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(ABSTRACT)

Administrators, faculty, and researchers have assumed that advising needs and preferences for advising styles are similar across student population segments and do not consider the relationship of student attributes or the institutional setting to academic advising. Crookston (1972) presented two advising styles—developmental advising, which reflects a concern for the student’s total education, and prescriptive advising, which is primarily focused on formal academic matters. In order to better understand the preference for advising relationships among college students, a model of developmental advising was formulated by Winston and Sandor (1984b). However, because of the increased numbers of special student populations such as women and minorities, it is difficult to ascertain the extent to which advising styles are received and desired by most students.

The special student population that may add perspective to the understanding of the advising process is African-
Americans enrolled in two-year commuter colleges. The purpose of this study was to determine: (a) the difference between the incidence of prescriptive or developmental advising for students distinguished by race, gender, enrollment status, and major, and (b) the difference in student preference for prescriptive or developmental styles of advising, based upon race, gender, major, and enrollment status.

The research sample consisted of 424 freshmen and sophomores who voluntarily participated in the study by completing an academic advising instrument. The Developmental - Prescriptive Advising Scale - Part I of the Academic Advising Inventory (Winston & Sandor, 1984a) was used to assess the difference among students who received either prescriptive or developmental advising. The Developmental - Prescriptive Advising Scale - Part II was used to measure the difference among students who prefer either prescriptive or developmental advising.

Two four-way analysis of variance (ANOVAS) were performed to determine whether racial, gender, major, and enrollment status differences existed with regard to advising received and advising approaches preferred. The general linear model (GLM) procedure was used in conjunction with the ANOVA procedure to account for any unbalanced data. The results revealed modest but significant differences
with regard to advising received between full-time and part-time enrollees and the interaction between race and gender and race and major. The results also indicated meager but significant difference with regard to advising preferred between males and females.

The findings are discussed in terms of implications for future research.
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Chapter 1

Narrowly defined, academic advising has long been a process of verifying students' course selections for graduation and attaching the advisor's signature to required forms. Academic advising should be a developmental, student centered process (Crookston, 1972). The application of student development theory to academic advising in recent years teaches students skills beyond the classroom to become fully developed human beings for the achievement of a self-fulfilling life. Today, academic advising attempts to link together (a) academic preparation and career planning and (b) decision-making skills and strategies, with (c) available college/university resources and student needs (Kramer, Taylor, Chynoweth, & Jensen, 1987).

One of the difficulties in studying advising is represented by the different advising needs of students such as ethnicity of students, part-time students, first-time college students, and students with physical or learning disabilities (Koerin, 1991; Lopez, Yanez, Clayton, & Thompson, 1988). Researchers and administrators are concentrating on identifying and understanding the advising needs and characteristics of various student populations and then providing appropriate specialized advising.

While no academic advising delivery system is best or most appropriate for all students in all types of
educational institutions, one such advising model has been proposed by Crookston (1972). Using student development theory as a foundation, Crookston introduced a description of developmental advising as a model distinctive from traditional advising. Crookston (1972) noted that developmental advising is designed to focus on a caring and concerned attitude toward students while prescriptive advising is characterized by a formal authority-based relationship in which the student is closely supervised by the advisor.

To better understand the preference for advising relationships, Winston and Sandor (1984b) developed a model of developmental advising. The model was based on Crookston’s (1972) theory that postulates the student-advisor relationship in terms of two contrasting behavioral styles, prescriptive and developmental.

The Academic Advising Inventory (AAI) was developed by Winston and Sandor (1984a) and based on the conceptualization of Crookston (1972) to determine the type of advising relationship students preferred. Research results have supported the value of using the AAI as a means of validating students’ preference for the developmental or prescriptive advising relationship. However, more remains to be done before we can fully understand the numerous factors which may enter into the developmental and
prescriptive advising process.

Winston and Sandor (1984b) and Fielstein (1989) recommended that to verify that developmental advising is preferred by most college students, further research should be done with special student populations enrolled at educational institutions other than four-year colleges. The special student population and institutional type which may help to address these concerns, but which have not been adequately studied, are African-Americans enrolled in two-year commuter colleges.

First-year attrition reports found that culturally different students, such as African-American students are leaving college because of a lack of social contact with members of the college community, administration, faculty, or staff (Earl, 1988; Glennen & Baxley, 1985b; Loo & Rolison, 1986). Moreover, researchers Pascarella and Wolfe (1985) and Endo and Harpel (1983) suggested that interacting with faculty outside the classroom was one factor that differentiated students who persisted and those who dropped out of college.

**Background of Study**

This study investigated the notion that there is far more to the two-year college experience than the cognitive development concerns of students. It was important that faculty advisors and administrators recognize the student's
total education, including career planning, extracurricular activities, personal concerns and utilization of resources on the campus. Fundamental to the concern for the holistic development of students is the role that academic advisor assumes in involving African-Americans and other special student populations in the educational enterprise.

Anchoring the study in the discipline of psychology enabled the researcher to investigate the psychological aspects of advising African-Americans and other special populations.

The study was firmly rooted in the theories of developmental psychology (Chickering, 1969; Erikson, 1968) and the involvement theory (Astin, 1985). The theories of developmental psychology suggested a proactive role of intervention in students' lives to ensure movement toward educational and personal goal development (Keyser, 1989). Involvement theories suggested becoming intimately involved in the development of the whole person, of which cognitive faculties are but a part.

Finally, the study was based on the cultural heritage variable. Often one's culture can determine the appropriateness and inappropriateness of certain behaviors. These culture impingements are present in all of us even though they may not appear in our everyday lives.
Statement of Problem

Typically, faculty, administrators, and researchers assume that advising needs and preferences for advising styles are similar for all students and do not vary in relation to specific student profiles (Crockett & Crawford, 1989). Though existing research is limited in examining the relationship between student characteristics and special-needs advising, one study investigated the advising needs of African-American students on predominantly white campuses and found that significant differences did exist (Burrell & Trombley, 1983). This study revealed that a personal concern of academic advisors exerted a greater influence on African-American students than it did for other students.

Given the emphasis of advising for African-American students, what are the key factors that makes a meaningful difference in the college experiences of African-American populations? The literature reported that sustained contact and interpersonal relationships are important for student assimilation into the institution and for change (Astin, 1986; Chickering, 1969; Gardner, 1986; Hazen Foundation, 1968; Marchese, 1987; Stern, 1966; Tinto, 1987; Winston & Sandor, 1984b). A developmental advising approach delivered by an active, dynamic, knowledgeable advisor to the African-American student population has been identified as an optimal delivery system for assimilation (Grites, 1982;
Winston & Sandor, 1984b).

Combining literature analysis and impressionistic inferences of advising professionals, it is logical to assess the advising needs of the African-American student population. At a time when academic advising is seen as the weakest link in the American undergraduate experience (Boyer, 1987), researchers also are discovering that practices of academic advising can be improved to meet the developmental needs of students, especially African-Americans. On the contrary, a review of the literature also revealed that only a few studies inquired into the extent to which African-American students are receiving the kinds of advising they prefer in the two-year commuter college. Most studies evaluated preferences for advising in the four-year college environment. Several variables which may bear some influence on the preference for advising styles are race (African-American or Caucasians), gender (Males or females), major (transfer or occupational, and enrollment status (full-time or part-time).

**Purpose of Study**

The two-year commuter college officials have attempted to convince constituencies of their concern for the holistic development of students, yet these same college officials have come up short in producing empirical evidence to demonstrate that academic advising is making a difference in
meeting the needs of most students. The purpose of this study is to determine the extent to which race, gender, major (transfer or occupational-technical) and enrollment status (part-time or full-time) differ in regard to advising received and preferred by students in a two-year commuter college.

Research Questions

This research study was designed to address some of the issues regarding the styles of advising preferred by African-Americans enrolled in the two-year commuter college. Specifically, this study sought answers to the following questions:

1. What is the difference between the incidence of prescriptive or developmental advising for students distinguished by race, gender, enrollment status, or major?

2. What is the difference in student preference for prescriptive or developmental approach to advising, based upon race, gender, major, and enrollment status?

Delimitations of Study

The following delimitations should be observed when interpreting the results of this study:

1. The study was delimited to freshmen and sophomores enrolled at J. Sargeant Reynolds Community College.
2. The study was delimited to students who attended classes on the day this study was conducted.

3. The study was delimited to students only enrolled in developmental and regular math classes during the Spring Semester 1993.

4. The study was delimited to African-Americans and Caucasian students enrolled at J. Sargeant Reynolds during the Spring Semester 1993.

5. The study was delimited by the context and institutional setting. Academic advising programs are designed around size of the institution, existing policies, and institutional goals which may be unique to a single institution. Therefore, the results may not be generalizable to other two-year commuter colleges.

Limitations of Study

When interpreting the results of this study, the following limitations should be observed:

1. The study was limited by the students’ lack of experience with a number of advisors. Subjects who were not exposed to a variety of advisors and advising styles may have had problems assessing critically their present experiences, since standards for comparison did not exist (Fielstein, 1987).
2. The study was limited to the extent to which each of the subjects were given appropriate time in each advising session to operationalize developmental and prescriptive advising.

3. The study was limited to students’ preferences for developmental or prescriptive advising, as measured by the Developmental-Prescriptive Scale (DPA).

**Significance of Study**

Fielstein (1989) proposed that before a determination can be made as to which advising approach is more appropriate, prescriptive or developmental, it is important that an academic advisor be knowledgeable about the diverse advising needs of students. This lack of awareness of the diverse needs of students may be partially explained by the variable of race.

Fleming (1984) found that the intellectual development of African-American students who attend predominately white colleges was inhibited by the lack of social contact between faculty and student. By studying the variable race, a greater understanding of the special advising needs of African-Americans may result so that advisors can design advising strategies to meet each student’s unique developmental needs. Previous studies about perceptions of African-American students in a two-year college setting with
regard to the preference for developmental advising are practically nonexistent. The findings from this study will add to the literature on advising special student populations, such as African-Americans enrolled in a two-year college, and assist administrators who will be selecting and providing professional development activities for prospective faculty advisors.

