984a) used factor analysis to examine the scales and found that the factor loadings ranged from .43 to .79 and all items loaded highest on their assigned scale.

**Additional Question Development**

This research study used Parts I – V. In Part IV, demographic questions regarding age, year in school, type of advising situation were eliminated because there is only one type of advising at the institution. Additional closed questions were added regarding generational status, fraternity/sorority membership, residence type, and student-athlete status. These demographic questions allowed for subgroup analysis, given the large proportions on this campus (Blair, Czaja, & Blair, 2014). Additionally two closed questions with bipolar ordinal scales were used to understand intent to persist and influence of the academic advisor on the decision to persist. Ordinal scales provide an ordered set of answer choices and it is up to the respondent to determine their answers along the continuum. Bipolar ordinal scales measure both level and direction—they are usually verbally labeled in self-administered surveys and longer scales (Dillman, Smyth, & Christian, 2009).

Since questions about the likelihood of returning to Franklin College are sensitive ones, one open-ended question asked about the reasons behind the likelihood of the intent to persist. Dillman et al. (2009) believed open ended questions gives the respondents a chance to freely answer the question without limitations and is preferable when the researcher does not want to influence the answers by providing potential answers. Additionally, the question should include adequate space and a preface about the importance of the question to help increase the accuracy of the response. Fowler (1995) argued that open-ended questions can allow for systematic
information gathering about a potentially complicated situation and can better reflect what the respondents say.

**Population**

The population investigated in this study was first-year students enrolled in the fall of 2014 at Franklin College, a liberal arts college in the Midwest. The sample frame was the same as the population and included 319 students enrolled in the first-year experience courses. The sampling error was zero since the sample was the entire population (Blair et al., 2014).

**Study Setting**

The study took place at Franklin College, a private, liberal arts college in the Midwest located 20 miles from Indianapolis. It is one of 31 private, non-profit colleges in the state of Indiana. It is categorized as a small, highly residential, full-time, four-year, selective with lower transfer-ins and an instructional program; classified as balanced arts and sciences/professions, no graduate coexistence by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (2014). There are 28 majors and all of its programs include a general Liberal Arts curriculum that provides a broad exposure to math, science, history, fine arts and literature in an immersive learning format. In the fall of 2014, there were 1,075 full-time and part-time students enrolled. The school is also a member of the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) as a Division III school (Franklin College, 2014b).

The college typifies the small liberal arts colleges in the nation and in Indiana in multiple ways. Higher education is comprised of a variety of institutions that generally fall into four sectors – community colleges, private for-profit, private nonprofit, and public. Private nonprofit comprise 36% of postsecondary institutions. Each operates independently of other institutions serving its mission as determined by its founders and its current leaders. While some may
affiliate with like-minded institutions or geographically (Jesuit colleges or colleges in Appalachia), each has its own board of trustees and governing system ("About U.S. Higher Education and Private Nonprofit Colleges," n.d.). There are 1,600 private, nonprofit colleges enrolling 3.7 million students which include liberal arts colleges, major research universities, church- and faith-related institutions, historically Black colleges and universities, schools of law, medicine, engineering, art, business and other professions. In an analysis by the National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities using data from the National Center for Education Statistics (NPSAS, 2008), 41% of students who attend independent colleges have family incomes less than $49,999 compared to 46% of those who attend state four-year schools. Nearly half (48%) are first in family to earn a bachelor’s degree and in 2007/2008, 89% received some form of financial aid. Nationally, independent colleges average 12:1 student-to-faculty ratios ("Independent Colleges and Universities," n.d.)

In 2013-2014 school year, 96% of Franklin College students received some form of financial aid worth $26 million (Franklin College, 2014d). Using an analysis of data from the State Student Assistance Commission of Indiana (2010-2011 data), the Independent Colleges of Indiana (ICI), 94% of students at independent Indiana institutions receive financial aid (ICI Smart, n.d.). Another ICI analysis using 2009 Fall Enrollment survey data by the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) showed that the average family income of ICI students is $3,500 less than peers at public four-year institutions (ICI Strong, n.d.). Also the ethnic make up of the Franklin College body is similar to the average ICI institution.

The student body at Franklin College is composed primarily of White, full-time, Indiana residents. There were 1,008 full-time and 67 part-time registered in Fall 2014: 541 females (53.6%) and 467 males (46.4%). The student body was comprised of 91.0% (978) of students
from Indiana, 6.7% (72) from 18 additional states and 2.3% (25) from 14 international countries. As far as ethnicity, 83.5% (898) identified themselves as White/Caucasian, 4.5% (48) as Black/Non-Hispanic, 2.5% (27) as Hispanic, 1.3% (14) as Asian, .2% (2) as American Indian, 4.6% (49) as unreported and 3.4% (37) as multiracial. Nearly 70 percent (69.7% or 703 students) live in residence halls on campus (T. Garner, personal communication, October 7, 2014). This statistic does not account for additional undergraduate males who live in fraternity housing adjacent to campus. Consistently, about one-third of the student body is first-generation college students (Franklin College, 2013b). Of the 327 first-time, full-time students enrolled at the beginning of the semester, 49 were legacies, meaning at least one family member attended or is attending Franklin College (J. Parrish, personal communication, October 14, 2014). The graduation rate (in four years) for the 2010-2011 cohort was 60%. Persistence from first year to second year has increased to 79% of the 2013-2014 cohort (T. Garner, personal communication, October 7, 2014). Graduates are also finding employment. In a survey of 2013 graduates, six months after graduation, 68% of graduates were already employed in full-time positions, 18% were in graduate school, 8.7% were in part-time employment, 2.4% were pursuing other interests, and 2.9% were still seeking employment (Franklin College 2014a).

As a form of social integration, participation in athletics can be one factor in persistence. The school participates in Division III athletics within the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA), which is the largest division within the organization both by number of institutions (444) and number of athletes (more than 170,000, NCAA, 2014). The NCAA defines Division III schools as those that provide at least five sports programs for men and women. The students do not receive financial aid or scholarships for their participation. In these programs, the focus is heavily on education. According to the NCAA Division III website (2013), student-
athletes can expect to participate fully in college experiences outside of athletics. In the 2014-2015 school year, the school offered 19 inter-collegiate sports: 10 women’s sports and 9 men’s sports. Approximately 39% of the student population participated in these inter-collegiate sports during the 2013-2014 school year (Franklin College, 2014b).

Faculty members teach full course loads of four courses per semester at Franklin College and advise on average, about 11 students, most of whom are in the faculty’s respective department. Students who have not chosen a major are assigned to a faculty member at large. Faculty members participate in yearly academic advising training and are given a 19-page advisor handbook with definitions of advising, advising relationships and other terms, suggestions on how to conduct meetings with advisees including questions to ask, and resources for advisors and advisees. The college defines academic advising as “an educational decision-making progression” with academic advising assistance. The student is expected to assume “responsibility for academic, professional, and personal goals by utilizing campus resources and engaging in the liberal arts” (Franklin College, 2014e, p. 4). The advisors offer knowledge and guidance on course selection, general education requirements, sequential course selection within their program, and recommendations on academic and/or student life services if there is a perceived need. Outcomes for the academic advising program focus on student connectivity to his/her academic major, department, and campus community, development of personal and professional goals, awareness of college academic policies, procedures, and student services, and engagement in short-term and long-term academic planning. College expectations of advisors during the first weeks of the fall semester are to build the relationship, assess the student’s transition to college, and intervene or recommend services as needed. A quality advising relationship at Franklin College is defined as one that includes: advisor availability,
compassionate listening, an understanding of advisees and their strengths, knowledge about the academic program, as well as policies and procedures, and assisting advisee with short and long-term academic planning.

In turn, advisees are expected to share “personal values, interests, strengths, and goals” (Franklin College, 2014e, p. 2), set up advisor appointments, become knowledgeable about policies, procedures and requirements, prepare for advising sessions and follow through on decisions made during them, as well as accept final responsibility for those decisions. During the freshman year, the advisor handbook recommends that the academic advising relationship focuses on four concepts: 1) building relationship, 2) focus on advisee’s strengths and goals, 3) develop academic four year plan, and 4) engage student with the campus and available resources. The college recommends seven advisor/advisee connections during the academic year including individual, face-to-face meetings, group sessions, and e-mails. Sessions in October and May plan for the upcoming semester and the student must receive electronic authorization from the advisor in order to register for courses for the following semester. If a student is not planning on returning for the following semester, the advisor is asked to encourage the student to register anyway and report the information to the director of the Academic Resource Center.

During first-year orientation before school begins, students attend a group academic advising session with their advisor and are given a guide with an explanation of the “partnership” with their advisor and in a student handbook called “The FC Passport.” It includes the school’s mission and values, roles and responsibilities of advisors/advisees, setting educational goals/plans, registration policies and procedures, and resources (Franklin College, 2013c). The student handbook identifies the following reasons why students need an academic advisor: academic and professional goal setting, degree planning, clarification of liberal arts and
graduation requirements, consultation during degree auditing, registration planning and authorization, assistance with academic support, assistance with graduate/professional school application process, strengths assessment, clarification of college policies and procedures, and assistance with internship opportunities. More specifically, it says “academic advisors are available to assist with educational and professional planning and goal setting” yet students are “ultimately responsible for their academic success” and that the relationship is a “team effort” (p. 4). The two are asked to sign a partnership agreement and asked to complete an informational interview questionnaire during the first few weeks of the fall semester, which includes questions such as:

1. What are your expectations of me as an advisee? What can I do to make our relationship beneficial for my success?
2. How do you envision your role as my academic advisor?
3. What advice do you have for me for my adjustment to Franklin College?
4. What tips do you have for academic success?
5. What strategies do you recommend for time management?
6. What is a realistic goal for the first semester?
7. Share possible concerns and needs with academic advisor.

The latter question includes checkboxes such as homesick/significant other off campus, academic success, athletics, health, time management, work, family struggles, social engagement, stress management, study habits, and other. The advisor and advisee are expected to set academic goals and assessment measures for the first semester, long-term academic goals as well as personal/professional goals. This planning includes suggestions of engaging in academic and social experiences on campus.
Aside from academic advising and social integration through student organizations and athletics, there is also an interdisciplinary group called the Student Success Team. Students are referred by academic advisors, athletic coaches, residence life staff, as well as others on campus. The team then formulates a plan to guide the student toward programs and services such as those that support academic success, social integration, personal well-being, and financial resources (Franklin College, 2014c).

The school operates under an honor system regarding academic advising evaluations. Each spring, an electronic survey is distributed to all students via email. The evaluation form used asks nine questions on a six-point Likert Scale. The questions focus on academic planning, career counseling, availability, and overall satisfaction (Franklin College, 2014e). However, the surveys are voluntary and provide limited usable data. The college has also not been able to gather valid feedback by students who choose to leave the college regarding their reasons why they are doing so. Attempts have been made to conduct interviews, but seldom produce reliable data (T. Garner, personal communication, January, 20, 2014).

