

STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS
OF ACADEMIC ADVISEMENT IN RURAL VIRGINIA
COMMUNITY COLLEGES

by

W. Ronald Hash

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

in

Community College Administration

APPROVED:

D. E. Hutchins, Chairman

D. A. Clowes

D.E. Hinkle

H. W. Stubblefield

S. M. Sullivan

July, 1985

Blacksburg, Virginia

STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS
OF ACADEMIC ADVISEMENT IN RURAL VIRGINIA
COMMUNITY COLLEGES

by

W. Ronald Hash

ABSTRACT

Professional literature suggests that there is widespread dissatisfaction with academic advisement, even though students continually indicate that the advising process is critical to their success in post-secondary education. This study investigated the perceptions of traditional and adult students, career and transfer students, and full and part-time students concerning the academic advising delivery system at three small rural Virginia community colleges.

The particular advising traits investigated were: (1) Advisor's knowledge of and interest in advisees, (2) accessibility of advisors, (3) discussion of non-academic problems, (4) advisor knowledge of institutional regulations and requirements, (5) warmth and friendliness of advisors, (6) frequency of contact, (7) freedom and encouragement to be open, (8) elimination of enrollment errors by advisors, (9) satisfaction with advisor and the advising system, and (10) recommendations by the advisee to the advisor and of the advising program to others.

Comparative analysis using chi square test and frequency distributions were conducted with traditional and adult students,

career and transfer students, and full and part time students. The results generally indicated that students were pleased with the advising process, however traditional students were more pleased than adult students. Furthermore, career more than transfer and full time more than part time students indicated greater satisfaction with the advising program. This study recommends that community colleges develop ways to provide better academic advisement for adult, transfer, and part time students. More research also needs to be conducted on academic advisement for career and transfer students.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to express my appreciation to Dr. David Hutchins, Committee Chairman, for the advice and assistance with this study, to Dr. Dennis Hinkle for his aid with statistical procedures, and to the Presidents of New River, Southwest, and Wytheville Community Colleges for both granting me permission to conduct the study and for providing the necessary assistance.

I would especially like to thank _____, my former employer, for his patience, encouragement, and understanding.

To my wife, _____, go my special thanks. Without her help, encouragement, love, and extraordinary patience, this study would not have been possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
	Abstract	ii
	Acknowledgement	iv
Chapter		
1	INTRODUCTION	1
	Background	2
	Statement of the Problem	2
	Research Hypotheses	4
	Definition of Terms	5
	Significance of the Study	7
	Delimitations of the Study	8
2	RELATED RESEARCH AND LITERATURE	9
	The Importance of Academic Advising	9
	Academic Advising Delivery Systems	15
	Change in Community College Population	22
	Summary	27
3	METHODOLOGY	29
	Design	29
	Population	30
	Sample	32
	Instrumentation	34
	Reliability	39
	Validity	39
	Procedures and Analyses	40
4	DATA ANALYSIS	50
	Advisors' knowledge of and interest in advisees	52
	Accessibility of advisors	54
	Discussion of non-academic problems	60
	Advisor knowledge of institutional regulations and requirements	62
	Warmth and friendliness of advisor	64
	Frequency of contact	67
	Freedom and encouragement to be open	70
	Elimination of enrollment errors by advisors	75
	Satisfaction with advisor and the advising system	78
	Recommendations by the advisee of the advisor and the advising system	81
	Advising Services	87

Table of Contents (continued)

5	DISCUSSION	92
	Summary	92
	Discussion	92
	Summary	103
	Recommendations	104
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	106
	APPENDICES	
1	Letters from Southwest, New River, and Wytheville Community Colleges Concerning their Advising Programs	124
2	Letters from the Virginia Community College System Concerning the Academic Advising Program	128
3	Academic Advising Questionnaire	130
4	Letter to and from the VCCS and the Presidents of the Colleges requesting and receiving permission to conduct the study	136
5	Cover letter from College Presidents to their respective faculty requesting their cooperation in conducting the study	144
	VITA	148

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	1972 & 1984 Fall Enrollment for New River, Southwest, and Wytheville Community Colleges	31
2	1983 Spring Enrollment for New River, Southwest, and Wytheville Community Colleges	33
3	Random Student Sample Distribution at New River, Southwest, and Wytheville Communities Colleges	35
4	Advising Traits and Related Survey Instrument Questions	37
5	Regular & Telephone Survey Responses and the Chi Square Probabilities to Academic Advising Questions	43
6	Regular & Telephone Survey Distribution at New River, Southwest, and Wytheville Community Colleges	49
7	Students' Responses to Advisors' Knowledge and Interest in Advisees	53
8	Polarized Analysis of Students' Responses to Advisor's Knowledge and Interest in Advisees	55
9	Students' Responses to the Accessibility of Advisors	56
10	Polarized Analysis of Students' Responses to the Accessibility of Advisors	58
11	Students' Responses to Discussion of Non-Academic Problems.	59
12	Polarized Analysis of Students' Responses to the Accessibility of Advisors	61
13	Students' Responses to Advisors' Knowledge of Institutional Regulations and Requirements	63
14	Polarized Analysis of Students' Responses to Advisors' Knowledge of Institutional Regulations and Requirements	65
15	Students' Responses to the Warmth and Friendliness of Advisors	66
16	Polarized Analysis of Students' Responses to the Warmth and Friendliness of Advisors	68
17	Students' Responses to the Desired Frequency of Contact with Advisors	69
18	Polarized Analysis of Students' Responses to the Desired Frequency of Contact with Advisors	71
19	Students' Responses to the Advisors' Ability to Encourage Advisees to be Free and Open	72
20	Polarized Analysis of Students' Responses to the Advisors' Ability to Encourage Advisees to be Free and Open	74
21	Students' Responses to the Advisors' Ability to Eliminate Enrollment Errors	76
22	Polarized Analysis of Students' Responses to the Advisors' Ability to Eliminate Enrollment Errors	77
23	Students' Responses to Their Satisfaction with the Advisor and the Advising System	79
24	Polarized Analysis of Students' Responses to Their Satisfaction with the Advisor and the Advising System	82