**Definition of Terms**

1. **College Transfer Program** – a course of study at a two-year commuter college that is equivalent to the lower division courses in a four-year institution. This course of study is also referred to as "university-parallel transfer," and is designed to prepare students to continue at a four-year college after leaving the two-year college (Baron, 1982).

2. **Commuter college students** -- students who do not live on the campus of an educational institution (Jacoby & Girrell, 1981). They may range from tradition-aged, full-time student who lives at home with parents to a displaced homemaker who returns part-time to seek a degree.

3. **Developmental advising** -- a logical and sequential process which assists students in the clarification of their life/career goals and in the development of educational plans for the realization of these goals.
The decision-making process emphasizes communication with the advisor and implies shared responsibility between advisor and advisee (Crockett, 1986; O'Banion, 1972).

4. **Developmental math** -- defined in the 1992-1993 J. Sargeant Reynolds Community College Catalog "as a course designed to bridge the gap between a weak mathematical foundation and the knowledge necessary for the study of mathematics courses in technical, professional, and transfer programs" (p.198).

5. **Enrollment status** -- a category of part-time or full-time enrollment.

6. **Occupational-Technical Education Program** -- generally a course of study designed to prepare students for employment as technicians, paraprofessionals, and skilled craftsmen.

7. **Preference** -- the act of choosing or to show as ideal or favor toward something or someone. To have a need, want and desire for something or someone.

8. **Prescriptive advising** -- a traditional advising relationship between the academic advisor and the student, where the advisor is seen as a kind of teacher who instructs students in academic advising matters such as registration, deciding upon a major, etc. (Fielstein, 1989).
Summary

This chapter provided an introduction and overview, and background of the study preceded by a discussion of the problem. Two major research questions were designed to address the problem and the purpose of the study. Delimitations and limitations were delineated, the significance of the study was discussed and terms defined. In chapter 2, a review of the literature will be presented and research related to general preferences for advising, African-American preference for advising, advising in the two-year commuter college, and outcomes of advising.
Chapter 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

A number of studies have been designed to describe approaches to academic advising while others have been designed to study the preference for developmental advising style that exists in the four-year college environment. However, little (if any) research has examined the influence of student characteristics such as race on the preference for advising in the two-year commuter college and the outcome of advising. This literature review will include studies which have been done in each of the four areas: (a) general preference for advising, (b) African-American preference for advising, (c) advising in the two-year commuter college, and (d) the outcome of advising.

General Preferences for Advising Systems

Beginning with articles relating to student preference for advising, Crookston (1972) presented two contrasting behavioral styles in which an advisor interacts with students--prescriptive and developmental advising.

Prescriptive advising. Prescriptive advising adheres to the students being instructed in academic matters, such as registration or deciding upon a major. Using a medical metaphor, Crookston (1972) related the advisor to a physician who makes a diagnosis for the patient to alleviate an ailment. The student is likened to the patient who
follows the instructions of the doctor. The student focuses on learning or carrying out the prescribed action and the advisor focuses on teaching or giving advice. This type of relationship allows the professor to profess what he knows thereby giving the student the benefit of the breadth and depth of the advisor’s knowledge and experience to help students make wise career decisions (Crookston, 1972). Further, this type of relationship provides for the student structure and limits such as the advisor making sure the student meets all curriculum requirements and follows the rules and regulations (Crookston, 1972).

Crookston (1972) also described prescriptive advising as an authoritarian relationship in which the motivation of students is secondary to required academic performance. Because there are requirements that must be fulfilled in doing the advising job, the prescriptive advisor takes the initiative and trusts the students own judgement to seek expert assistance the advisor may offer. Therefore, students want advisors to take responsibility for staying well-informed and for telling students what they must do to satisfy requirements (Winston & Sandcr, 1984). Prescriptive advising can provide a focus on academic matters without curtailing the student’s academic freedom. Prescriptive advisors may have the will to meet the advising needs of students beyond the bounds of academic matters; however,
their skills may limit them to do so. While advising request from students does fall outside of the advisor’s area of expertise as noted by Winston and Sandor (1984), it does not mean that they are not conceptually committed to developmental concerns such as problem solving, decision-making, and behavioral awareness.

**Developmental advising.** In contrast to a prescriptive relationship is a more recent approach, emerging from the student development movement of the mid-1960s, which espouses a developmental relationship between advisor and advisee. This developmental relationship is based on a teaching and learning model in which the relationship between advisor and student is intended to assist students in achieving educational and personal goals by utilizing institutional and community resources (Winston, Ender, & Miller, 1982). The relationship is expected to inherently reflect the mission of the total student development and is "personal growth oriented" (Chickering, 1969; Sanford, 1967). By contrast to the prescriptive style, the advice given in a developmental relationship is accomplished by the student and advisor freely and openly agreeing on which developmental tasks are most relevant and appropriate to work on. The successful completion of the task will yield results in which the advisor learns more about the student’s expectations of the advisor.
The overarching theme in a developmental orientation to an advising relationship is "to encourage and enable intentional developmental change in all students throughout the life cycle" (Chickering & Havighurst, 1981, p. 2). The principle of intentionality applied to developmental advising has the utility to "meet the needs of all students, to plan change rather than react to it, and to engage the full academic community in a collaborative effort" (Miller & Prince, 1976, p.21). Much of that intentional change is reflected in the interaction between the advisor and student. The main goal is to teach students how to live effectively in a changing world, how to make decisions and how to share responsibility for these decisions (Crockston, 1972). This mentor-friend type of relationship facilitates responsibility on the part of the student, promotes a sense of self-direction in the world, and a focus on academic success (Crockston, 1972).

Academic advising in developmental terms has been redefined by Grites (1979) as a decision-making process with the student and advisor communicating and exchanging information. Developmental advising becomes a teaching function with the advisor helping students in the use of rational processes, interpersonal and environmental interactions, awareness of behavior, and use of evaluation skills (Crockston, 1972). The advisor can be a primary
consultant, the trusted guide or confidant, who assists students in articulating purpose and life direction (McCaffrey & Miller, 1980). Crockett (1978) makes the point that developmental advising is a vehicle of coordinating the student’s total experience in higher education. Such coordination of activities may include helping students with self-knowledge and making use of resources in the educational environment to meet needs and fulfill aspirations.

Relative to developmental advising, it is the responsibility of academic advisors to blend the expertise of both student affairs and the academic community to assist students in the integration of their total college experience (Laff, Schein, & Allen, 1987). Similarly, Winston and Sandor (1984b) defined developmental advising as a systematic process that will aid students in achieving educational, personal, and career goals through utilization of all institutional community resources. Both of the developmental advising definitions call for the advisor to serve as a "boundary-spanner" who assists students in making meaningful connections between the classroom as well as extracurricular experiences (McMillan & Ivy, 1990).

Academic advising is a "potent intervention" to positively influence the personal and educational development of students (Walsh, 1979; Winston, Ender, &
Miller, 1984). The developmental advising approach does not limit the advisor to clerical and mechanical activities, such as signing student class schedules; this is considered prescriptive advising. Rather, developmental activities stimulate and support an enriched college life as well as life experiences (Delworth, Hanson, & Associates, 1989; Terenzini & Pascarella, 1991). Developmental advising also shares common goals with student development and student affairs divisions (Delworth, Hanson, & Associates, 1989). Such goals include identifying and attaining life goals, acquiring attitudes and skills, promoting intellectual as well as personal growth, and sharing concerns for self and others as well as the academic community (Ender, Winston, & Miller, 1984). These goals are not single-handedly achieved by either student affairs professionals or academics, but through engaging the full academic community in a collaborative effort (Grites, 1979; Winston, Grites, Miller, & Ender, 1984). Developmental advising is intended to aid students in achieving educational and personal goals through the utilization of all colleges or universities and community resources (Winston, Ender, & Miller, 1982).

Moreover, interpretations of what approach should be provided may stem from views of those advisors who are committed conceptually to a particular approach. When driven by a conceptual orientation, prescriptive and
developmental advisors often resemble one another in their goals to promote student success. They differ, of course, in the methods of relating to student motivation, but their organizational forms often are comparable in functional intent, if not bureaucratic appearance.

In spite of efforts by Crookston (1972) and others (e.g., Gordon, 1988; Grites, 1979; Winston, Grites, Miller, & Ender, 1984) to conceptualize advising approaches to improve advising, reviews and surveys indicate that students are dissatisfied with advising services (Astin, 1985; Boyer, 1987; Winston & Sandor, 1984b). Many studies indicated that advising continues to be perceived by faculty and students as an information disseminating function and that institutions do not engage in systematic evaluation of their advising programs (Crockett, Habley, & Cowart, 1987; Crockett & Levitz, 1983). Although being perceived as a low-status function by students, faculty, and administrators, a plethora of articles during the 1980s were attributed to improving advising services to students by determining the type of advising style students preferred (Creeden, 1990; Crockett & Crawford, 1989; Fielstein, 1987; 1989; Winston & Sandor, 1984b). Much of this research stemmed from the debate over whether academic advising should be a prescriptive or a developmental process.

Kramer and Gardner (1977) found that providing
information in a one-on-one teaching role which supports a prescriptive approach to advising is no longer exclusively preferred by faculty, administrators and students. Winston, Ender, and Miller (1982) supported their hypothesis and noted that developmental advising seems to be preferred by most students from their first enrollment through graduation.

Research studies on advising systems, since 1970, has highly supported the developmental concept of academic advising (Crookston, 1972; Creeden, 1990; Fielstein, 1989; Grites, 1981; O’Banion, 1972; Winston & Sandor, 1984). These writers perceived the advising function as a decision-making process that should facilitate student growth and development, rather than merely tending to the mechanical aspects of the activity such as signing a student schedule sheet (Fielstein, 1985; Glennen, 1991b).