Data Collection Procedures

Upon approval from the Institutional Review Boards at Ball State University and Franklin College, the researcher administered the AAI at Franklin College during the fall semester of 2014 to all first-time, full-time students through paper surveys in the first-year experience course called LA 100. Responses were gathered in different sections of the course between November 6 and November 20, 2014; following spring registration on November 4. Winston and Sandor (2002) suggested, where possible, the AAI should be administered to participants in a controlled setting. Fowler (2014) argued that group-administered surveys provide a high rate of response and the limits are usually only due to absenteeism or scheduling.
issues. The advantages of group administration include high cooperation rates, the chances to explain the study, ability to ask batteries of similar questions and that respondents can respond to sensitive questions in privacy. The main disadvantage are that adequate reading and writing skills by respondents are needed, open questions may not be useful, and an interviewer is not involved to ensure quality control.

The students completed a modified version of the Academic Advising Inventory developed to measure the nature of advising relationships (Winston & Sandor, 2002). Surveys were completed during normal class periods and participation was voluntary. Participants were read a brief statement about the survey and directions on how to fill out the survey by the faculty member who led the class. Students were asked to complete the AAI as pencil and paper surveys with responses recorded on the instrument itself. The faculty members were asked to allow approximately 15-20 minutes to complete the surveys. The survey was distributed in 19 sections of the course in November 2014. Faculty members reported the number of students who were registered for the course and how many were absent. In all, 321 first-time, full-time students were enrolled in the courses during the research period. On the day of survey completion, 15 were absent. Students had the option to not participate and two students did not complete the survey, leaving 304 completed surveys for analysis. The first page of the survey included the consent to participate language that told the students if they completed the survey, it was voluntary. To ensure confidentiality and anonymity, the participants were told to not put their names on the surveys. The data received contained the responses completed for each survey. Not all students completed all questions.

Of the 304 surveys, 17 were double coded in Part I and 13 in Part V by answering both sides within each survey question and two contained at least one missing variable in Part I. In
Part V, six did not complete the section at all, two were missing more than half of the questions, and two were missing less than half, but at least one variable. Thus for Part I, there were 285 valid surveys and for Part V, there were 286. The data were then entered into a password-protected Microsoft Excel file.

**Data Analysis Procedures**

Upon completion of the data collection the data were analyzed using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), Version 21. In order to analyze the data, the researcher used both descriptive and inferential statistics to analyze the data. Descriptive statistics (e.g., mean, median, and standard deviation) were used to describe the results in general terms (Coladarci et al., 2008). Inferential statistics were used to evaluate the relationships between the independent predictor variables and the dependent variables. Identifying such a correlation allowed the researcher to make inferences about the relationships. Descriptive statistics were used to compare demographic differences among the participants in Part IV of the instrument. Analysis included frequencies and measures of central tendency for descriptive purposes (e.g., means, median, standard deviation, ranges, etc.). Chi square statistics were used to answer questions about the categorical variables (Knapp, 2014). Another method used was the independent samples t-test to determine the statistical significance of the difference in the mean scores of the sample groups when there are no differences between the groups themselves. The t-test revealed any differences that were large enough to be statistically significant (Troxel & Campbell, 2010). None of the data included identifiable information about the students involved and was stored in a password-protected Microsoft Excel file on the researcher’s computer.

Prior to the analysis, the data were examined for entry accuracy. Responses from the paper surveys were entered into an Excel file. A data reliability check was completed by
randomly selecting 30 students (10% of the completed surveys), and recoding the data. The recoded data were compared to the original data entered for each respondent. The accuracy check showed 10 individual data inaccuracies from 2,040 possible data points. These results indicate the data entered from the completed surveys were 99.5% accurate.

Data Presentation

The data are presented in multiple forms within chapter four including text and in tables formatted according to the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association (2010). It is be presented in the order of the research questions in this study and will begin with descriptive statistics regarding demographic variables including generational status, gender, athletic status, fraternity/sorority membership, residence status, and intent to persist with advising needs, satisfaction, and preferences. Lastly, tables of statistical analysis results containing the results were presented. Chapter five will include a discussion of the results, conclusions, limitations, and suggestions for future research.

Summary

Chapter three provides information about the methods that were used to conduct the research study. It included the study design, the population, research approach, setting, data collection procedures, statistical design, and data presentation.
CHAPTER IV: RESULTS

Study Summary

This research examined the role of academic advising during a critical transition phase as students began their college experiences: how they perceived and preferred academic advising as well as the relationship with their intent to persist to the second semester. The Academic Advising Inventory (Winston & Sandor, 2002) was utilized to better understand first-time freshmen’s current and ideal advising styles, types of advising activities, satisfaction with advising, demographic information, and intent to persist. The dissertation is presented in a five-chapter format. Chapter four describes the results, including preliminary analyses, analyses of the research questions, as well as an additional post-hoc question.

Population Characteristics

The sample was the same as the population: first-time, full-time, freshman students at Franklin College who were enrolled in a required first semester course, Liberal Arts Seminar (LA 100). Descriptive information for the demographic (independent) variables is included in Table 1 (Appendix D). The sample was comprised of 58.2% \( (n = 177) \) female students and 41.8% \( (n = 127) \) male students. Of the respondents, 54.6% \( (n = 166) \) reported that one or both of their parents graduated from a four-year college or university, thus are considered continuing-generation college students (CGS), while 45.1% \( (n = 137) \) reported that neither parent graduated and are considered first-generation college students (FGS). Regarding ethnicity, the majority of the students reported their cultural/racial background as White/Caucasian (81.9%, \( n = 249 \)), the next most reported background was African-American/Black (4.6%, \( n = 14 \)).

Additional demographic questions were asked to provide further sub-analyses of the respondents. More than half of the students reported participating in a formally recognized sport
at Franklin College (53.9%, n = 164) and less than half said they were members of a Greek fraternity or sorority (44.7%, n = 136). Since residence life can play a role in engagement and intent to persist, respondents were asked where they lived. Most (92.1%, n = 280) lived in a residence hall or in fraternity housing while 7.9% (n = 24) lived off campus with family members or in another setting.

Understanding of the responses to Part I of the AAI were analyzed through the Developmental-Prescriptive Advising Scale (DPA) and its three subscales, Personalizing Education (PE), Academic Decision-Making (ADM), and Selecting Courses (SC). Reliability was estimated through the use of the Cronbach Analysis procedure. As shown in Table 2 (Appendix D), the 14-item DPA scale (α = .81) produced similar results as those by the survey authors (α = .78). The PE subscale consisted of 9 items (α = .72), the ADM included 4 items (α = .73), and the SC scale had two items (α = .81). The subscales are also relatively independent measures. Table 3 (Appendix D) shows the Pearson r correlations among the DPA and the three scales subscales: PE (r = .80), ADM (r = .58), and SC (r = .46) were significantly correlated at the p < .01 level (2-tailed).

Advising Perceptions, Satisfaction, and Preferences by Generational Status

The first research question examined whether college students perceptions, satisfaction, and preferences for academic advising differed by generational status. Part I of the AAI is meant to reflect the topics covered during advising sessions and includes 14 pairs of statements containing one that reflects a prescriptive advising style and the other that reflects developmental. Using all 14 pairs, the Developmental-Prescriptive Advising (DPA) scale is the primary scale and reflects the overall perceptions of advising style. Low scores (14-56) reflect a student’s perception that prescriptive advising occurred where formal academic matters
(scheduling, course registration) are the focus and the advisor prescribes the actions the student should take. High scores (57-112) reflect developmental advising and results from a perception of a “warm, caring, and friendly relationship” (Winston & Sandor, 2002, p. 11). As Table 4 (Appendix D) shows, nearly nine out of 10 respondents (89.8%) perceived they were receiving developmental advising (DPA scale) and the responses were similar for both CGS (89.2%) and FGS (90.6%). A chi-square test for association was conducted between perceived advising style and generational status. There was no statistically significant difference between perceived advising style and generational status, \( \chi^2(1) = .146, p = .703 \). Similar tests were also run for associations between ethnicity, athletic status, fraternity/sorority membership, and perceived advising style. No statistical significance was found.

The three subscales focus on different aspects of advising. Personalizing Education (PE) questions focus on both personal and academic concerns. Low scores (8 to 32) reflect “formal and distant relationship” (Winston & Sandor, 2002, p. 11) while high scores (33 to 64) reflect a mutual, friendly relationship. The results were similar to the DPA scale. Nearly nine of 10 (87.7%) perceived they were receiving developmental advising on this scale with similar results by generational status (CGS = 89.2%, FGS = 90.6%). Fewer students (82.4%) believed they were receiving developmental advising on the Academic Decision-Making (ADM) questions that focused on how the academic process is handled. Low scores (4 to 16) indicated prescriptive advising where the advisor made the decisions and told the students what to do. High scores (17 to 32) reflect where the advisor may help the student evaluate options, but ultimately left it to the student to carry through. By generational status, fewer CGS (75.8%) felt they were receiving developmental advice according to this scale compared to FGS (85.0%). The final scale, Selecting Courses (SC), also had the lowest percentage of students (77.8%) who felt they were
receiving developmental advising on these questions. SC only involves two items on the scales. Low scores (2 to 8) reflect that the adviser made course choices and planned schedules for students. High scores (9 to 16) reflect an advisor/advisee collaboration, but the students made the final decisions. Fewer CGS (75.8%) than FGS (80.3%) felt they were receiving developmental advising. An independent t-test was run to determine if there were statistical differences in the perception of advising received between CGS and FGS. There was homogeneity of variances, as assessed by Levene’s test for equality of variances for the DPA scale \( (p = 4.17) \). The mean scores on the DPA were similar between CGS \( (M = 73.54, SD = 0.9) \) and FGS \( (M = 73.76, SD = 0.9) \), thus there was no statistical difference, \( M = -.214, 95\% CI [-2.82 – 2.39], t (282) = -1.62, p = .872 \). There was also homogeneity of variances, for all three subscales: PE \( (p = .504) \), ADM \( (p = .504) \), SC \( (p = .842) \). Results similar to DPA were found for all three subscales and there was also no statistical difference.

Part II of the AAI examines the frequency of common advising activities (e.g., discussing college policies, getting to know each other, discussing career alternatives). Students were asked to identify the frequency (from zero to five or more times). Mean scores for each activity were calculated. Winston and Sandor (2002) also classified the activities into five scales. First, the Personal Development and Interpersonal Scale (PDIR) is composed of 12 items and includes activities such as discussions about personal issues (academic or personal problems and values) as well as short-term and long-range plans. Second, Exploring Institutional Policies (EIP) is comprised of five items that consist of general information about the college, academic rules and regulations (transfer credits), and study abroad programming. Third, Registration and Class Scheduling (RCS) encompasses four items ranging from signing registration forms, selecting courses, and planning schedules. Fourth, Teaching Personal Skills (TPS) includes three items
that reflected college policies, study skills, and time management. The last one, Academic Majors and Courses (AMC), contains six items from discussing possible majors, declaring a major, and potential career options. Scores for the five scales were computed by following the recommended procedures by Winston and Sandor (2002). This involved summing the total number of times a student reported participating in the activity with an advisor across items in the scale. Scale means and standard deviations are reported in Table 5 (Appendix D) by the respondents and by generational status. Mean scores of reported activities ranged from EIP (\(M = .93, SD = 0.8\)) to AMC (\(M = 2.04, SD = 1.1\)). The scores were also similar between CGS and FGS. The most frequently reported activities (overall) are listed in Table 6 (Appendix D) and included “Discussing possible majors/academic concentrations” (\(M = 2.70\)), “Discussing degree or major academic requirements” (\(M = 2.69\)), “Discussing content of courses” (\(M = 2.58\)), and “Selecting courses for the next term” (\(M = 2.53\)), which corresponds with some of the first advising sessions in a student’s first semester on campus. The least frequently reported activities were “Discussing probation and dismissal” (\(M = .28\)) and “Discussing financial aid” (\(M = .89\)), which would be less likely to occur during the first semester before students receive grades and have already received their financial aid for the first year.

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to determine if the frequency of activities as measured through the scales was different based on generational status for CGS (\(n =166\)) or FGS (\(n =136\)). There was homogeneity of variances on four of the five scales, as assessed by Levene’s Test of Homogeneity of Variance (EIP, \(p = 2.58\); RCS, \(p = .66\); TPS, \(p = .37\); AMC, \(p = .83\)). However, there was no statistically significant differences by generational status (EIP, \(p = .67\); RCS, \(p = .93\); TPS, \(p = .78\); AMC, \(p = .94\)). Assumption of homogeneity of variance was
violated for PDIR \( (p = .03) \). Thus Welch’s test was used to determine there was no statistical
difference by generational status \( F(1,281.66) = .15, p = .70 \).

Students were also asked to report the number of advising sessions they had received thus
far in the semester and the average length of time. As shown in Table 7 (Appendix D), more
FGS (7.3%) reported only one advising session compared to CGS (2.4%). Overall, about three-
fourths of the respondents reported having between two and four advising sessions. As far as the
length of the sessions, Table 8 (Appendix D) shows responses by generational status. More than
half of all students reported the average sessions were 15-30 minutes in length, with similar
percentages reported for CGS (59.0%) and FGS (58.4%).

Part III of the AAI contains five questions related to satisfaction with advising from
general satisfaction to accurate information, advising availability, and sufficient time for the
sessions. Frequencies and means for each one of the questions as well as an overall mean score
were computed and are shown in Table 9 (Appendix D). Winston and Sandor (2002) argued that
low mean scores (1-2) suggest dissatisfaction with advising received and/or that specific portion
of advising addressed in the individual question. High scores (3-4) indicate satisfaction with
advising. Overall, nearly three-fourths (74.3%) of the respondents believed they were satisfied
with the advising they received ranging from a mean score of 1 indicating “very dissatisfied”
(4.3% of respondents) across all five questions to a mean score of 4 indicating “very satisfied”
(23.4%). The overall mean score was 3.20 \( (SD = 0.8) \). Individually, the questions with the
highest overall mean scores related to sufficient time for advising \( (M = 3.30, SD = 0.9) \),
availability of advising \( (M = 3.28, SD = 0.9) \), and accurate information \( (M = 3.23, SD = 0.9) \). A
one-way ANOVA was conducted to determine if satisfaction on each measure was different
based on generational status for CGS \((n = 166)\) or FGS \((n = 136)\). There was homogeneity of
variances on all five questions (Q1, $p = .67$; Q2, $p = .19$; Q3, $p = .32$; Q4, $p = .15$; Q5, $p = .28$). However, there was no statistically significant differences by generational status (Q1, $p = .79$; Q2, $p = .72$; Q3, $p = .61$; Q4, $p = .70$; Q5, $p = .73$).

Part V repeats Part I, but asks the students to identify their preferred advising style rather than their perception of what they have received (as reflected in Part I). As Table 10 (Appendix D) shows, more than nine out of 10 respondents (91.2%) preferred to receive developmental advising and the responses were similar for both CGS (89.6%) and FGS (93.0%). A chi-square test for association was conducted between preferred advising style and generational status. There was no statistically significant difference between perceived advising style and generational status, $\chi^2(1) = .943, p = .332$.

**Academic Satisfaction and Perceived, Preferred Advising Styles**

The second question examined whether college students who believe they are receiving their preferred advising style will have higher satisfaction with academic advising. Associations among the three variables were analyzed. First, a one-way ANOVA was conducted to determine if advising satisfaction (Part III) was different based on perceived advising received (Part I). Participants were classified based on their scores in Part I of the AAI, indicating whether or not they perceived they were receiving prescriptive advising ($n = 21$) or developmental advising ($n = 264$). There was homogeneity of variances, as assessed by Levene’s Test of Homogeneity of Variance ($p = 1.33$). Satisfaction was higher for those perceiving they were receiving developmental advising ($M = 3.24$, $SD = 0.8$) than those perceiving prescriptive advising ($M = 2.66$, $SD = 0.9$). There was a highly statistically significantly difference between the two perceptions of perceived advising styles, $F(1,283) = 10.642, p = .001$. 
Second, another one-way ANOVA was conducted to determine if advising satisfaction was different based on the preferred advising style. Participants were classified based on their scores in Part V of the AAI, indicating whether or not they preferred prescriptive advising \((n = 25)\) or developmental advising \((n = 259)\). There was homogeneity of variances, as assessed by Levene’s Test of Homogeneity of Variance \((p = .507)\). Satisfaction was higher for those who preferred developmental advising \((M = 3.27, SD = 0.8)\) and those preferring prescriptive advising \((M = 2.88, SD = 0.8)\). Satisfaction with advising was a highly statistically significant difference between the two perceptions of preferred advising styles, \(F(1,282) = 3.385, p = .016\).

Satisfaction, perceived advising, and preferred advising were also examined. As shown in Table 11 (Appendix D), mean satisfaction scores for those who perceived they were receiving prescriptive advising but preferred either prescriptive \((M = 2.64, SD = 1.3)\) or developmental \((M = 2.64, SD = 0.8)\) had the same mean scores, but less variation. Those who perceived they were receiving developmental advising, but preferred prescriptive advising had a higher mean score \((M = 2.93, SD = 0.7)\) while those who both perceive and prefer developmental advising had the highest mean score \((M = 3.30, SD = 0.7)\). The three variables were analyzed using a two-way ANOVA. There was homogeneity of variances, as assessed by Levene’s Test of Homogeneity of Variances \((p = .111)\), but not a statistically significant difference between received and preferred advising on satisfaction, \(F(1,274) = .697,\) partial \(\eta^2 = .003\).

However, importance of the advisor did have an effect on advising satisfaction from those who thought the advising interactions were very important \((M = 3.23, SD = 1.0)\) to very unimportant \((M = 2.76, SD = 0.6)\) as Table 12 (Appendix D) shows. A one-way Welch ANOVA was conducted because there was heterogeneity of variances, as assessed by Levene’s test of homogeneity of variances \((p = .000)\). Statistical significance was found using Welch’s test, \(F(3,}
118.4) = 1.35, p < .005). Follow-up tests were conducted to evaluate pairwise differences among the means using Dunnett’s C test, a test that does not assume equal variances. There was a significant difference in the means between the groups that reported the advisor was very important to those who said very unimportant; between somewhat important and somewhat unimportant; and between those who viewed the advisor as somewhat important and very important.

**Academic Advising Satisfaction and Intent to Persist**

The third research question examined whether college students who are satisfied with the advising they are receiving will be more likely to indicate intent to persist. This research question was analyzed through advising preference, satisfaction, likelihood to return, and importance of academic advising in the decision whether or not to return. With the demographic questions in Part IV of the study, students were asked to rate their likelihood to return to the college for the spring semester on a four-point Likert scale (very likely, somewhat likely, somewhat unlikely, very unlikely). As shown in Table 13 (Appendix D), nine out of ten (90.4%) indicated they were highly likely to return, another 5.6% said they were somewhat likely, 2.0% believed they were somewhat unlikely and 1.6% were very unlikely to return. Using Fisher’s Exact Test (p = .736), there was no statistical difference by generational status.

Students were also asked to evaluate the importance of their academic advisor on their likelihood to return (Table 14, Appendix D) using a four-point Likert Scale (very important, somewhat important, somewhat unimportant, very unimportant). More than two-thirds indicated the academic advisor was somewhat important (46.8%) to very important (23.1%) in their decision whether or not to return. Using Fisher’s Exact Test (p = .982), there was no statistical difference by generational status.
A one-way ANOVA was conducted to determine if likelihood to return was affected by advising satisfaction (Table 15, Appendix D). Participants were classified according to their response to the question regarding their intent to return for the spring semester from very likely ($n = 276$), somewhat likely ($n = 17$), somewhat unlikely ($n = 6$), very unlikely ($n = 5$). There was homogeneity of variances, as assessed by Levene’s Test of Homogeneity of Variance ($p = .933$). There was an increase in satisfaction score from those who said they were highly unlikely to return ($M = 2.56, SD = 0.7$) to those who said they were very likely to return ($M = 3.22, SD = 0.8$), a mean increase of .66, which was not statistically significant between the groups ($p = .283$). Similar results were found when responses were condensed to two variables (likely, unlikely). There was a mean increase of .33 between likely ($M = 3.22, SD = 0.8$) and unlikely ($M = 2.89, SD = 0.7$), which was also not statistically significant between the groups ($p = .185$).

Students’ likelihood to return was also compared by both perceived and preferred advising styles (Table 16, Appendix D). A higher percentage of those who perceived developmental advising ($n = 242, 97.2\%$) indicated they were highly likely to return compared with those who perceived they were receiving prescriptive advising ($n = 18, 85.7\%$). Similar percentages of those who preferred prescriptive ($n = 22, 96.0\%$) and descriptive ($n = 22, 96.0\%$) advising also indicated they were highly likely to return. Importance of advisor interactions on likelihood to return was also examined. Chi Square association could not be applied because the cell count was too low and the conditions were not met. So both variables were collapsed to two groups each: likelihood to return (likely, unlikely) and importance of advisor interactions on the decision (Table 17, Appendix D). Using the Fisher’s Exact Test ($p = .430$), there was no statistical difference.
Post-Hoc Analysis

A fourth research question was added upon analysis of the data that ultimately ties into the second theoretical framework of this study, Tinto’s (1975, 1987, 1993) Theory of Student Departure. Tinto (2012) identified four institutional conditions that impact student success and retention: high expectations, support, assessment/feedback, and involvement/engagement. Part IV of the study included an open-ended question right after the likelihood to return that asked students to name three reasons which influenced their likelihood to return. To analyze these answers, Fowler (2014) recommended examining the characteristics of the answers for analytical significance by drafting a code based on initial responses, then applying to an additional 10-20 responses to finalize. The code should include “other” for responses that don’t fit. In the first round of analysis, seven codes were identified and the answers were evaluated. Upon reviewing the predominant themes, they were closely related to Tinto’s (2012) institutional conditions for student success.