A number of articles, however, indicated that the developmental approach to advising is not wholeheartedly endorsed by all administrators, faculty, and researchers (Raskin, 1979). Bogard (1983) raised the question: Is developmental advising attainable given the intensive contact required between advisors and students over a long period? While these articles did not find developmental advising to be especially effective, Earl (1988) made a similar observation. He stated, "The model’s greatest time
of inefficiency occurs precisely at the time of greatest student need: the few weeks just preceding drop/add and registration deadlines" (p. 29).

The literature review suggested that, not only do experts in the field vary in opinions as to what is the best advising approach, but students' perceptions also vary as to the preferences for individual advisors. Creeden's (1990) study of 1,670 undergraduate students at Rutgers University revealed that even though students are spending time with advisors who discuss procedural issues, they preferred advisors who discuss broader educational issues. Kozloff (1985) reported that students had a high preference for advisors who discussed degree requirements but gave a low priority to advisors who sign registration forms. Moreover, students desired advisors who helped them review career opportunities (Gordon, 1988). Grites' (1981) analysis of student ratings of faculty advisors revealed that students preferred a warm, personal, and friendly relationship. One researcher asserted that three of the top four predictors of advisee preference were concern, warmth, and dependability (Polson & Jurich, 1981). Prior to this study, Chathaparambil's (1971) investigation had claimed that advisors needed to possess perceived competencies in five areas in order for advisees to prefer them as advisors: technical help, rapport, personal help, service in getting
students through the system, and competence in one's field.

Fielstein (1989) found evidence that "advisors who represented the more traditional (prescriptive advising) approach were more preferred overall by students than advisors who represented a more developmental approach" (p. 37). However, 58 percent of students also wanted advisors to be open to the idea of helping students with personal problems. Despite these findings, prior research has conceptualized that a dual role in advising, providing both information and establishing a personal relationship, is viewed by students as essential (Grites, 1981; Trombley, 1984).

**African-American Preference For Advising**

Studies by Boyd (1974) and Braddock (1981) indicated that the transition for African-Americans from high school to college has been characterized as traumatic. Cultural identity concerns often produce feelings of estrangement, alienation (Fleming, 1984; Suen, 1983), and feelings of helplessness (Loo & Rolison, 1986). Cope and Hannah (1975) also found some African-American students come to the college environment lacking many of the basic writing, reading, and speaking skills necessary for academic survival. Cibik and Chambers (1991) argued that for many African-American students, making social contacts is the primary problem in adjusting to college life in
predominately white institutions. Despite evidence showing the needs of African-American students, academic advising support services to increase the retention of African-American students have been recognized only in the past decade as a key to increasing student retention.

Given the crucial concern that some African-Americans are experiencing feelings of alienation, low self-esteem, unrealistic expectations and low achievement, numerous articles have revealed that these students are good candidates who could benefit from a mentor or advisor as a source of encouragement and support (Gardner, 1986; Gordon, 1984) as well as success with skill development (Wagner & Mckenzie, 1980).

According to Frost (1991), contact with faculty through developmental advising fosters the positive nature of the environment and could help special student populations, such as African-Americans, achieve beyond their expectations. Koerin (1991) noted specialized services are sometimes provided for these students, but in many cases academic advisors are called upon to deal with the developmental needs of African-Americans for whom their previous advising experience has not prepared them.

A number of studies have investigated African-Americans' preference for encouragement and support but failed to identify student preference for advising style.
Webster and Fretz (1978) studied the source of help African-Americans sought when confronted with academic problems. Their results showed that both African-Americans and Caucasians perceived parents as a primary resource for assistance with academic problems. Burrell and Trombley (1983) obtained somewhat different results in a study regarding the perceived needs of African-Americans on predominately white campuses. Findings showed that when faced with academic problems, African-Americans were most likely to turn to African-American professionals. However, the study did not conclusively show whether responses about advisors referred to the African-American students’ official (assigned) advisor or someone who performed the advising role in an unofficial (non-assigned) capacity. Most of the aforementioned studies sought to elucidate the perceptions of African-Americans' satisfaction for the university and its services and did not examine the relationship of student characteristics such as race to preference for advising style.

One such study, Crockett and Crawford (1989) investigated the relationship between race and preference for advising style and found that an essential characteristic of students such as race and gender were significantly related to student preference for a developmental advising relationship. Based upon the results
of this study, recommendations were made that institutions that do not presently provide developmental advising to their students should consider the feasibility of doing so. Heretofore, studies investigating advising from the student's perspective have typically assumed that advising needs do not vary in relation to specific student profiles and campus setting. Furthermore, because this study indicated a preference for developmental advising among African-Americans enrolled in a four-year college environment, there is reason to suspect that African-American students who are enrolled in two-year commuter colleges also may have a preference for developmental advising relationships. If significance is established, a basis would be provided to substantiate earlier studies that developmental advising is preferred by most college students including African-Americans in the four-year and two-year commuter college (Fielstein, 1989; Winston & Sandor, 1984b).

Advising in the Two-Year Commuter College

While the delivery of advising systems must include advisors and the student type as recipients of advising, it also must include the context in which the advising is to be accomplished (Hines, 1984). The effectiveness of academic advising systems has varied from campus to campus. On the residential campus, academic advising delivery is clearly linked to the concern for providing an environmental climate
in which advising can take place (Astin, 1986; 1977; 1982; Chickering, 1975; George, 1971). The climate of residential campuses sets them apart from a commuter institution and can effect the practice of academic advising.

The commuter institution is considered in many research studies as that type of institution that can limit the interactive involvement of students with faculty advisors. On the average, students in two-year commuter colleges are available for education approximately one-half as much time as students in four-year colleges (Creamer, 1988), thus creating an advantage of four-year colleges over commuter colleges in promoting meaningful interactions between students and faculty. Sloan and Wilmes (1989) explained the importance of two-year colleges to replicate similar environmental conditions that are conducive to quality faculty-student interaction. They argued that the commuter student lacked the convenience and easy access to services provided by the college or university. Findings from this study revealed that the question of what type of advising is occurring on college campuses may receive different answers on different campuses.

Currently, the commuter population is characterized by being on both sides of three different dichotomies: (a) dependent (i.e., living with parents)/independent (i.e., living in their own apartment, house, etc.), (b) traditional
age (i.e., 18-25 years)/nontraditional age (i.e., over 25 years), and (c) part-time/full-time (Stewart & Rue, 1983). The part-time/full-time dichotomy might describe a woman in a full-time position taking classes at night to enhance her career skills or a man who is working part-time and attending college full-time (Sloan & Wilmes, 1989).

A growing body of literature indicates that the traditional transfer student is becoming more visible in the two-year commuter colleges. These students are older and female, take longer than two years to complete a degree, and are likely to be employed at least part-time (Barkley, 1993). While the two-year commuter college is experiencing a rise in the number of traditional students who wish to transfer, a longitudinal study conducted by Grubb (1991) revealed that there is an apparent decline in the numbers of students who actually transferred to a four-year institutions.

Based on the increased interest to improve the decline of transfers, steps should be taken to strengthen the transfer process by identifying deficiencies and up dating student advisement (Kintzer & Wattenbarger, 1985). This can best be managed by being informed of student needs so that academic advising activities can be provided that best meet those needs.

Academic advisors are required to be more aware of and
better informed about the complexities of African-Americans and the returning adult women (Winston, Enders & Miller, 1982; Lopez, Yanez, Clayton & Thompson, 1988). Given the special climate that exists in the commuter campus environment, it would be naive to believe that commuter campus advisors can achieve the same advising objectives as colleagues in residential campus environments when they have half the time and more obstacles that impede effective and efficient advising programming (Creamer, 1988). However, some implications of the differences in environmental conditions existing at the residential versus the two-year commuter college suggest that two-year college students should be given as much as, if not more of, an opportunity for faculty-student advising interaction than four-year college students (Creamer, 1988).

Sloan and Wilmes (1989) gave an account of how and why advising on a commuter campus must work. They stated:

For the commuter student, the advisor may be the first and only personal contact that the student has with the institution outside of the classroom. It is extremely important, therefore, for the advisor to understand the significance of his or her role as a potential source of support and information. Because of the nature of the advising relationship, the advisor can play an important role in helping students become aware of campus resources and how to use them productively. (p. 70)

These aforementioned studies confirmed that institutional type contributes to institutional arrangements
which affect the delivery of academic advising systems and that faculty advising must continue to be the predominant advising delivery mode in all types of institutions (Crockett & Levitz, 1983). Moreover, Baer and Carr (1985) claimed that regardless of the type of college, an academic advisor can be "a catalyst, the resource person who facilitates and accelerates the interaction between the student and the academic institution" (p.36). However, the faculty-student interaction must be triggered and nurtured (Blocher, 1974; Kramer, 1979) and structured and regularized by the institution (Tinto, 1982).

Outcomes of Advising

Evaluators of academic advising are critical of the almost exclusive use of student satisfaction as a dependent variable (Banzinger, 1987; Crockett, 1984a; Dowst, McGreevey, & Roundy, 1985; Winston & Sandor, 1984a). Students are perceived as unable to appreciate the ultimate value of varying advising approaches. Advisee satisfaction should be but one of the several measures in such an evaluation (Spencer, 1990). Furthermore, the type of advising approach should be predicated on the desired outcomes for the advising program. While most studies indicate that the retention of students is the primary measure, generally, universities with a desired outcome to promote effective enrollment management, many have used
measure, generally, universities with a desired outcome to promote effective enrollment management, many have used intrusive advising programs as a catalyst for positive changes in retention and attrition rates (Glennen, Farren, & Black, 1989). Moreover, an intrusive advising approach has been linked to improved academic performance and a decrease in the number of freshmen students requiring personal-metaphysical counseling (Glennen, 1975; 1983).

By contrast, several studies (O'Banion, 1972; Crookston, 1972; Dameron & Wolf, 1974; Grites, 1977; Mash, 1978; Tittley, 1978) have described the developmental advising function as a decision-making process that should facilitate student growth and development, rather than a mere course scheduling activity as a desired outcome. Hutchins and Miller (1979) found fewer course changes, residence hall damage, or disciplinary referrals with a developmental advising approach. Although these studies gave some indication of outcomes of advising, most studies only tested either the use of developmental or intrusive activities. The outcome test should be the use of a combination of activities which serve students and help meet the total developmental goals of students (e.g., cognitive, affective, career, physical, and moral growth) which embrace the total college experience (Winston, Ender, & Miller, 1982). Hence, not only should advising programs be tailored
Summary

From this review of the literature, indications are that a developmental approach to academic advising is a present reality for advisors serving African-Americans in at least the four-year college environment.

Although the majority of research studies showed that efforts to apply student development concepts to the advising needs of African-American student populations is minuscule, this literature review summarized deliberate efforts made by faculty, administrators, and researchers to improve advising services to this population. Efforts to improve academic advising were these: (a) change an authoritarian traditional prescriptive relationship between advisor and advisee toward a developmental definition of advising which focuses on the personal caring for students; (b) identify and understand the various needs of African-American students; and (c) examine the unique advising needs of students enrolled at differing types of educational institutions.

In a time of concern for the success of a rapidly increasing African-American student population, it is imperative that the two-year commuter college be prepared to meet the advising needs of African-Americans. Developmental advising, which provides an opportunity for African-Americans to build positive relationships with their faculty
advisors, has the potential to ensure that students from this population experience success in college.

In chapter 3, information on the methods and procedures implemented to determine the influence of race and other factors on preference for advising are presented.
Chapter 3

METHODOLOGY

This chapter describes the methods and procedures used in the collection and analysis of the data. Design of study, design of study, subjects, instrumentation, pilot study, procedures, and data analysis of the study are presented.

The purpose of this study was to determine if there was a relationship between major, enrollment status, gender, and race as measured by the Academic Advising Inventory (AAI) and perceived incidence of prescriptive or developmental advising in the two-year commuter college. The following research questions were addressed:

1. What is the relationship between race, gender, major or enrollment status and perceived incidence of prescriptive or developmental advising in the two-year commuter college?

2. What is the preferred advising style that the two-year commuter college student wants?

Based on a review of the literature that revealed a need for additional research on determining the preference of advising styles that exist among special population segments, it was decided that race, gender, enrollment status and major were to be the independent variables. The dependent variable, scores on the Academic Advising
Inventory (AAI) (Appendix A) authored by Winston and Sandor (1984a) was chosen because previous research adequately validated students’ preference for the developmental or prescriptive advising relationship.

Design of the Study

Survey research procedures were used in conducting this investigation to determine the relationship between major, enrollment status, gender, and race and perceived incidence of prescriptive or developmental in the two-year commuter college. The group administration mode of data collection was used because, according to Fowler (1988), respondents are more cooperative and the cost to gather the data is generally low.

Subjects

The subjects for this study consisted of freshmen and sophomores who were enrolled at J. Sargeant Reynolds Community College during the Spring 1993. The subjects were African-Americans and Caucasians who completed the AAI during sessions of their regular and developmental math classes. Permission to conduct the study had been secured from the Division of Engineering and Applied Science and the Division of Arts and Sciences at the College. Four hundred and eighty-one students participated in the study. Of these, 57 were disqualified, either because they failed to complete the questionnaires according to instructions (e.g.,
completing part I of the questionnaire and not part II), or they indicated that their cultural/race background was Asian, Hispanic, or American Indian. Of the remaining 424 usable inventories, or (88%) of the sample were used in the study. The sample included 168 (39.8 percent) male, 256 (60.2 percent) female, 222 (52 percent) African-American and 202 (48 percent) Caucasian. There were 213 (50 percent) students, ages 18-21; 82 (19 percent) students were 22-25 years of age; and 129 (30 percent) were over 25.

Provisions were made to ensure that a sufficient number of students with varied characteristics would be available for a meaningful analysis. For instance, the sample of classes consisting of students with different profiles were chosen since student perceptions might differ depending on the student’s major, enrollment status, gender, and race. On average during the Spring 1993 semester, the following were student characteristics found in the math classes:

Gender: Males = 7; Females = 10
Enrollment Status: Full-time = 10; Part-time = 7
Major: Transfer = 11; Occupational/Technical = 6
Race: African-American = 6; White = 12
Total classes: 25
Class average: 17
Instrumentation

The AAI was used to address the research questions. This inventory was selected because of its theory-grounded perspective of academic advising. The construct validity of this instrument was established using Crookston’s construct (Winston & Sandor, 1984c). The reliability of the scale as measured by Cronbach’s alpha was found at .78.

The instrument has three parts. Part I, the Developmental-Prescriptive Advising (DPA) (see Appendix C) was used to measure the student’s current perceptions of the advising relationship in which the advisor-advisee engaged. This section of the instrument consisted of 14 pairs of statements (items 1-14). One statement was intended to be developmental and the other prescriptive, representing a choice between two contrasting behavioral styles and attitudes as perceived by students. Subjects were asked to choose one of the two statements that most accurately described the academic advising they received during the year. The scale on the questionnaire ranged from 1-4, where the subjects indicated how true that aspect of advising was by using A = 1 "Very true" to D = 4 "slightly true" for developmental statements or E = 1 "slightly true" to H = 4 "very true" for prescriptive statements. Negatively worded statements were reverse coded resulting in a scale where, E = 1 "very true" to H = 4 "slightly true." Responses were
collapsed into two categories, "developmental actual" (DACTT), and "prescriptive actual" (PACTT). The difference between the DACTT scores and the PACTT scores yielded an actual advising index (PA-DA). The reliability of the actual advising scale as measured by Cronbach's alpha was found at .74. Optical scanning and scoring equipment provided by the Department of Academic Computing at Virginia Tech were used to score the instrument.

In Part II, the Developmental-Prescriptive Advising (DPA) (Appendix C), consisting of 14 pairs of statements, items (15-28), was used to measure the student's preference for an advising style. Each pair of items on the instrument was preceded by the stem statement, "I would like my advisor to..." followed by a brief statement. One statement was intended to be developmental and the other prescriptive. The student selected what they perceived to be either a prescriptive or developmental description of academic advising. The scale on the questionnaire was, A = 1 "very important" to D = 4 "slightly important" or E = 1 "slightly important" to H = 4 "very important." The responses to prescriptive items (response choices E through H) were reverse coded, which resulted in E = 1 "very important" to H = 4 "slightly important." The scores on prescriptive and developmental items were aggregated to compute "developmental ideal" (DIDLT) and "prescriptive ideal"
(PIDLT) scores. The difference between the DIDLT scores and PIDLT scores yielded an ideal advising index (DEVIDL). The reliability of the ideal advising scale as measured by Cronbach's alpha was found at .76.

Part III of the Inventory was used to collect demographic information about the student and the type and frequency of advising received. Certain portions of Part III were used in making group comparisons.

Pilot Study

A pilot study conducted in Spring 1992 provided feedback on the validity of the survey. Construct validity was established by identifying two group of students who would be expected to perceive advising differently from each other and then administer them the AAI. Males and females were the two groups identified at J. Sargeant Reynolds Community College. Females were predicted to perceive the advising they wanted as more developmental than the males. The pilot sample consisted of responses from 57 students selected from a population similar to the one that was used in the study. Results from the study found that women had a stronger preference for developmental advising than did males. Indeed the results of this study were congruent with Crockett and Crawford (1989) study, who found identical results.

Students' opinions also were sought as to the
worthiness of the survey in general, item ambiguities, utility of the survey, and the length of the survey. As a result of the pilot study, the word "vocational" located in items 3 and 17 of Parts I and II was replaced with the word "career." Also, the stem, "I would like my advisor to..." was added to begin each pair of items in Part II. No other revisions in the original structure of the instrument were made.

Procedure

A list of students enrolled in math classes during the 1993 Spring Semester was obtained from the Office of Institutional Research at J. Sargeant Reynolds Community College. The average class size was calculated and consisted of the following student types: African-Americans and Caucasians, males and females, full-time and part-time students, and transfers and occupational-technical students.

A packet of materials was forwarded to each instructor and included: (a) a copy of two memorandums delineating the purpose of the research and procedures to be followed in administering the AAI; (b) one set of inventories, optical scanner answer sheets, and number two pencils with erasers; and (c) a brief statement describing academic advising as it existed at the college. After students had completed the inventory, instructors were told to collect all materials and return them to the academic division in a sealed
envelope that was provided by the researcher.

Data Analysis

This section describes the method of analysis used to evaluate the data. A four-way analysis of variance employing the general linear model (GLM) was the major statistical technique used to answer both research questions. The data were analyzed using the *Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS-X)* (SPSS Inc., 1988).

The numerical values of responses for Part I, actual advising styles (items #1 thru #14) were summed into two pairs of scores to represent the type of advising actually received. The responses for Part 2, ideal advising styles (items #15 thru 28) were summed into two scores representing each subjects' preference for developmental or prescriptive advising. The value of responses to prescriptive and developmental items numbered 1 thru 28 were recoded such that: E = 1, F = 2, G = 3 and H = 4. The maximum possible summed score for each survey respondent on actual prescriptive and actual developmental advising was 56.

An index score describing the preference for the type of advising for each respondent was computed by using items in Part II of the inventory. It was accomplished by subtracting the developmental summated score from the prescriptive summated score. A negative score denoted a
preference for developmental and a positive score denoted a preference for prescriptive over developmental. The same procedure was applied on Part I items to identify the kind of advising that was received most.

A four-way analysis of variance was employed to investigate whether the incidence of prescriptive and developmental advising depends on the race, gender, enrollment status, and major of students in a two-year commuter college. Two levels for each independent variable were selected: race (African-American and Caucasian); gender (male and female); enrollment status (full-time and part-time); major (transfer and occupational-technical). The Alpha level was set at .05. PA-DA was used as the dependent variable and reflected the net amount of developmental or prescriptive advising that was actually received. This index was derived from items located in the first part of the inventory.