The data were reanalyzed using those four conditions (high expectations, support, assessment/feedback, and involvement/engagement), a code for “other,” and an additional one for negative reasons. Tinto (2012) defined “high expectations” from faculty, the program, and the school that pertains to success, goals, and outcomes. Expectations are set by the student or the institution. This included answers such as “strong education support,” “academic success,” and “I want success in my future major.” “Support” was defined by helpfulness, caring, and encouragement to succeed in both academic and social settings. This is especially important with underprepared students. Responses included “I enjoy the assistance I get when needed,”
“the encouragement to succeed,” and “connections with the staff.” “Assessment/feedback” can be formal or informal, but critical in the first year of school when students are adjusting to new academic and social demands. Student responses included “quality of learning,” “success I’ve had thus far,” and “academically thriving.” “Involvement/engagement” relates to academic and social relationships with faculty, staff, and peers. This occurs in the classroom, formal organizations (athletics, fraternity/sorority), and social interactions. Tinto (2012) considered this the most important condition because the more likely students are involved, the more likely they are to succeed. Student responses included “abundance of opportunities,” “social life on campus,” and “ability to build relationships with professors.” “Other” includes positive responses which did not fit into the above categories such as “close to home,” “my father works here,” and “food.” “Negative reasons” reflects comments that are critical of the student’s experience such as “I don’t like taking the required classes,” “seems too much like high school,” and “don’t like my roommate.”

From the 304 respondents, there were 823 answers to code. Both the researcher and a second coder reviewed the data using the same code book. There was an intercoder agreement on 83.9% of the items. Table 18 (Appendix D) reflects the results of the coding of these answers. More than six of 10 responses \( (n = 504, 61.2\%) \) reflected “involvement/engagement,” the next was “high expectations” \( (n = 121, 14.7\%) \).

Summary

Chapter four provided the results of the current study. Within this chapter, the individual sections included population characteristics, advising perceptions, satisfaction, and preferences by generational status; academic satisfaction and perceived, preferred advising styles; academic advising satisfaction, and intent to persist; and post-hoc analysis. The results from the sample of
first-year, full-time students revealed nearly 9 of ten (89.78%) perceive they were receiving developmental advising. Similar results were found by generational status. Similar satisfaction scores were also found for both CGS ($M = 3.13, SD = 1.0$) and FGS ($M = 3.16, SD = 0.9$) as the entire sample ($M = 3.15, SD = 1.0$). There was a statistical difference in satisfaction both by perceived and preferred styles of advising. The highest mean satisfaction scores were found for those who were both receiving and preferring developmental advising. A very high percentage of students (96%) indicated they were very likely or somewhat likely to return. Nearly two-thirds believed their advising was somewhat to very important in that decision. Those indicating they were highly likely to return had higher mean advising satisfaction scores than those who were very unlikely to return. In a post-hoc analysis of students’ open question responses to the three reasons why they made their persistence decisions, approximately 60% were related to involvement and engagement.
CHAPTER V: DISCUSSION

This descriptive research study determined the influence of academic advising on the intent to persist at a small, private, four-year, liberal arts college. In higher education, there are multiple internal, external, and institutional variables that affect students’ decisions on whether or not to remain in school in general or at one school in particular. Yet, one of them, academic advising has a positive effect on persistence and is often ignored. The research provided a better understanding of a full cohort of first-year students’ perceptions, preferences, and satisfaction with academic advising provides new insights into this critical time period in college and the role of faculty advisors. Additional analysis reflected Tinto’s (2012) institutional conditions for influencing persistence decisions. The study is presented in a five-chapter format. Chapter five is a discussion of the results as they pertain to the research questions and concludes with suggestions for future research.

This study focused on first-year students because of their increased risk of departure (Bai & Pan, 2009-2010; Glenn, 2007; Lau, 2003; Light, 2001; Upcraft et al., 2005). Especially in the first semester, students, academic advisors can be a valuable campus connection in the early, precarious weeks of transition. When done well, academic advisors focus on a series of holistic, intentional interactions grounded in teaching and learning (NACADA, 2006). In turn, this positively affects academic decisions and personal growth. The theoretical framework for the research was built from two streams of literature: Crookston’s (1972) theory on developmental advising and Tinto’s Theory of College Student Departure (1975, 1987, 1993).

Franklin College typifies small, private, four-year institutions in many ways, including its reliance on faculty to provide academic advising. Despite perceptions of elitism, private colleges, like Franklin, also serve many middle-class, first-generation students. For this research, first-
semester, full-time students enrolled in the required first-year experience course were surveyed ($n = 304$) using a modified version of Winston and Sandor’s (1984b) Academic Advising Inventory (AAI) in November 2014.

**Academic Advising: Perceptions, Satisfaction, and Preferences**

It is important to understand students’ views of advising relationships in order to understand the influence on intent to persist. This research was based on Crookston’s (1972) theory in which he defined two types of academic advising relationships: prescriptive, where students implement authoritative recommendations from advisors; and developmental, based on a mutual relationship that includes both personal and academic support.

**Perceptions of Academic Advising Styles**

In this study, nearly nine out of 10 respondents perceived they were receiving developmental advising on the Developmental—Prescriptive Advising (DPA) Scale in Part 1 of the AAI. Such a high student perception of developmental advising is important because there is solid evidence that this style influences retention and graduation (Winston et al., 1984). When students receive developmental advising, the focus is on student needs, values, and career goals rather than administrative tasks such as information about curriculum, courses, and graduation requirements (Kuhn et al., 2006). Students perceived they experienced more teaching and learning activities with a focus on student-decision making, higher order thinking, and student responsibility which leads to personal growth. These results indicate a greater proportion of developmental advising activities occurred in the first semester: building a foundation for future academic advising, while helping students transition to college, and becoming aware of available resources. Through the use of this advising style early in the academic experience, students are involved in and responsible for important activities that will impact their trajectory toward
graduation. Similar to the DPA scale, nearly nine of 10 perceived they were receiving developmental advising on the Personalizing Education (PE) subscale, reflecting advisor concern for the students. Students felt there was a high level of personal attention that ultimately builds a strong college experience including career planning, extracurricular activities, and personal concerns. Higher scores on this scale also meant students felt they experienced a warm, trusting, and purposive relationship with their advisor. Since the advisor/advisee relationship is one of the first on campus, this indicated faculty members are building strong connections with students from the very beginning. Fewer students (82.4%) believed they were receiving developmental advising on the Academic Decision-Making (ADM) subscale. This means a significant number of students thought their opinions mattered regarding the evaluation of their academic progress. The final subscale, Selecting Courses (SC), had the lowest percentage of students who felt they were receiving developmental advising in these areas. While fewer students perceived the SC activities were developmental, nearly three-fourths were still involved in choosing the courses they need and their spring schedule. Overall, these results are intriguing because of limited training in developmental advising. For the first time, there was an additional, albeit limited session on developmental advising before the beginning of the 2014-2015 school year (K. Wehner, personal communication, March 25, 2015). In previous years, faculty only participated in a brief session during faculty orientation focused on the prescriptive aspects of advising: mainly new policies and procedures. An overall lack of advisor education is similar to many other institutions (Gordon & Habley, 2000). Yet, Franklin’s definition of and expectations for advising are developmental in nature, including shared responsibilities by both advisors and advisees (Franklin College, 2014e). The advising handbook includes suggestions on advising relationships with shared responsibility, how to conduct well-rounded meetings with advisees,
and available resources for advisors and advisees. During those first advising sessions, faculty are expected to build the advisor/advisee relationship, assess the student’s transition to college, and intervene or recommend services if needed. In turn, advisees are expected to share goals, set up appointments, prepare the advising sessions, and follow through/accept final responsibility for decisions made during the advising sessions. The handbook reflects the holistic approach of Crookston’s (1972) theory on developmental advising including a level of mutuality through advisor/advisee collaboration, which in turn builds the relationship. Given the disparity between faculty preparation for providing developmental advising and these results, additional research may indicate why. As a small institution, Franklin’s culture is already very student-centered and based on personal relationships. This could transfer into the advisor/advisee bond. Additionally, the average length of service of full-time faculty is 12 years (T. Garner, personal communication, March 20, 2015), which could be an additional factor. The institutional focus and the faculty experience in advising could influence the style. Another factor could be the personal experiences of the faculty themselves. If they preferred or favorable experienced developmental advising as an undergraduate, they may practice it. A third factor may be the incorporation of their own teaching styles. Those drawn to smaller institutions are more likely to be focused on teaching and bring their own classroom style to advising.

This study is significant because it sampled an entire cohort of first-time students and found an overwhelming perception of developmental advising from faculty advisors. These findings contradict previous research that discovered professionals were more likely than faculty to deliver developmental advising because of lack of time and training (Jordan, 2012). Despite, a reliance on faculty to advise, they found time to provide developmental advising. The results also marginally support previous research on similar groups of students. In a study of under-
resourced, first-semester freshmen taking a remedial course, Duckworth (2008) found that 67% of students at a large Southern university perceived their advising to be developmental, which is a smaller proportion than this study. While she also found an overwhelming perception of developmental advising with the PE and ADM subscales, students perceived they were receiving prescriptive advising on the SC subscale. In this study, students indicated they were receiving developmental advising on all three scales. The differences in results may be indicative of the sample (remedial students vs. full cohort) or the size of the institution (large university vs. small college).

Other studies utilizing the AAI have also involved sub-sets of student populations, producing a range of results. Similar to this research, Brown (2005) found that less than 10% indicated a preference for prescriptive advising. His research involved primarily freshman, but students at other levels as well. Unlike this study, he found statistically significant differences in higher DPA scores with White, older students, and students with higher self-reported GPA. Dedmon (2012) examined academic advising at community colleges and found that traditional-age, underprepared students were more satisfied with developmental advising while older, underprepared students were satisfied with either prescriptive or developmental advising. However, this study contradicts scholars who argued a prescriptive approach should be applied early in the academic experience (Brown & Rivas, 1994; Mottarella et al., 2004; Smith, 2002). While some prescriptive advising may have been taking place, the majority of activities were focused on connecting students to the institution, to their coursework, and with each other.

The results of this research clearly show that the faculty members at Franklin College are providing developmental advising from the beginning of the advisor/advisee relationship. Both sides understand the mutual responsibility for advising outcomes. Since faculty student
relationships are one of the first, consistent relationships that students experience on campus, there is an immediate opportunity to build trust, satisfaction, and personal growth (Bruning, 2002). The size of the institution and the number of advisees per advisor may have also provided a more pronounced effect on this bond than what might occur at larger schools. With a smaller faculty to student ratio, the ability to build relationships can occur quickly and deeply.

**Frequency of Academic Advising Activities**

In Part II of the AAI, students identified how often they participated in some of the most common advising activities. Based on Winston and Sandor’s (2002) five scales, the most frequent activities noted were part of the Academic Majors and Courses (AMC) scale. These included discussing possible majors, declaring a major, and potential career options. The second highest scale was Registration and Class Scheduling (RCS) and contained activities such as registration form signatures, course selection, and schedule planning. The Personal Development and Interpersonal Relationships (PDIR) scale was third, and incorporated personal issue discussions, as well as short-term and long-range planning. The Teaching Personal Skills (TPS) scale was fourth, and reflected activities focused on college policies, study skills, and time management. The fewest identified activities belonged to the Exploring Institutional Policies (EIP) scale, which was comprised of general information about the college, academic rules and regulations, as well as study abroad programming. Given three factors: institutional expectations of the first advising sessions, recent student participation in orientation, and enrollment in the first-year seminar course, it is likely that activities measured in EIP were less important in these first advising sessions. As students move through higher education, the expectation would be that these items are discussed more frequently. Ultimately though, the results reflect the institution’s recommendations in the advising handbook (Franklin, 2014e).
Overall, the most frequently reported individual activities included discussions about possible majors, degree or major academic requirements, course content, and course selection. The least reported activities were: probation and dismissal policies, and financial aid. This would align with Franklin’s advisor handbook (Franklin, 2014e) that recommends the focus in that critical first-semester on four concepts: building relationships; setting short-term and long-term academic goals; getting the student academically and socially engaged on campus; and connected with available resources.

Frequency and length of academic advising sessions mattered. About two-thirds reported attending three or more advising sessions and nearly nine in 10 reported the average session length was more than 15 minutes. Developmental advising takes more time than prescriptive advising. These factors indicate more developmental activities occurred and supported students’ perceptions that they were receiving developmental advising. The number of academic advising sessions is also important. The college’s expectation is three individual advising sessions during the first semester (Franklin College, 2014e), which is also aligned with advising literature (Cuseo, 2012). The more students meet with their advisors, the more likely they are to stay. In fact, Seidman (2007) found community college students who received a trio of academic advising touch points were 20 percent more likely to persist. Swecker et al. (2013) indicated that for every advising meeting, the chances the student persisted increased by 13 percent. The number of sessions also positively correlates with satisfaction with advising (NSSE, 2005), and increased student performance (Vander Schee, 2007). Coll and Draves (2009) found that student satisfaction relates to discussions about personal values and possible academic majors, both activities that were high on the scales in this study. This research is also in contrast to Duckworth (2008), who found respondents only received an average of one or two sessions for
a period of 15 minutes or less in the first semester. Since developmental advising takes more
time, this study indicated Franklin students were spending longer periods with advisors than in
the students in Ducksworth. While a majority in this study did believe they attended at least
three advising sessions, there was about one-third who said they participated in two or less
sessions. Ensuring that students, especially those at-risk, meet with advisors at least three times
could positively impact persistence at Franklin and other institutions.

**Satisfaction with Academic Advising**

Student satisfaction with their college experience has a direct link to persistence. One
key aspect of that is advising satisfaction (Cuseo, 2012). Part III of the AAI examined
satisfaction with advising. Overall, nearly three-fourths of the students believed they were
satisfied with the advising they received, and showed a higher level of satisfaction on two
individual questions regarding time for advising and availability of advisors. Since the question
regarding advising time had the highest overall mean satisfaction score, it corresponds with
results in Part II of the survey. Students were satisfied with the amount of time with their
advisors. Since nearly two-thirds reported three or more sessions, satisfaction with availability is
also aligned. Together, time and accessibility allow for relationships to be built through more
and richer faculty-student interactions (Bruning, 2002; Tinto, 1993). While this is positive, the
challenge may be the sustainability of the relationship, and whether all students regardless of
year in school, receive the time and attention they need. At smaller institutions, faculty are
primarily focused on teaching, yet still have service and research responsibilities in addition to
the advising requirements. It takes time to develop quality relationships. Mottarella et al. (2004)
found that if the advisor/advisee relationship is earnest, caring and considerate, students will be
satisfied.
Despite the trends toward fewer tenure-line positions, ensuring there are enough full-time faculty who can spend the time with students can also be crucial. Finkelstein and Schuster (2001) found that contract and part-time faculty were far less likely to spend time with students outside of the classroom. At Franklin, 79% of the full-time faculty are tenure track/tenured and 21% are non-tenure track (T. Garner, personal communication, March 20, 2015). Students advised by those in contract positions may not get the time and attention they need. Another challenge may be in the number of advisees; Franklin averages 11 advisees per faculty member and O’Banion (2013) recommended no more than 15 advisees without a reduced teaching load. While Franklin is within the parameters, there may be cases where those perceived as stronger advisors may have more advisees than recommended. Faculty who are less focused or capable may not be engaged or satisfied with their advising assignments. In turn, they may not provide a quality experience. However, this study did not seek to better understand faculty skills or satisfaction with advising.

**Preferred Academic Advising Styles**

Part V of the AAI examined students’ preferred advising style. More than nine out of 10 (91.2%) preferred to receive developmental advising. The percentage was similar to Part I where students indicated that the majority (89.8%) were already receiving this type of advising. As a result, this as “good fit” as defined by Tinto (1975) and could well be a positive factor in persistence. Advisors have created an environment that was conducive to success despite student characteristics that point toward prescriptive advising. Students were content with involvement in the advising decision-making. This contradicts both Chickering (1969) and Light (2001) who contended students would want more direction in this time of uncertainty as they transition to college.
These results also contradict what we know about Millennial students as well. Students currently in college are the middle of the Millennial generation, born in or after 1982 until 2002. This group is more academically oriented than previous generations, more likely to accept authority, and follow rules (Howe & Strauss, 2000). They may have clear goals, but they may be unable or unsure how to reach them. In addition, the students may also lack critical analytical and thinking skills because of a highly structured K-12 experience, be easily overwhelmed, yet, have a high regard for adults (Bigger, 2005). Given these characteristics, students would be expected to show satisfaction with or a preference for prescriptive advising. However, the findings did not bear out these sweeping generational characteristics. Instead, students preference for developmental advising aligned with some of today’s challenges they face such as issues about identity, autonomy, self-confidence, setting goals, using resources, and becoming familiar with academic life (Kramer, 2000; Swing & Skipper, 2007). Feelings of incompetence, self-confidence, higher levels of stress, and depression are also factors. Since there is a large student-athlete population, there are also struggles with academic eligibility, advanced time management, and injuries (Broughton, 2001). While there was a strong preference for developmental advising when the study was conducted, students may want or need prescriptive advising at different points in their college careers depending on personal and institutional factors (Jordan, 2000; Lowenstein, 1999).

Like many previous studies on college students, these students preferred a developmental approach (Crockett, 1985, Frost, 1990; Milburn, 1994; Winston et al., 1982; Winston & Sandor, 1984b). The high percentage is similar to Craig’s (2004) findings at an urban community college where 98.4% of first-semester students preferred developmental advising. However, the data contradicted previous research (Ducksworth, 2008, Muedking, 2006; Smith,
2002) where first-semester students preferred prescriptive and more of a one-way relationship with advisors. In fact, Ducksworth (2008) found there was a statistically significant difference (p < .05) between what students perceived they were receiving and their preferences in the first semester. By examining a full cohort, this study provides a clearer picture of what may be needed for an entire entering class of first-year students rather than previous studies on sub-populations.

**Impact of Generational Status on Advising Perceptions and Preferences**

The first research question focused on differences in perceptions, satisfaction, and preferences by generational status. Slightly less than half of the study respondents (45.1%) reported that neither parent graduated from a four-year college or university; thus they are first-generation college students (FGS) based upon the definition used in this study. Since FGS are less likely to persist and graduate from college, the transition to college can be more academically and non-academically challenging than for those whose parents can provide guidance based on their own college experiences. Yet, there were no statistical differences in perceptions, satisfaction, or preferences between FGS and CGS (continuing-generation students) on the DPA scale or the subscales in this study. There was also no statistical difference in number or length of advising sessions. Similar tests were also run for associations between ethnicity, athletic status, fraternity/sorority membership, and no statistical significance was found with any of these groups as well. Since students reported participating in similar advising activities regardless of generational status, it could reflect the institution’s focus on persistence of all first-year students regardless of special characteristics.

In general, FGS begin college with different characteristics than CGS including lower family support levels, and a less basic college understanding. They may lack cultural capital as
well as academic, social, and critical thinking skills (Elkins, 1996; Oldfield, 2009; Sy et al., 2011; Terenzini et al., 1996). Additional support has been shown to make a difference (Choy, 2001; Cuseo, 2012; Darling, & Scandlyn Smith, 2007; Engle et al., 2006). Yet, limited research (Chando, 2007) did not find a relationship between student preferences for advising style and generational status. That is why the first research question first sought to capture any significant differences between those students whose parents graduated from college and those whose parents did not. Similar results were found.

Since there was no statistically significant difference in perceptions and preferences of, as well as satisfaction with, academic advising by generational status, the hypothesis that first-generation college students would have different views and desires of their advising experience was not supported. While past research suggested FGS should receive and want more prescriptive advising, this study failed to support this assumption. Institutional conditions, types of students attracted to small schools, or characteristics of this cohort may have been factors in the outcome. Incoming students who want personal attention and faculty relationships may choose smaller institutions, thus they may prefer developmental advising. Student-athletes who face additional challenges in transitioning to college also want a more personal relationship that also addresses their personal and academic needs (Ender, 1983; Gurney & Johnston, 1986). They are often overwhelmed and need a great deal of support (Gaston-Gayles, 2003)

**Student Needs and Satisfaction with Academic Advising**

The second question examined whether college students who believe they are receiving their preferred advising style will have higher satisfaction with academic advising. The most critical period for academic advising, like retention, is in the first year. Efforts to increase satisfaction with academic advising should increase institutional satisfaction, thus also increase
retention (Cuseo, 2012). Congruence is also important. Students are more satisfied with advising when they perceive they are getting the style they prefer and the results from this study supported this assumption. If quality academic advising is provided during the first year, students may make better first choices about majors and course selection which will in turn promote retention, especially among at-risk students.

Understanding how satisfaction correlates with student opinions of current and ideal advising can provide further insights. There was a statistically significant difference in satisfaction (Part III of the AAI) between those who perceived they were receiving developmental advising and those who perceived prescriptive advising. Those getting developmental advising were more satisfied, and there was also a highly statistically significant difference between the two perceptions of preferred advising styles and satisfaction. Satisfaction was higher for those preferred developmental advising than those preferring prescriptive advising. Independently, each analysis supports a connection between developmental advising and satisfaction. Additionally, those who both perceive and prefer developmental advising had the highest mean score on satisfaction, supporting earlier research (Guillén, 2010).