Another four-way analysis of variance was conducted to determine if perceptions of ideal advising practices depends on a student’s major, enrollment status, gender, and race in a two-year commuter college. All independent variables had two levels. The alpha level was set at .05. The dependent variable was IDEAL and was derived by subjects’ responses to items in Part II of the inventory.

Optical scanning and scoring equipment provided by the
Department of Academic Computing at Virginia Tech were used to score the instrument. The Statistical Analysis System (SAS) (SAS Institute Inc., 1989) was the computer program used in the scoring of the instrument.

Summary

This chapter has described the methods, independent and dependent variables, and procedures which were used in this study, including subjects, instrumentation, validity, and data analysis. In chapter 4, the results obtained from this research will be presented.
Chapter 4

RESULTS

The data collected in this study were analyzed utilizing two four-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) and frequency distributions to determine if significant racial, gender, major, or enrollment status differences existed on the PA-DA actual and PA-DA ideal index scores. This chapter presents the results of these analyses.

Sample Characteristics

Of the 481 subjects who participated in this study, a total of 424 usable responses were obtained. Fifty-seven sets of scores were deleted because respondents failed to complete the instruments according to the instructions or respondents designated a racial group other than African-American or Caucasian. The reasons for these deletions were discussed in Chapter 3.

In Chapter 3, the scoring system for the instrument used in this study was explained. As mentioned previously, 56 was the maximum score on Parts 1 (Actual) and 2 (Ideal) of the Academic Advising Inventory (AAI). PA-DA index scores for actual advising were computed by subtracting the developmental actual (DACTT) summated score from the prescriptive actual (PACTT) summated score. PA-DA index scores for ideal advising were computed by subtracting the developmental ideal (DIDLT) summated score from the
prescriptive ideal (PIDLT) summated score. Positive scores indicated prescriptive advising was received or preferred. Negative scores indicated developmental advising was received or preferred.

In this study, actual scores obtained on Part 1 (actual advising scale) of the Academic Advising Inventory (AAI) ranged from -54 to 47, with a mean score of 4.02 and a standard deviation of 17.08. Scores obtained on Part 2 (ideal advising scale) ranged from -56 to 24, with a mean score of -24.17 and a standard deviation of 18.44. Mean scores for major, enrollment status, race, and gender are shown in Table 1. Data in Table 1 reflect the nature of advising received and preferred by various groups on the basis of the student's profile. Low positive numbers on the DPA Actual Advising Scale reflect that students were marginally receiving prescriptive advising and low negative scores on the DPA Ideal Advising Scale reflect that students slightly preferred developmental advising. A closer visual inspection, of Table 1 shows that African-American females who are considered full-time transfer majors tended to be receiving developmental advising. Caucasian males and females who were classified as full-time non-transfer majors tended to be receiving developmental advising. It is evident that most students were receiving prescriptive advising and yet desired developmental advising.
Table 1

**Means for Various Groups Formed on the BASIS of Major, Enrollment Status, Race, and Gender: Actual and Ideal**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Transfer</th>
<th>Non-Transfer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full-Time</td>
<td>Part-Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>-3.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>14.34</td>
<td>19.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ACTUAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-23.20</td>
<td>-26.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-19.57</td>
<td>-27.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-27.77</td>
<td>-24.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-19.84</td>
<td>-24.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-13.67</td>
<td>-22.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-28.81</td>
<td>-25.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-26.49</td>
<td>-25.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20.80</td>
<td>17.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.64</td>
<td>16.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19.67</td>
<td>17.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20.65</td>
<td>19.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.77</td>
<td>19.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.38</td>
<td>15.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.65</td>
<td>19.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IDEAL
Statistical Analysis

The analysis of the data was organized according to the research questions. The null hypothesis that there is no difference between the incidence of prescriptive or developmental advising for students distinguished by major, enrollment status, gender, and race was tested at the .05 level of significance. The differences in the PA-DA actual index scores were analyzed using a four-way ANOVA. PA-DA Actual index scores were used as the dependent variable and major (A), enrollment status (B), gender (C), and race (C) were the independent variables. The ANOVA indicated a significant main effect of enrollment status, $F(1,423) = 17.30$, $p = 0.00$. The significant $F$ ratio indicated that part-time students received more prescriptive advising than full-time students. The results of the four-way ANOVA testing for differences between major (A), enrollment status (B), gender (C), and race (D) on PA-DA Actual Scale scores are shown in Table 2. None of the other main effects presented in the model were statistically significant.

The ANOVA test also indicated a significant interaction between race and major, $F(1,423) = 4.67$, $p = 0.03$, and race and gender, $F(1,423) = 3.85$, $p = 0.05$. The significant interaction indicated that African-Americans who were transfer majors received different amounts of prescriptive
Table 2

ANOVA Summary For DPA Actual Scale Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources Of Variation</th>
<th>ANOVA df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major (A)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>744.96</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment Status (B)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4782.05</td>
<td>17.30*</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (C)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29.64</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race (D)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>829.52</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.10</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1293.18</td>
<td>4.67*</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B X C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>469.89</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B X D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.87</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C X D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1065.34</td>
<td>3.85*</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X B X C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>788.33</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X B X D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>462.96</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X C X D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>483.11</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B X C X D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30.94</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X B X C X D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>362.62</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Error 408 276.35

Total 423

*p ≤ .05.
advising than Caucasians. In Figure 1, a graphic presentation of the significant interaction between race and major suggests that Caucasian transfers ($M = 7.37$) received more prescriptive advising than non-transfer Caucasians ($M = 1.49$). Mean scores for African-Americans indicated that non-transfer majors received more prescriptive advising ($M = 2.74$) than transfer majors ($M = 2.20$). Simple effects were conducted to test the difference in means between majors at each level of race. This procedure is analogous to a one-way ANOVA. The first test compared the mean score of African-American transfers ($M = 2.20$) with the mean score of African-American non-transfers ($M = 2.74$) and was found non-significant, $F(1, 133) = 0.16$, $p = .68$. The second comparison between the mean scores of Caucasian non-transfers ($M = 1.49$) and Caucasian transfer ($M = 7.37$) resulted in a significant effect, $F(1, 291) = 6.99$, $p = .009$. The results of this analysis are shown in Table 3.

As shown in Figure 2, the significant interaction between race and gender indicated that female African-Americans ($M = 0.98$) scored lower than African-American males ($M = 5.49$) on the actual advising received. Mean scores for Caucasian females ($M = 7.01$) was higher than Caucasian males ($M = 4.1$). Simple effects were conducted to determine if significant difference existed between the mean scores.
Figure 1. Interaction between race and major on actual advising received.
Table 3
One-way Anova on Actual Advising Received for Each Level of Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Blacks**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>50.89</th>
<th>50.89</th>
<th>0.16</th>
<th>0.68</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ERROR</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>300.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Whites**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1958.63</th>
<th>1958.63</th>
<th>6.99</th>
<th>0.009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>83415.11</td>
<td>285.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 2. Interaction between race and gender on actual advising received
The first test involved comparing the mean score for African-American males (M = 5.49) with the mean score for African-American females (M = 0.98), and a significant effect was found, $F(1,255) = 7.67$, $p = .006$. The remaining comparison between Caucasian male (M = 4.1) and Caucasian females (M = 7.01) did reveal a non-significant difference, $F(1,167) = 0.29$, $p = .58$. The variation in scores among White females accounted for the significant effect. Race and gender together were salient variables. The results of the analysis are presented in Table 4.

The second hypothesis regarding differences in students' preference for a prescriptive or developmental advising as a function of major (A), enrollment status (B), gender (C), and race (D) was tested by ANOVA at .05 level of significance. The differences in the ideal advising index scores (PA-DA) were analyzed using a four-way ANOVA. The results revealed a statistically significant difference between males and females, $F(1, 423) = 5.27$, $p = 0.02$. The significant F ratio indicated that female students preferred more developmental advising than males. The results of the four-way ANOVA testing for differences between major (A), enrollment status (B), gender (C), and race (D) on ideal advising index scores (PA-DA) are shown in Table 5.
Table 4

One-way ANOVA on Actual Advising Received for Each Level of Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Black</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2282.50</td>
<td>2282.50</td>
<td>7.67</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>75882.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Whites</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>81.10</td>
<td>81.10</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>45315.20</td>
<td>271.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 5

**ANOVA Summary For DPA Ideal Scale Scores**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources Of Variation</th>
<th>Anova df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major (A)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>151.58</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment Status (B)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18.32</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (C)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1792.16</td>
<td>5.27*</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major (D)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>48.54</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>78.03</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>517.46</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B X C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B X D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>814.23</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C X D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>119.52</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X B X C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>112.59</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X B X D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>538.81</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X C X D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1031.98</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B X C X D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>208.60</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X B X C X D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1049.96</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Error* 408  339.85  
*Total* 423

*p ≤ .05.*
Summary

This chapter provided a summary of the data analysis. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used as the primary statistical procedure to answer each research question. Data were analyzed to determine whether prescriptive and developmental advising received actually depended upon race, gender, enrollment status, and major. It was found that there were significant interaction effects between race and major and between race and gender. The simple effects test were performed on each interaction. It was determined that the variation in scores among Caucasian transfers accounted for the significant interaction effects between race and major, and the variation in scores among African-American males accounted for the significant interaction effects between race and gender. A significant mean difference also was found in the main effects between part-time and full-time respondents with regard to the actual prescriptive or developmental advising received.