These results corroborate previous research that found first-year students who preferred developmental advising were more satisfied when they received it throughout the first semester (Muedking, 2006). There was also significantly higher satisfaction among students who prefer developmental advising and received it, than those who had a conflict between preferred and perceived advising styles (Hale et al., 2009). Conversely, Duckworth (2008) found that the first-semester students who preferred prescriptive advising, but believed they were receiving developmental, were only marginally satisfied with advising. The data from this study support the importance of students receiving their preferred style of advising. There was also a
statistically significant effect on advising satisfaction from those who thought the advising interactions were very important from those who did not. Thus, the importance of academic advisors themselves is reinforced by these results.

The second hypothesis, that college students who believe their advising needs and preferences are met will have higher satisfaction with academic advising, was supported. Additionally, students believed their advisor played an important role in the decision to remain or leave. This may present institutional challenges on ensuring quality advising for all students. Since there are few extrinsic reasons, faculty may have intrinsic motivation to make the time commitment and connections to provide quality advising. Like many other colleges, there is little advisor training and few institutional rewards at Franklin. Consideration of quality advising is limited within Franklin’s faculty promotion and tenure process, and there is only one annual award for advising. Quality faculty advisors are driven by personal motivation to help students grow and succeed. Those not so inclined may provide subpar advising, which in turn could affect persistence. This research would support more initial faculty training, additional yearly professional development, and better evaluative systems so that it can be considered part of the promotion and tenure process (Fiddler & Alicea, 1996; Habley & Morales, 1998; Hester, 2008).

**Importance of Advising on Intent to Persist**

Given the literature that supports an impact of academic advising on intent to persist, the third research question analyzed advising preference, satisfaction, likelihood to return, and importance of academic advising on the decision whether or not to return. While nearly 96% of respondents, indicated they were somewhat to highly likely to return for the spring semester, this statistic is somewhat expected. At the mid-year point, there can be challenges in transferring to a
new institution including financial aid, living arrangements, and credit transfers. Students received mid-term grades and “early alert” grades earlier in the semester to those with challenges (T. Garner, personal communication, March 20, 2015). Ultimately, this statistic was close to the actual second semester persistence of 93.6% in the spring of 2015 that was based on all 327 entering freshmen (T. Garner, personal communication, February 19, 2015). The number of students who began the school year is slightly less than the research population. Six left the college prior to November. While this statistic indicates strong retention from first to second semester, persistence data usually drops off further between the first and second years (Noel, 1985; Tinto, 1987). The persistence rate could also be influenced by student involvement and where they live. Since more than half identified as student-athletes and slightly less than half as members of a sorority or fraternity, a high level of engagement in these activities early in their academic career may be a factor (DeBard, Lake, & Binder, 2006; Ishler & Upcraft, 2005; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). The very residential nature of the campus may be a reason as well.

Students were also asked evaluate the importance of their academic advisor on their likelihood to return and more than two-thirds indicated the academic advisor was somewhat important (46.8%) to very important (23.1%) in their decision to persist. Ducksworth (2008) found similar qualitative results where first-semester students agreed their advisor played a marked role in their intent to persist into the second semester. These findings along with the past research support Tinto’s (2012) argument that institutions can increase retention using existing programs such as advising. While there were no statistical differences between the satisfaction scores of those highly likely to highly unlikely to return, there was an increase in mean satisfaction scores. Ultimately, more students who received developmental advising indicated a higher likelihood of returning.
These results correlate with what other researchers found regarding advising satisfaction, predictability of contentment with the college experience (NSSE, 2005) and a sense of belonging (Hausmann et al., 2009). These factors lead to better retention and graduation rates (Campbell & Nutt, 2008; Kuh et al., 2005; Light, 2001, Noel & Levitz, 1995; Tinto 2012). Taken together, this research supports the third hypothesis that students who perceive their advising needs and preferences are met will have higher satisfaction with academic advising, and remain at the institution. The results also reinforce the importance of student-faculty relationships on retention, and the need to train and support faculty to do so.

**Institutional Conditions that Influenced Intent to Persist**

A post-hoc analysis was conducted upon examination of the data from the open-ended answers. These results connected to the second theoretical framework of this study, Tinto’s (1975, 1987, 1993) Theory of Student Departure. Tinto (2012) identified four institutional conditions that impact student success and retention: high expectations, support, assessment/feedback, and involvement/engagement. In order to better understand why students were likely or unlikely to return for the spring semester, Part IV of the AAI included an open-ended question, asking students to name three reasons that influenced their likelihood to return. The data were analyzed using Tinto’s four institutional conditions. More than 60% of the responses identified “involvement/engagement” as a reason for the decision to return to college. Tinto considered “involvement/engagement” to be the most important condition because it increases the likelihood of student success and ultimately increases retention. Involvement can occur anywhere on campus: in class, formal organizations, and every day social interactions. Students mentioned the campus opportunities, social life, student-faculty relationships, and sports involvement as positive aspects of their decision to return. The second most frequent
theme, “high expectations,” was found in 14.7% of the responses. Tinto defined these as self-driven or from faculty, the program, and the school. Student responses included success, goals, outcomes result from educational support, a desire to succeed in class or careers, and expectations of faculty. Since both involvement and expectations are intended outcomes of Franklin’s advising program, it is interesting to note the prevalence of these two categories in the open ended answers. While fewer answers were coded as “support,” there were still nearly 10% of responses in this category. Since this is part of the school’s focus as a smaller institution to personalize the educational experience, it would be interesting to see if more students identified support in later semesters. “Assessment/feedback” was the least listed of the four categories (3.1%), but not surprising given the population and the amount of assessment of feedback received at this point in their college careers. Further research questions regarding institutional conditions and persistence may lend additional insights.

In his Theory of Student Departure (1993), Tinto posited that involved students are more likely to persist and graduate. Otherwise, if students do not feel like they belong, they are more likely to drop out in the first or second year. Astin’s Theory of Involvement (1984, 1993) added a more proactive role on the part of students: the more they invest, the more they get from the college experience, and the more likely they are to stay. Advisor encouragement to become involved could be an important piece of the persistence puzzle. Encouragement and guidance toward involvement could increase student’s connectedness, especially among FGS who are less likely to get involved on their own (Hertel, 2002).

Smaller institutions such as Franklin may have an underutilized advantage in faculty-student relationships. While often these relationships are important aspects of student life at small colleges and universities, they can also lead to higher involvement on campus because of
the individual attention, small class sizes, and faculty-student ratios (Astin, 1993; Hemwall & Trachte, 2005; Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991). These were all influential factors named by the students in the study. Therefore, given more focused attention to these relationships may further increase persistence. More interactions that are substantive and educationally meaningful can have the greatest impact on students (Astin, 1993; Kuh & Hu, 2001; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005; Sax, 2008). The early faculty relationships was also reflected in the 124 (15.1%) of responses, across all four institutional condition factors where students named some type of positive teacher interaction in involvement/engagement, expectations, support, and assessment/feedback. While 6.4% of the open-ended responses were coded as negative responses, none were from students who indicated they were unlikely or very unlikely to return. Therefore, another area for further research would be to better understand the choices made by those who leave. Even though they found positive institutional conditions, they made decisions to depart.

**Concluding Thoughts**

This study examined a full cohort of first-time, full-time college students to better understand perceptions, preferences, and satisfaction with academic advising and influence on intent to persist. Given the higher dropout rates of FGS, generational status was also examined to determine if those whose parents did not attend college received and/or wanted different types of academic advising. Post-hoc analysis of open-ended responses to students’ persistence decisions provided additional insights for institutional persistence strategies.

This study contributes to a growing body of knowledge on first-semester student advising and first-generation students at a time when both are more closely examined in order to improve retention and success. By studying a full cohort of students, this study found that those who
perceive and prefer developmental advising are more satisfied and likely to persist. The results reinforced previous research that the majority of college students preferred developmental advising, but contradicted previous results that at-risk or under resourced students preferred prescriptive advising. Generational status was not a factor in advising perceptions, satisfaction, or preference.

More than one-third of post-secondary institutions in the United States are private, nonprofit colleges and universities (National Association of College and Universities, n.d.). The research site, Franklin College, typifies such an institution. The student-centered focus of smaller higher educational institutions may better lend itself to develop the training, implementation, and evaluation of intentional developmental advising programs for first-year students. While the majority of students were satisfied with advising, there were still nearly 10% who were not, or did not feel they were receiving the type of advising they preferred. Opportunity to go beyond the faculty handbook and ensure consistent developmental advising throughout the college could positively impact persistence; not only for this institution, but all colleges of similar size and mission.

**Limitations**

The following limitations apply to this study.

1. The participants were representative of the full-time, first-year population at a small, private, Midwest college in the first semester of higher education. Thus the results are not necessarily generalizable to other institutional settings except four-year schools of similar size, selectivity, and demographic composition.

2. The researcher was not able to control the number of students who completed the surveys. While only two who attended class the day of the survey did not complete it,
the 15 who were absent were not surveyed. Another six first-time students left the institution before the research study was conducted.

3. The sample was not very diverse. The overall make-up of Franklin College’s student body is primarily White, traditional-aged, middle-class, campus residents, which differs from national statistics on first-generation students.

4. The short time frame of study only focused on voluntary persistence/withdrawal from one semester to the next.

5. It only included students who completed nearly the full fall semester. It did not include those who left prior to the study time period. Thus, their advising experiences and reasons for departure are not included.

**Suggestions for Future Research**

There are several suggestions for future research based on the results of this study. The first is to replicate the study at other small, private, four-year colleges who rely on faculty to provide academic advising. This study only examined first-year, full-time freshman at Franklin College in the fall of 2014. Other studies may be conducted at similar sized institutions, with more diverse population (by ethnicity, geography) and other institutional characteristics. Another opportunity for replication may be with institutions that provide fewer resources for first-generation college students. Franklin identifies FGS at admission and provides additional first-year programming support to help meet their needs.

Further qualitative research may better understand why students choose not to persist from first to second semester. While the answers provided in this survey may provide initial awareness, additional questions and context may provide added insights and specific possible solutions. Also, there is room to better understand Tinto’s (2012) four institutional factors
(involvement/engagement, high expectations, support, and assessment/feedback) that affected likelihood to return through quantitative and/or qualitative research. This study asked one open-ended question with a wide range of responses. Further research may provide insights into connections between advising and these four influences. A final suggestion would be to conduct a survey with faculty advisors at small, private, four-year institutions to determine whether their perceptions of and preferences for advising style is similar or different based on students’ generational status or year in school. Qualitative research may also find how they choose to advise students and the implications of their past experiences on their advising style.
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APPENDIX A: ACADEMIC ADVISING INVENTORY

Student Perceptions of Advising and Influence on Retention: A Comparison of Perceived Satisfaction, Needs, and Intent to Persist of First-Semester, First-Generation and Continuing Generation College Students at a Liberal Arts College

Purpose of this study:
This is a study being conducted by doctoral student Debbie Davis from Ball State University. The purpose is to examine student perceptions of academic advising and influence on retention.