For research question two, data were analyzed to identify differences among students regarding the style of advising students want in an advising session. Small mean differences between males and females were reported, although, significant gender differences were found with regard to preferences for developmental approach to advising. Further elaborations of the results of the study,
a summary, and implications for future research will be discussed in the next chapter.
Chapter 5

SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, AND IMPLICATIONS

This chapter contains a summary of the study including the statement of the purpose, background of the study, the problem of the study, research procedures, a summary of findings, discussion and implications based on the findings.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to investigate the extent to which major, enrollment status, gender, and race differ in regard to advising received and preferred by students in a two-year commuter college. Specifically, this study attempted to determine if there were differences between students with regard to the advising styles received. In addition, to determining these differences, the study ascertained differences in student preferences for advising styles. This study gathered data from African-American and Caucasian respondents who were enrolled in developmental math and regular college math classes. Anchoring the study were theories of developmental psychology, involvement and the cultural heritage variable that form the background for the study.

The problem of this study was that the diversity of student populations and programs makes it difficult to evaluate advising programs. Researchers have conducted studies that considered only limited advising needs of
students. There is little research available, for example, that examines the relationship between specific student profiles and advising approaches existing in educational institutions other than four-year colleges and universities. This study attempted to do so.

African-Americans' transition from high school to college involves a complex process incorporating a multitude of factors (Boyd, 1974; Braddock, 1981; Fleming, 1984; Loo & Rolison, 1986; Suen, 1983). Hence, a greater understanding of the differences between two-year commuter college African-Americans and Caucasians, males and females, part-time and full-time enrollees, and occupational-technical and transfer majors may help to determine whether African-Americans and other students with specific advising needs are in fact receiving the advising they prefer. It was hoped that this investigation would serve to shed some light upon the impact that profiles of two-year commuter college students have on the advising received and preferred.

Four-hundred and eighty-one students participated in the study. A total of 424 useable questionnaires, or 88% of the sample were included in the data analysis. A forty item questionnaire was utilized to collect the data. The group administration mode of data collection was used as recommended by Fowler (1988). The four-way analysis of variance was used to analyze the data.
Summary of Findings

This investigation revealed an interaction between race and major and race and gender with regard to actual advising received. The race and major interaction resulted in a significant effect indicating that Caucasians who are transfer majors were receiving more prescriptive advising than Caucasian non-transfer majors. A simple effects test identified Caucasian transfers as the group causing the significant effect. The race and gender interaction also resulted in a significant effect showing that African-American males were receiving more prescriptive advising than African-American females. A simple effects test identified African-American males as the group causing the significant effect.

Further, the investigation found significant differences between part-time and full-time students with regard to actual advising received. Mean scores also showed women expressed a higher preference for developmental advising than did men. The following section presents a discussion of the results.

Discussion

The results of the analysis of variance for question one to test the type of advising the two-year commuter college students were receiving disclosed a significant difference between full-time and part-time enrollees. This
difference indicated that part-time students were receiving more prescriptive advising than full-time students. These differences may have existed because part-time students spend less time on campus. Part-time students spend comparatively little time on campus other than to attend classes. Because of busy work schedules and family obligations, part-time students are forced to engage academic advisors who can accommodate them quickly. Subsequently, part-time students have a limited opportunity to receive a holistic form of advising which requires more time.

The median advisor/student ratio with full-time students in the New York State community colleges was one to twenty and one to fifty with part-time students (Hines, Krause, & Endieveri, 1980). While the results of this finding suggested that part-time students received less advising time, they may have equal or greater needs than full-time students. Perhaps part-time students are naive about what to expect from their advisor; thus, if given the opportunity they would seek more personal attention. This condition is suggested by the results of this study that part-time students are receiving prescriptive advising but expressed a preference for developmental advising.

This information is further corroborated by the research of Kuh and Sturgis (1980). They found that part-
time students do not perceive their college environments as being very supportive or tolerant of their individual differences.

The significant interaction between race and major indicated that for transfer majors, Caucasians are receiving more prescriptive advising than Caucasian non-transfer majors. Advisors tended not to be called upon to help Caucasian students navigate the transfer process. According to Vaala (1988), students reported that colleges and universities can do a better job of preparing transfer students to handle the expected differences between college and university life. Eaton (1990) noted that a successful transfer occurred when the two-year commuter students were taught by advisors and counselors how to prepare and plan in advance for the transfer.

While African-American two-year commuter college transfers were exhibiting characteristics that require specialized advising, it is unlikely that these students are receiving the extensive transfer information they need. Most African-American students who wish to transfer were greatly concerned about the extent to which their courses were accepted by other colleges and universities. Subsequently, academic advisors should consider spending more time helping African-Americans assess equivalency of courses, their interests, aptitudes, and career plans. In
sum, results from this study revealed that the likelihood of caucasians and African-Americans who are transfer and occupational-technical majors are receiving the repeated and timely advisor-advisee contacts to trigger developmental advising is nil.

The significant interaction between race and gender with regard to advising received revealed that African-American women had lower incidence of receiving prescriptive advising while African-American men were describing the incidence of prescriptive advising they received as significantly higher. Perhaps this surprising gap that existed between the advising received by African-American men and women can be attributed to the fact that African-American women were receiving developmental advising or other forms of teacher-learner interactions outside of the confines of traditional academic advising. If so, this points to the fact that academic advisors were willing to discuss broader issues and were concerned about African-American women as individuals. Clearly, this possibility should be examined in another study.

African-American men, on the other hand, are less likely than African-American women or their White counterparts to obtain academic advisement or use the traditional support services in the first place. This is intuitively reasonable since some African-American men need
more prodding from campus agents than do other students with respect to seeking out the help they need.

Question two attempted to determine if differences existed between variables of major, enrollment status, gender, and major with regard to preference for developmental or prescriptive advising. This study revealed that women expressed a greater preference for developmental advising than did men. Women, more so than men, wanted an advisor who does not mind sharing college resource information and clarifying career options for them. Further, it appeared that women, more so than men, desired advisors who were considered their confidante and role model. While this finding does not agree with the finding of non-significant relationship between gender and advising style preference in the Winston and Sandor study (1984b), a subsequent study conducted by Crockett and Crawford (1989) found significance for the variable of gender. Because women were motivated to expand learning experiences and employment capability, Ancheta (1980) found that women preferred advisors who would expose them to new academic and career areas that would lead them to gainful employment.

Several factors may help to elucidate these findings. Higher levels of academic advising were required according to the varying needs of today's two-year commuter college students. These students can be categorized into special
population categories based on the unique needs they bring to the institution (Winston, Ender, & Miller, 1982). Advisors should take into account the profiles of students and then consider implementing strategies to meet each student's total developmental needs. Student populations in the two-year commuter colleges are now more heterogeneous and present a greater range of advising needs than they did a decade ago. Advisors must be alerted to the fact that advising activities in the two-year commuter college can range from basic advising of course selection to life planning.

African-American students, in particular, exhibited characteristics that required specialized advising considerations. For example, within one advising session the advisor may have to address psychosocial and sociocultural assimilation issues, such as African-Americans who are experiencing feelings of loneliness and alienation at the predominantly white educational institutions. These assimilation issues can have a negative effect on their capacity to establish and maintain interpersonal relationships on campus (Fleming, 1984). The overarching challenge of the African-American student is making social contacts within the predominantly white college environment (Cibik & Chambers, 1991). African-Americans may find it to be extremely difficult to function with the flexibility and
openness necessary for college success.

Sedlacek (1987) identified eight non-cognitive variables critical to the success of African-Americans in higher education, and these have implications for developmental advising. The results of Sedlacek's use of the Noncognitive Questionnaire revealed these important variables as (a) positive self-concept or confidence, (b) realistic self-appraisal, (c) management of racism, (d) preference for long-range goals over immediate needs gratification, (f) availability of a strong support person, (g) successful leadership experience, and (h) non-traditionally acquired knowledge.

African-American students entered the predominantly white two-year commuter college with many academic and personal concerns requiring immediate attention. The advisor is called upon to broaden the scope of advising activities to include a focus on the development of the whole student. For example, African-Americans, as do other students, seek advisors who can help them with their programs of study, career exploration, or personal concerns (Winston, Ender & Miller, 1982). Indications derived from this study were that efforts were being made to provide African-Americans women with the advising they perceived as preferred. This conclusion is further substantiated by the empirical evidence in this study that African-American women
are likely to be receiving more developmental advising than previously expected.

Several alternative explanations for this finding can be offered. First, previous research has been limited to the perceptions of traditional-age subjects that were enrolled full-time at predominantly white four-year colleges (Fielstein, 1989; Winston & Sandor, 1984). The current study is unlike the one used in previous research, in that the sample population were educationally and demographically different. For example, the two-year commuter college student cohort was heterogeneous in nature but when compared to the four-year college student cohort, their advising needs seemed to be more alike than different.

Second, the perception of advising styles received by students may vary according to the advisor's own sensitivity to socio-cultural and within group differences. For example, academic advisors' advising may be governed by their sensitivity to needs of African-Americans who were part-time, and who because of employment and family obligations, cannot spend quality time on campus. Further, it is perhaps a combination of advisors’ sensitivity to students' needs and the students’ receptivity for help that has the most significant impact on advising outcomes.

It is possible that the decision of whether or not to participate in the research were affected by the
participants' perception of advising at the college. Students who truly felt comfortable about the type of advising they were receiving and what they prefer in an advisor-advisee relationship were willing to participate in the research study. Furthermore, it is possible that participants may hold perceptions different from those expressed as statistical means in this study. Clearly, further research is needed to provide a greater understanding regarding differences that existed between race, gender, enrollment status, and major and to explain the small differences between groups.

Implications

The results of this study yield several implications for advisors, researchers, and administrators who were seeking to understand whether students with special advising needs were in fact receiving the type of advising they prefer. At a first glance, administrators may have trouble substantiating support to change advising practices currently in force since only modest differences were shown between African-Americans and Caucasians, full-time and part-time enrollees, males and females, and occupational-technical and transfer majors. While significant differences between groups with regard to advising received and preferred were revealed, it was quite surprising how small these differences were between groups. The fact that
most scores appear on either the lower end of the developmental or prescriptive scale demonstrates that caution should be exercised in designing advising programs that are too narrowly focused.

The next consideration is the need to find a means of determining academic advising style effectiveness with respect to identifying behaviors of advisors that may improve the retention and academic performance of all students enrolled in the two-year commuter college. Thus, an investigation of the outcomes of the prescriptive and developmental advising systems is warranted.

When considering the African-American presence in the two-year commuter college, advisors must take into account the changing roles and needs of persons from various racial and ethnic groups (Clayton & Lewis, 1984). Hence, further research is needed in the area of determining the extent to which advisors within the two-year commuter college are receiving the kinds of professional development activities they perceive as needed so that they may be better equipped to provide creative advising strategies for African-Americans with special advising needs.

Also, it is plausible that most African-Americans and Caucasian students have common advising goals; thus, the effectiveness and efficiency of providing relevant professional development activities for advisors would be
enhanced. Perhaps, fulfilling the professional development needs of an advisor who, for example, wishes to know how to help African-Americans confront a different social culture while they strive to succeed academically Clayton (1978) or providing professional development activities for advisors who wish to perform more effective advisement for students with learning disabilities. Another example could be a faculty advisor who wants to help a Caucasian transfer student who wishes to learn how to prepare for an adjustment to a new academic social culture when transferring could be accomplished in one academic advising professional development activity. Hence, such professional development activities would help academic advisors who are well-intentioned but often are not equipped to assist most students with unique advising needs.

Because a significant relationship existed between gender and advising style preferences, administrators may consider including professional development activities that focus on advising women students. Winston, Ender and Miller (1982) suggested that advisors should be aware of the changing roles and needs of women students seen in the advising process. Other researchers have proposed that, in addition to providing accurate information and being available, women expected advisors to help them explore nontraditional career opportunities (Gordon, 1988).
A longitudinal study would also be valuable since changes may occur in the advising styles students receive and prefer over time. After having the opportunity to acquire experiences in receiving different styles of advising, the students could be retested to see if differences existed between groups such as African-Americans and Caucasians, and full-time and part-time students relative to their preference for advising.

Further, this study has shown that either the AAI is not the discriminating tool we thought it to be or the advising needs of various student populations are virtually synonymous. The nature of the AAI itself may have contributed to a lack of diversity among the participants. It is recommended that a panel of two-year commuter college advising experts be assembled to take a closer look at each item to determine appropriateness in validating students’ preference for the developmental or prescriptive advising relationship. Also, items could be modified or added to the existing instrument to identify other factors that may lead to a more distinctive determination of advising style preferences (e.g., critical thinking and social skills).

If African-Americans and other special student populations in the two-year commuter college receive the advising they prefer, the effects of prescriptive and developmental advising can help ease the transition of these
students to the predominantly White campus. Data from this study underscores the influence of race, gender, enrollment status, and major on advising styles received and desired, which yielded information that should be used in academic advising. While being careful not to stereotype or predict behavior based solely on student profiles, administrators should not ignore potential differences among groups (Fuhrmann & Armour, 1988). Hence, this study may help advisors to improve the awareness that a student’s perceived need for advising must be taken into account in the advising process if all students are to be afforded an equal opportunity to succeed.

Finally, the inclusion of advising activities to enhance student participation in the teaching and learning process of the two-year commuter college is critical. While this study clearly demonstrated that African-Americans in the two-year commuter college preferred a developmental model of advising, it is recommended that other two-year commuter colleges consider implementing a developmental model of advising for all students. Thus, this study acts as a point of departure for two-year commuter college administrators who earnestly want to select an advising model that is functional and adaptable to meet the emerging advising needs of African-Americans and other student populations found in the two-year commuter college. This
research study presents a guide for practical application of advising programs to be implemented in the two-year commuter college.
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APPENDIX A

LETTERS OF REQUEST
MEMORANDUM

TO:     Dr. Tom Diamond, Chairman
        Engineering & Applied Sciences
        Parham Road Campus

FROM:   J. Ben Herndon, Jr.  JBl
        Counselor/Associate Professor
        Student Development Services

DATE:   January 27, 1993

SUBJECT: A Request to Survey PRC Math Students

This memorandum is a request to conduct a survey of the math
students on the Parham Road Campus. The purpose of the survey is
to conduct a research study at the College entitled "Advising
Styles Preferred By African-American Students Enrolled In A Two-
Year Commuter College." I believe academic advising is a
significant educational activity for all students, particularly the
segments of our student population which have special advising
needs. By increasing our understanding of the advising styles
preferred by African-Americans, advisors can design advising
strategies to maximize each student's unique developmental needs.

Therefore, I wish to request your support to survey students who
are enrolled in mathematics courses at the Parham Road Campus. If
you have questions regarding this project, please feel free to
contact me. Thank you for your anticipated cooperation and
support.

JBl: ss

cc: Dr. Peyton Butler
    Dr. Roland Moore
MEMORANDUM

TO:      Dr. T. D. Diamond, Division Chairman
          Engineering/Applied Science
          Department

FROM:   Payton T. Butler, Mathematics Program Head
          Parham Road Campus

DATE:   February 1, 1993

SUBJECT: Survey Request—Mr. J. Ben Herndon

Mr. J. Ben Herndon has requested that I forward you a statement in reference to
his desire to administer a survey in selected mathematics classes. While Mr.
Herndon's study does not relate to mathematics in particular, students enrolled in
mathematics courses represent a cross section of the total student population. An
assessment of advising strategies can prove beneficial in the advising and
placement of all students.

I am in support of the study that Mr. Herndon has requested. I have discussed
the possibility of such a study with the mathematics faculty and did not receive
any opposition. I have further worked with Mr. Herndon in attempting to identify
classes which this semester have not previously been involved in an assessment
measure. Nine developmental courses and eight non-developmental course have
been identified to be surveyed. I am amenable to working with Mr. Herndon and
the mathematics faculty in minimizing disruptions in instruction.

As I am sure that you are aware, Mr. Herndon is a professional educator who has
made significant contributions to the advising and counseling functions of the
division. I view his desire to grow educationally and professionally as yet another
attempt to enhance advising at the College. Again, I support his request and
encourage you to afford him every positive consideration. I will await your
response.

Approved

2-1-93
APPENDIX B

LETTER OF APPROVAL
September 22, 1992

Mr. James Ben Herndon, Jr.
1775 Altman Road
Richmond, VA 23228

Dear Mr. Herndon,

In response to your letter of September 14, 1992, Student Development Associates, Inc. gives you permission to use the Academic Advising Inventory in your research study for your dissertation.

Good luck with your research. We would be interested in your results.

Sincerely,

Roger B. Winston, Jr.
Director

RBW/gm
ACADEMIC ADVISING INVENTORY
Roger B. Winston, Jr. • Janet A. Sandor

PART I

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 this year, please respond to the statements in terms of your current situation.

There are 14 pairs of statements in Part I. 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").

Mark your answers to all questions in the Inventory on the separate optical scan answer sheet provided. Use a number 2 pencil. If you need to change an answer, erase it completely and then make the desired response. DO NOT MARK in spaces I and J.

EXAMPLE

80. My advisor plans my schedule. OR My advisor and I plan my schedule together.

A--------B--------C--------D
very slightly
true true

E--------F--------G--------H
slightly very
true true

RESPONSE ON ANSWER SHEET: A B C D E F G H I J

80 0 1 2 3 4 □ 6 7 8 9

EXPLANATION: In this example, the student has chosen the statement on the right as more descriptive of his or her academic advising this year, and determined that the statement is toward the slightly true end (response F).

1. My advisor is interested in helping me to learn how to find out about courses and programs for myself. OR My advisor tells me what I need to know about academic courses and programs.

A--------B--------C--------D
very slightly true

E--------F--------G--------H
slightly very
true true

2. My advisor tells me what would be the best schedule for me. OR My advisor suggests important considerations in planning a schedule and then gives me responsibility for the final decision.

A--------B--------C--------D
very slightly true

E--------F--------G--------H
slightly very
true true

continued on Page 2
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3. My advisor and I talk about career opportunities in conjunction with advising.
A------B------C------D
very  slightly  true
OR My advisor and I do not talk about career opportunities in conjunction with advising.
E------F------G------H
slightly  very  true
true

4. My advisor shows an interest in my outside-of-class activities and sometimes suggests activities.
A------B------C------D
very  slightly  true
true
OR My advisor does not know what I do outside of class.
E------F------G------H
slightly  very  true
true

5. My advisor assists me in identifying realistic academic goals based on what I know about myself, as well as about my test scores and grades.
A------B------C------D
very  slightly  true
true
OR My advisor identifies realistic academic goals for me based on my test scores and grades.
E------F------G------H
slightly  very  true
true

6. My advisor registers me for my classes.
A------B------C------D
very  slightly  true
true
OR My advisor teaches me how to register myself for my classes.
E------F------G------H
slightly  very  true
true

7. When I'm faced with difficult decisions, my advisor tells me my alternatives and which one is the best choice.
A------B------C------D
very  slightly  true
true
OR When I'm faced with difficult decisions, my advisor assists me in identifying alternatives and in considering the consequences of choosing each alternative.
E------F------G------H
slightly  very  true
true

8. My advisor does not know who to contact about other-than-academic problems.
A------B------C------D
very  slightly  true
true
OR My advisor knows who to contact about other-than-academic problems.
E------F------G------H
slightly  very  true
true

9. 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
very  slightly  true
true
OR My advisor does not spend time giving me tips on managing my time better or on studying more effectively.
E------F------G------H
slightly  very  true
true

continued on Page 3
10. My advisor tells me what I must do in order to be advised.
A----B----C-----D
very    slightly   true

11. My advisor suggests what I should major in.
A----B----C-----D
very    slightly   true

12. My advisor uses test scores and grades to let him or her know what courses are most appropriate for me to take.
A----B----C-----D
very    slightly   true

13. My advisor talks with me about any other-than-academic interests and plans.
A----B----C-----D
very    slightly   true

14. My advisor keeps informed of my academic progress by examining my files and grades only.
A----B----C-----D
very    slightly   true

OR
My advisor and I discuss our expectations of advising and of each other.
E----F----G-----H
slightly    very   true

OR
My advisor suggests steps I can take to help me decide on a major.
E----F----G-----H
slightly    very   true

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.
E----F----G-----H
slightly    very   true

OR
My advisor does not talk with me about interests and plans other than academic ones.
E----F----G-----H
slightly    very   true

OR
My advisor keeps informed of my academic progress by examining my files and grades and by talking to me about my classes.
E----F----G-----H
slightly    very   true

continued on Page 4
PART II

Part II of the Inventory concerns how you view the IDEAL academic advisor. You are to choose the one statement from each pair that 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 this College.