What will be done:
You will complete a paper survey, which will take about 20 minutes. The survey includes questions about your experiences with academic advising.

Only adult (18+), freshmen students at Franklin College are being asked to participate in the study. Students who are not freshmen are excluded from the study.

There are no perceived risks for participating in this study. If you feel uncomfortable with a question, you can skip that question or withdraw from the study altogether.

Your participation in the survey is entirely voluntary and all of your responses are anonymous. No personally identifiable information will be associated with your responses. Only the researcher and a research assistant will see your individual survey responses. The data will be kept for five years and will kept on a password protected computer and/or flash drive. Any paper copies will be kept in the original sealed envelope (from the survey administration), a locked cabinet or office. No one from Franklin College will see the raw data.

Should you have any further questions or comments, please feel free to contact Debbie Davis at dadavis@bsu.edu or (317) 508-2179.

IRB Contact Information
For questions about your rights as a research subject, please contact the Director, Office of Research Integrity, Ball State University, Muncie, IN 47306, (765) 285-5070 or at irb@bsu.edu.

By beginning the survey, you acknowledge that you have read this information and agree to participate in the research with the knowledge that you are free to withdraw your participation at any time without penalty. If you choose not to complete the survey, simply submit the survey tool without completing any questions.
**Academic Advising Inventory**

Thank you for participating in this study. Your responses are very important and will help us carefully examine the role of academic advising at the college.

Part I of this Inventory concerns how you and your advisor approach academic advising. Even if you have had more than one advisor or have been in more than one type of advising situation, please respond to the statements in terms of your current situation. There are 14 pairs of statements in Parts I and V. You must make two decisions about each pair in order to respond: (1) decide which one of the two statements most accurately describes the academic advising you received this year, and then (2) decide how accurate or true that statement is (from very true to slightly true). Circle your response.

Mark your answers to all questions on the survey itself. Use a pencil if possible. If you need to change an answer, erase it completely and then mark the desired response. If using a pen, clearly mark out the incorrect response.

### Part I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>My advisor is interested in helping me learn how to find out about courses and programs for myself.</th>
<th>My advisor tells me what I need to know about academic courses and programs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-----------B---------------C---------------D</td>
<td>OR A-----------B---------------C---------------D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very True  Slightly True</td>
<td>Very True  Slightly True</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>My advisor tells me what would be the best schedule for me.</th>
<th>My advisor suggests important considerations in planning a schedule and then gives me responsibility for the final decision.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-----------B---------------C---------------D</td>
<td>OR A-----------B---------------C---------------D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very True  Slightly True</td>
<td>Very True  Slightly True</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>My advisor and I talk about vocational opportunities in conjunction with advising.</th>
<th>My advisor and I do not talk about vocational opportunities in conjunction with advising.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-----------B---------------C---------------D</td>
<td>OR A-----------B---------------C---------------D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very True  Slightly True</td>
<td>Very True  Slightly True</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>My advisor shows an interest in my outside-of-class activities and sometimes suggests activities.</th>
<th>My advisor does not know what I do outside of class.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-----------B---------------C---------------D</td>
<td>OR A-----------B---------------C---------------D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very True  Slightly True</td>
<td>Very True  Slightly True</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My advisor assists me in identifying realistic academic goals based on what I know about myself, and about my test scores and grades.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My advisor identifies realistic academic goals for me based on my test scores and grades.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A———B———C———D</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very True</td>
<td>Slightly True</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| My advisor registers me for my classes. |
| My advisor teaches me how to register myself for classes. |
| A———B———C———D | OR | A———B———C———D |
| Very True | Slightly True | Very True | Slightly True |

| When I’m faced with difficult decisions my advisor tells me my alternatives and which one is the best choice. |
| When I’m faced with difficult decisions, my advisor assists me in identifying alternatives and in considering the consequences of choosing each alternative. |
| A———B———C———D | OR | A———B———C———D |
| Very True | Slightly True | Very True | Slightly True |

| My advisor does not know who to contact about other-than-academic problems. |
| My advisor knows who to contact about other-than-academic problems. |
| A———B———C———D | OR | A———B———C———D |
| Very True | Slightly True | Very True | Slightly True |

| My advisor gives me tips on managing my time better or on studying more effectively when I seem to need them. |
| My advisor does not spend time giving me tips on managing my time better or on studying more effectively. |
| A———B———C———D | OR | A———B———C———D |
| Very True | Slightly True | Very True | Slightly True |

| My advisor tells me what I must do in order to be advised. |
| My advisor and I discuss our expectations of advising and of each other. |
| A———B———C———D | OR | A———B———C———D |
| Very True | Slightly True | Very True | Slightly True |
### Part II

Consider the following activities that often take place during academic advising. During this academic year, how many times have you been involved in each?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>1 time</th>
<th>2 times</th>
<th>3 times</th>
<th>4 times</th>
<th>5 or more times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discussing college policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signing registration forms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropping and/or adding course(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussing personal values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussing possible majors/academic concentrations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussing important social or political issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussing content of courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selecting courses for the next term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning a schedule for the next term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussing transfer credit and policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1 time</td>
<td>2 times</td>
<td>3 times</td>
<td>4 times</td>
<td>5 or more times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussing advanced placement or exempting courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussing career alternatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussing probation and dismissal policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussing financial aid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying other campus offices that can provide assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussing study skills or study tips</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussing degree or major academic concentration requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussing personal concerns or problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussing study abroad or other special academic programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussing internship or cooperative education opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking about or setting personal goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating academic progress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting to know each other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussing extracurricular activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussing job placement opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussing the purposes of a college education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declaring or changing a major/academic concentration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussing time management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking about experiences in different classes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking about what you are doing besides taking classes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Part III**

Consider the academic advising you have participated in this year, respond to the following five statements below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied in general with the academic advising I have received.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have received accurate information about courses, programs, and requirements through academic advising</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient prior notice has been provided related to institutional policies and procedures</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising has been available when I needed it.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient time has been available during advising sessions</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part IV

Please respond to the following questions. Circle your response.

1. What is your sex?
   a) Male
   b) Female

2. What is your cultural/racial background?
   a) African-American/Black
   b) Hispanic American/Latino/a
   c) Asian American or Pacific Islander
   d) White/Caucasian
   e) Native American
   f) Biracial/multiracial
   g) Other
   h) Declined to respond

3. Did either one of your parents graduate from a four-year college or university?
   a) Yes
   b) No

4. Are you a student-athlete on a team sponsored by the college’s athletic department?
   a) Yes
   b) No

5. Are you a member of a social (Greek) fraternity or sorority?
   a) Yes
   b) No

6. Which best describes where you are living now while you are attending college?
   a) On-campus (residence halls, fraternity housing)
   b) Off-campus (with family members or in another setting)
   c) Other (Please describe): __________

7. How many academic advising sessions have you had this semester?
   a) None
   b) 1
   c) 2
   d) 3
   e) 4
   f) 5
   g) 6
   h) 7
   i) 8
   j) 9 or more
   k) Not applicable

8. Approximately how much time was generally spent in each advising session?
   a) Less than 15 minutes
   b) 15-30 minutes
   c) 31-45 minutes
   d) 46-60 minutes
   e) More than 1 hour
   f) Not applicable

9. How likely are you to return to Franklin College in the spring?
   a) Very likely
   b) Somewhat likely
   c) Somewhat unlikely
   d) Very unlikely
10. This is a very important question in understanding why students choose to return to or leave Franklin College. Name three reasons which have influenced your answer above.

[Blank lines]

11. How important were the interactions with your academic advisor on the likelihood you would return or leave Franklin College?

a) Very important
b) Somewhat important
c) Somewhat unimportant
d) Very unimportant

---

**Part V**

This part concerns how you view the IDEAL academic advisor. Choose the one statement from each pair which best describes, in your opinion, the ideal academic advisor (that is, what you would want an advisor to be like). Then determine how important that statement is to you for an ideal advisor. This is not an evaluation of your present or past advisors at the college.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A---------B---------C---------D</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>A---------B---------C---------D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My advisor is interested in helping me learn how to find out about courses and programs for myself.</td>
<td>My advisor tells me what I need to know about academic courses and programs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very True</td>
<td>Slightly True</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My advisor tells me what would be the best schedule for me.</td>
<td>My advisor suggests important considerations in planning a schedule and then gives me responsibility for the final decision.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very True</td>
<td>Slightly True</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My advisor and I talk about vocational opportunities in conjunction with advising.</td>
<td>My advisor and I do not talk about vocational opportunities in conjunction with advising.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very True</td>
<td>Slightly True</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Option A</td>
<td>Option B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My advisor shows an interest in my outside-of-class activities and sometimes suggests activities.</td>
<td>A---------B---------C---------D</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>Very</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>Slightly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| My advisor assists me in identifying realistic academic goals based on what I know about myself, and about my test scores and grades. | A---------B---------C---------D | OR | A---------B---------C---------D |
| Very                      | True     | Very     | True     | True     |
| Slightly                   | True     | Slightly | True     | True     |

| My advisor registers me for my classes. | A---------B---------C---------D | OR | A---------B---------C---------D |
| Very                      | True     | Very     | True     | True     |
| Slightly                   | True     | Slightly | True     | True     |

| When I’m faced with difficult decisions my advisor tells me my alternatives and which one is the best choice. | A---------B---------C---------D | OR | A---------B---------C---------D |
| Very                      | True     | Very     | True     | True     |
| Slightly                   | True     | Slightly | True     | True     |

| My advisor does not know who to contact about other-than-academic problems. | A---------B---------C---------D | OR | A---------B---------C---------D |
| Very                      | True     | Very     | True     | True     |
| Slightly                   | True     | Slightly | True     | True     |

| My advisor gives me tips on managing my time better or on studying more effectively when I seem to need them. | A---------B---------C---------D | OR | A---------B---------C---------D |
| Very                      | True     | Very     | True     | True     |
| Slightly                   | True     | Slightly | True     | True     |

| My advisor does not spend time giving me tips on managing my time better or on studying more effectively. | A---------B---------C---------D | OR | A---------B---------C---------D |
| Very                      | True     | Very     | True     | True     |
| Slightly                   | True     | Slightly | True     | True     |
My advisor tells me what I must do in order to be advised. OR My advisor and I discuss our expectations of advising and of each other.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>Slightly</td>
<td>True</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My advisor suggests what I should major in. OR My advisor suggests steps I can take to help me decide on a major.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>Slightly</td>
<td>True</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My advisor uses test scores and grades to let him or her know what courses are most appropriate for me to take. OR My advisor and I use information, such as test scores, grades, interests, and abilities, to determine what courses are most appropriate for me to take.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>Slightly</td>
<td>True</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My advisor talks with me about interests and plans other than academic ones. OR My advisor does not talk with me about interests and plans other than academic ones.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>Slightly</td>
<td>True</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My advisor keeps me informed of my academic progress by examining my files and grades only. OR My advisor keeps informed of my academic progress by examining my files and grades and by talking to me about my classes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>Slightly</td>
<td>True</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

You have completed all of the questions. Thank you very much for your participation in this survey.
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APPENDIX D: TABLES
Table 1

*Frequency Distribution of Student Participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Variables</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>41.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>58.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generational Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing Generation Student</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>54.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-Generation Student</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>45.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural/Racial Background</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American/Black</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic American/Latino/a</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Caucasian</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>81.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biracial/multiracial</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-athlete</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>53.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-student-athlete</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>46.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social (Greek) fraternity/sorority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>44.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-member</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>55.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of residence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-campus</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>92.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-campus</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2

Coefficient Alpha Reliability Estimates for Developmental—Prescriptive Advising Scale and Subscales (n=304)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>This study</th>
<th>Winston &amp; Sandor (2002)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developmental—Prescriptive Advising (DPA)</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personalizing Education (PE)</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Decision-Making (ADM)</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selecting Courses (SC)</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3

*Intercorrelations of Subscales and DPA (N=285)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ADM</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>DPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.41</td>
<td>.80**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADM</td>
<td></td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.58**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.46**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes.* DPA = Developmental—Prescriptive Advising, PE = Personalizing Education, ADM = Academic Decision-Making, SC = Selecting Courses. ** = significantly correlated at the $p < .01$ level (2-tailed).
Table 4

*Perceptions of Advising Style Received by Generational Status by Frequency (N=284)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceptions of Advising Style</th>
<th>Generational Status</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CGS</td>
<td>FGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental—Prescriptive Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescriptive advising</td>
<td>17 (10.8)</td>
<td>12 (9.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental advising</td>
<td>140 (89.2)</td>
<td>115 (90.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personalizing Education Subscale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescriptive advising</td>
<td>20 (12.7)</td>
<td>15 (11.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental advising</td>
<td>137 (87.3)</td>
<td>112 (88.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Decision-Making Subscale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescriptive advising</td>
<td>31 (19.7)</td>
<td>19 (15.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental advising</td>
<td>26 (80.3)</td>
<td>108 (85.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selecting Courses Subscale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescriptive advising</td>
<td>38 (24.2)</td>
<td>25 (19.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental advising</td>
<td>119 (75.8)</td>
<td>102 (80.3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes.* Percentage of the total respondents in each study group are provided in parentheses.
Table 5

Means and Standard Deviations for Activity Scales (N = 303)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Total (N = 302)</th>
<th>CGS (N = 166)</th>
<th>FGS (N = 136)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Development and Interpersonal Relationships (PDIR)</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploring Institutional Policies (EIP)</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration and Class Scheduling (RCS)</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Personal Skills (TPS)</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Major and Courses (AMC)</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. CGS = continuing-generation student, FGS = first-generation student.
Table 6

*Most Frequently Reported Advising Activities (N=303)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discussing possible majors/academic concentrations</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussing degree or major academic requirements</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussing content of courses</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selecting courses for the next term</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating academic progress</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting to know each other</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking about what I am doing besides taking classes</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Students were asked to report the number of times an activity occurred.
Table 7

Reported Number of Advising Sessions by Generational Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CGS (N = 166)</th>
<th>FGS (N = 137)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 advising session</td>
<td>4 (2.4)</td>
<td>10 (7.3)</td>
<td>14 (4.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 advising sessions</td>
<td>49 (29.5)</td>
<td>39 (28.5)</td>
<td>88 (28.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 advising sessions</td>
<td>44 (26.5)</td>
<td>42 (30.7)</td>
<td>87 (28.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 advising sessions</td>
<td>44 (26.5)</td>
<td>26 (19.0)</td>
<td>70 (23.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 advising sessions</td>
<td>16 (9.6)</td>
<td>10 (7.3)</td>
<td>26 (8.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 advising sessions</td>
<td>6 (3.6)</td>
<td>4 (2.9)</td>
<td>10 (3.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 advising sessions</td>
<td>2 (1.2)</td>
<td>3 (2.2)</td>
<td>5 (1.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 advising sessions</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 or more advising sessions</td>
<td>1 (.6)</td>
<td>3 (2.2)</td>
<td>4 (1.3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. Percentages are in parentheses. CGS = continuing-generation student, FGS = first-generation student.
Table 8

Reported Average Session Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CGS</th>
<th>FGS</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N = 166)</td>
<td>(N = 137)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 15 minutes</td>
<td>21 (12.7)</td>
<td>15 (10.9)</td>
<td>36 (11.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-30 minutes</td>
<td>98 (59.0)</td>
<td>80 (58.4)</td>
<td>178 (58.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-45 minutes</td>
<td>35 (21.1)</td>
<td>28 (20.4)</td>
<td>63 (20.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-60 minutes</td>
<td>12 (7.2)</td>
<td>10 (7.3)</td>
<td>22 (7.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than one hour</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>3 (2.2)</td>
<td>3 (1.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1 (0.1)</td>
<td>1 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. Percentages are in parentheses. CGS = continuing-generation student, FGS = first-generation student.
Table 9

*Reported Satisfaction by Individual Questions and Generational Status*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CGS (N = 166)</th>
<th>FGS (N = 136)</th>
<th>Total (N = 277)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Generally satisfied</td>
<td>3.13 (1.0)</td>
<td>3.16 (0.9)</td>
<td>3.15 (1.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accurate information</td>
<td>3.25 (0.9)</td>
<td>3.21 (0.8)</td>
<td>3.23 (0.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient prior notice related to institutional policies and procedures</td>
<td>3.03 (0.8)</td>
<td>3.08 (0.8)</td>
<td>3.05 (0.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of advising</td>
<td>3.30 (0.9)</td>
<td>3.26 (0.9)</td>
<td>3.28 (0.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient time</td>
<td>3.32 (0.9)</td>
<td>3.29 (0.9)</td>
<td>3.30 (0.9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes.* Percentages are in parentheses. CGS = continuing-generation student, FGS = first-generation student.
Table 10

*Preferred Advising Style by Generational Status (N=283)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generational Status</th>
<th>CGS</th>
<th>FGS</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prescriptive advising</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>(8.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental advising</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>(91.2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes.* Percentages are in parentheses. CGS = continuing-generation student, FGS = first-generation student.
Table 11

*Perceived Advising Received, Preferred Advising, and Satisfaction*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perceived Prescriptive Advising</strong></td>
<td>Prefer Prescriptive Advising</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prefer Developmental Advising</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perceived Developmental Advising</strong></td>
<td>Prefer Prescriptive Advising</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prefer Developmental Advising</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes.* Mean scores based on a 4-point Likert scale (1 = Very unsatisfied, 4 = Very satisfied).
Table 12

*Satisfaction by Importance of Advisor on Intent to Persist (N=300)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Important</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Important</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Unimportant</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Unimportant</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes.* Mean scores based on a 4-point Likert scale (1 = Very unsatisfied, 4 = Very satisfied).
Table 13

Likelihood to Return by Generational Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likelihood to return</th>
<th>Generational Status</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CGS (N = 166)</td>
<td>FGS (N = 137)</td>
<td>Total (N = 303)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Likely</td>
<td>153 (92.6)</td>
<td>122 (89.0)</td>
<td>275 (90.4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Likely</td>
<td>7 (4.2)</td>
<td>10 (7.3)</td>
<td>17 (5.6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Unlikely</td>
<td>3 (1.8)</td>
<td>3 (2.2)</td>
<td>6 (2.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Unlikely</td>
<td>3 (1.8)</td>
<td>2 (1.5)</td>
<td>5 (1.6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. Percentages are in parentheses. CGS = continuing-generation student, FGS = first-generation student.
Table 14

Importance of Advisor Interactions on Likelihood to Return by Generational Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance of advisor interactions</th>
<th>Generational Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CGS ($N = 163$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Important</td>
<td>38 (23.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Important</td>
<td>77 (47.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Unimportant</td>
<td>27 (16.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Unimportant</td>
<td>21 (12.9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. Percentages are in parentheses. CGS = continuing-generation student, FGS = first-generation student.
Table 15

*Satisfaction by Likelihood to Return (N=304)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Likely to return</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Likely</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Unlikely</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Unlikely</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes.* Mean scores based on a 4-point Likert scale (1 = Very unsatisfied, 4 = Very satisfied).
Table 16

Importance of Advisor Interactions on Likelihood to Return by Generational Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance of advisor interactions</th>
<th>Generational Status</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CGS ((N = 163))</td>
<td>FGS ((N = 136))</td>
<td>Total ((N = 299))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Important</td>
<td>38 (23.3)</td>
<td>31 (22.8)</td>
<td>69 (23.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Important</td>
<td>77 (47.2)</td>
<td>63 (46.3)</td>
<td>140 (46.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Unimportant</td>
<td>27 (16.6)</td>
<td>25 (18.4)</td>
<td>52 (17.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Unimportant</td>
<td>21 (12.9)</td>
<td>17 (12.5)</td>
<td>38 (12.7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. Percentages are in parentheses. CGS = continuing-generation student, FGS = first-generation student.
Table 17

Importance of Advisor Interactions on Likelihood to Return

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likelihood to Return</th>
<th>Importance of Advisor in Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Important (N = 210)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likely</td>
<td>203 (96.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlikely</td>
<td>7 (3.3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Percentages are in parentheses.
Table 18

*Open-Ended Answers Coded by Tinto’s (2012) Institutional Conditions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reason 1</th>
<th>Reason 2</th>
<th>Reason 3</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N = 279)</td>
<td>(N = 277)</td>
<td>(N = 267)</td>
<td>(N = 823)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement/Engagement</td>
<td>182 (65.2)</td>
<td>158 (57.0)</td>
<td>164 (61.4)</td>
<td>504 (61.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Expectations</td>
<td>41 (14.7)</td>
<td>41 (14.8)</td>
<td>39 (14.6)</td>
<td>121 (14.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>19 (6.8)</td>
<td>27 (9.7)</td>
<td>29 (10.9)</td>
<td>75 (9.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Reasons</td>
<td>19 (6.8)</td>
<td>20 (7.2)</td>
<td>15 (5.6)</td>
<td>53 (6.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>15 (5.4)</td>
<td>16 (5.8)</td>
<td>12 (4.5)</td>
<td>43 (5.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment/Feedback</td>
<td>3 (1.0)</td>
<td>15 (5.4)</td>
<td>8 (3.0)</td>
<td>26 (3.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Percentage of the total respondents for each answer and total answers are provided in parentheses.