Record your answers on the same answer sheet used for Part I.

I would like my advisor to .... OR I would like my advisor to ....

15. be interested in helping me to learn how to find out about courses and programs for myself.
   A------B------C------D
   very slightly important important
   OR tell me what I need to know about academic courses and programs.
   E------F------G------H
   slightly very important important

16. tell me what would be the best schedule for me.
   A------B------C------D
   very slightly important important
   OR suggest important considerations in planning a schedule and then gives me responsibility for final decision.
   E------F------G------H
   slightly very important important

17. talk about career opportunities in conjunction with advising.
   A------B------C------D
   very slightly important important
   OR not talk about career opportunities in conjunction with advising.
   E------F------G------H
   slightly very important important

18. show an interest in my outside-of-class activities and sometimes suggests activities.
   A------B------C------D
   very slightly important important
   OR not know what I do outside of class.
   E------F------G------H
   slightly very important important

19. assist me in identifying realistic academic goals based on what I know about myself, as well as about my test scores and grades.
   A------B------C------D
   very slightly important important
   OR identify realistic academic goals for me based on my test scores and grades.
   E------F------G------H
   slightly very important important
PART II

Part II of the Inventory concerns how you view the IDEAL academic advisor. You are to choose the one statement from each pair that 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 this College.

Record your answers on the same answer sheet used for Part I.

I would like my advisor to ....

15. be interested in helping me to learn how to find out about courses and programs for myself.
A-------B------C-------D
very slightly important important

16. tell me what would be the best schedule for me.
A-------B------C-------D
very slightly important important

17. talk about career opportunities in conjunction with advising.
A-------B------C-------D
very slightly important important

18. show an interest in my outside-of-class activities and sometimes suggests activities.
A-------B------C-------D
very slightly important important

19. assist me in identifying realistic academic goals based on what I know about myself, as well as about my test scores and grades.
A-------B------C-------D
very slightly important important

OR

I would like my advisor to ....

15. tell me what I need to know about academic courses and programs.
E-------F------G-------H
slightly very important important

16. suggest important considerations in planning a schedule and then gives me responsibility for final decision.
E-------F------G-------H
slightly very important important

17. not talk about career opportunities in conjunction with advising.
E-------F------G-------H
slightly very important important

18. not know what I do outside of class.
E-------F------G-------H
slightly very important important

19. identify realistic academic goals for me based on my test scores and grades.
E-------F------G-------H
slightly very important important
I would like my advisor to ....

20. register me for my classes.

A-----B-----C-----D
very slightly important important

21. tell me my alternatives and which one is the best choice when I'm faced with difficult decisions.

A-----B-----C-----D
very slightly important important

22. not know who to contact about other-than-academic problems.

A-----B-----C-----D
very slightly important important

23. give me tips on managing my time better or on studying more effectively when I seem to need them.

A-----B-----C-----D
very slightly important important

24. tell me what I must do in order to be advised.

A-----B-----C-----D
very slightly important important

25. suggest what I should major in.

A-----B-----C-----D
very slightly important important

26. use test scores and grades to let him or her know what courses are most appropriate for me to take.

A-----B-----C-----D
very slightly important important
I would like my advisor to ....

27. talk with me about any other-than-academic interests and plans.
A-------B-------C-------D very slightly important important

OR I would like my advisor to ....
OR not talk with me about interests and plans other than academic ones.
E-------F-------G-------H slightly very important important

28. stay informed of my academic progress by examining my files and grades.
A-------B-------C-------D very slightly important important

OR stay informed of my academic progress by examining my files and grades and by talking to me about my classes.
E-------F-------G-------H slightly very important important

PART III

Please respond to the following questions. Continue marking your responses on the same answer sheet.

29. What is your gender?
(a) male  (b) female

30. What is your cultural, racial background?
(a) Black  (e) White/Caucasian
(b) Spanish Surname  (f) Any other
(c) Oriental Asian  (g) Decline to respond
(d) American Indian

31. What was your age at your last birthday?
(a) 18 or younger  (d) 21  (g) 24
(b) 19  (e) 22  (h) 25
(c) 20  (f) 23  (i) over 25

32. What is your cumulative grade point average?
(a) probation  (c) 3.00-3.49  (e) 4.00
(b) 2.00-2.99  (d) 3.50-3.99

33. What is your academic class standing?
(a) Freshman
(b) Sophomore

continued on Page 7
34. Which of the following best describes the majority of the academic
advising you have received this year? Select only one.
(a) Advised individually by assigned advisor at an advising center
(b) Advised individually by any available advisor at an advising center
(c) Advised individually, not through an advising center
(d) Advised with a group of students
(e) Advised by a peer (student) advisor
(f) Advised in conjunction with a course in which I was enrolled
(g) Advised in a manner other than the alternatives described above
(h) No advising received

35. Approximately how much time was generally spent in each advising
session?
(a) less than 15 minutes  (c) 31-45 minutes  (e) more than 1 hour
(b) 15-20 minutes       (d) 46-60 minutes

36. How many academic advising sessions have you had this academic year in
your current situation?
(a) none    (c) two    (e) four    (g) six    (i) eight
(b) one     (d) three  (f) five    (h) seven (j) nine or more

37. How many academic advising sessions in total have you had this year?
(a) none    (c) two    (e) four    (g) six    (i) eight
(b) one     (d) three  (f) five    (h) seven (j) nine or more

38. What is your enrollment status?
(a) full-time    (b) part-time

39. What is your educational objective?
(a) college transfer    (b) occupational-technical

40. What math level are you enrolled?
(a) regular    (b) developmental

THANK YOU FOR PARTICIPATING IN THIS STUDY.
APPENDIX D

MEMORANDUM OF INSTRUCTIONS FOR ADMINISTERING THE INVENTORY
MEMORANDUM

TO: Selected Mathematics Faculty

FROM: Payton T. Butler, Mathematics Program Head
       Parham Road Campus

DATE: February 3, 1992

SUBJECT: Advising Survey

Your class has been selected as one of nineteen mathematics courses on the Parham Road Campus to participate in an assessment on advising. The purpose of the survey is to evaluate one facet of academic advising. While the study does not relate to mathematics in particular, students enrolled in mathematics courses represent a cross section of the total student population. An assessment of advising strategies can prove beneficial in the advising and placement of all students.

Mr. Herndon is a counselor here at the College and has worked with students pursuing courses of studies within our division. The assessment measure will be used in the writing of his dissertation.

Please take time to review the instructions prior to administering the survey. Questions may be directed to me at 371-3021. It should take approximately twenty minutes to administer the survey in your class. Follow the instructions given. All materials should be returned to my office box on or before Friday, February 12, 1993.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Attachments: 102
TO: Mathematics Faculty  
     Downtown Campus, Parham Road Campus

FROM: J. Ben Herndon  
      Student Development Services, PRC

RE: Instructions for Administering the Academic Advising Inventory  
    (AAI)

DATE: January 29, 1993

The AAI takes approximately 20 minutes to complete. The administrator of the
inventory will provide each student with an Inventory, an optical scanner answer sheet
(#T4887), and a number two pencil with eraser. The following instructions should be
read to students before beginning to administer the inventory.

The purpose of the Academic Advising Inventory is to allow
us to evaluate the academic advising program at J. Sargeant
Reynolds Community College. Your honest and careful response
is necessary if we are to improve the quality of academic advising
here.

Do not provide any of the information requested on the left
of the answer sheet such as name, grade, sex, and so on. Only
answer the questions on the inventory (1-40). Use a number two
pencil ONLY. If you need to change a response, erase your first
response completely and then mark your new response. It is very
important that you erase completely and do not make extraneous
marks on the answer sheet because it will be optically scanned for
machine scoring. Incompletely erased or marked responses will
provide inaccurate information.

After students have completed the Academic Advising Inventory (AAI), please
return all materials to Dr. Payton Butler, (Parham Road Campus), Room 302, Bldg. B
or Dr. Roland Moore, (Downtown Campus), Room 331 by Friday, February 12, 1993.

Thank you for your cooperation and support.
Counseling and academic advising services are available on all college campuses. New students are advised by members of the counseling staff. Returning curricular students are advised by an assigned faculty advisor. Non-curricular students are able to "self-advice" unless placement testing is required. Counselors are available for assistance if needed.
VITA

James Ben Herndon, Jr. was born in Lynchburg, Virginia on May 12, 1946. He received his secondary school education at Dunbar High School in Lynchburg, Virginia in 1964. In 1968, he received a Bachelor of Arts degree in Sociology from Virginia Union University, Richmond, Virginia. He received the Master of Education degree in Counselor Education from University of Virginia in 1974.

His professional work experience includes five years with the Virginia Department of Transportation as a right of way agent and nineteen years as a counselor and associate professor in the Division of Student Development Services for J. Sargeant Reynolds Community College, Richmond, Virginia.

He holds memberships in the Virginia Counselors Association (VCA), Virginia Community College Association (VCCA), and is currently President-Elect of the Richmond Area Counselors Association (RACA). The Association for Multicultural Counseling and Development (AMCD), a division of the American Counseling Association (ACS) awarded him the 1988 Humanitarian and Caring Person Award. He was the former President and Treasurer of the Virginia Association for Multiculture Counseling and Development (VAMCD).

James Ben Herndon, Jr.