List of Tables (continued)

Table		Page
25	Students' Responses to Their Willingness to Recommend the Advisor and the Advising Program to Others	83
26	Recommendation by the Advisee of the Advisor and Advisee Program to Others	86
27	Advising Services Students Indicated They Would Use . . .	88
28	Students' Desired Number of Meetings with Advisors	90
29	Students' Perceptions of Academic Advisement in Rural Virginia Community Colleges	91

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

In response to the need to provide more higher educational facilities which offer a variety of vocational programs, a unique institution emerged--the community college (Medsker and Tillery, 1971). In their attempt to meet the needs of local communities, two-year institutions have attracted a heterogeneous student population. Most community colleges are open-door colleges, admitting all high school graduates, high school equivalency certificate recipients, or 18 year old adults. Among these students exist considerable ranges in age, socioeconomic backgrounds, educational capabilities, personal motivation, and career objectives (Medsker and Tillery, 1971).

Further, the community college is probably the most rapidly changing element in the American educational hierarchy. Some of the changes are the de-emphasis on liberal arts and transfer-oriented education, an increase in part-time and older students, and an increased emphasis on occupational and community service programs (Grede, 1981). The community colleges diverse educational interests and vocational goals require more diversified curricula than those found at many four year institutions (Johnson, 1964; Medsker, 1972). No aspect of student services more directly relates to excellence in teaching and learning than academic advising (Creamer and Atwell, 1984). In a report by the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education (1979), 27% of the students rated academic advising

inadequate. Clearly, supporting services such as academic advising must be revamped (Kurin, 1981).

Background

The academic advising process can contribute substantially to the total success of the diverse and heterogeneous community college students since "An academic advisor can be the human instrument for creating the harmonious meshing of the student's needs and the educational objectives set forth by the institution" (Hoffman, 1974, p. 3). Even with good teaching and a good admissions fit, the student still needs to find a bond to the institution--an important bond is the personal relationship with a faculty member through the advising process (Landry, 1981; McCutcheon, 1983; Petschauer, 1983; Smith, 1978).

Since academic advising serves such an important role to a large heterogeneous group of students, it seems reasonable to assess the effectiveness of academic advising in community colleges. Furthermore, academic advising must be accountable for its resources and program effectiveness (Kramer, 1984). This study assesses the perceptions of students about the academic advising delivery system at three small rural Virginia community colleges.

Statement of the Problem

Academic advising is being increasingly regarded as an important and useful concern to both traditional and adult students (Bachhuber, 1977; Biggs, 1975; Brown and Myers, 1975; Burrell & Trombler, 1983; Friendlander, 1983; Grites, 1977; Holmes & Trombler, 1981; Mahoney,

1978; Teague, 1977); however, dissatisfaction with advising seems widespread among students and faculty. Nayman and Patten (1980, p. 40) reported that nationally, "Most advising systems were created to respond to the developmental needs of 18 to 21 year olds." The same pattern also holds true for Virginia, as verified by letters from Southwest, New River, and Wytheville Community Colleges (Appendix 1) attesting that the advising delivery system at each of these colleges was created mainly for 18 to 21 year old traditional students.

The letters also substantiate that the community colleges in this study opened in the late 60's and early 70's when the student body consisted largely of full-time traditional students enrolled in transfer programs. Sixty-two percent of the 10,380 students enrolled in the Virginia Community College System (VCCS) for the 1967 fall quarter (the second year of its existence) were full-time students, 73% were males, and 78 percent were in a transfer curriculum. The fall 1984 enrollment for the VCCS was 107,526 students: 26% were full-time students; 42% were males; and, 19% were in a transfer curriculum.

Nearly all of the Virginia Community Colleges use the same type of academic advising delivery system (full-time faculty) and attempt to apply the same delivery system to all students (Instruction Committee, 1982). The problem is that there has never been a study conducted in the VCCS to determine whether or not the VCCS advising delivery system satisfies the needs of most students (Appendix 2). In light of the changing mix of students, it seems reasonable to assume that administrators could benefit from knowing students' perceptions of the

advising delivery system in order to help determine whether the system needs adjustments or changes. To begin to understand student perception, a systematic sample of students at three small rural Virginia community colleges was assessed to determine their perceptions of the current academic advising delivery system.

Research Hypotheses

The null hypotheses for this study are as follows: There are no differences in traditional and adult, full and part-time, and career and transfer students' perceptions of the following aspects of academic advising:

1. Advisors' knowledge of and interest in advisees;
2. Accessibility of advisors;
3. Discussion of non-academic problems;
4. Advisor knowledge of institutional regulations and requirements;
5. Warmth and friendliness of advisor;
6. Frequency of contact;
7. Freedom and encouragement to be open;
8. Elimination of enrollment errors by advisors;
9. Satisfaction with the advisor and the advising system; and
10. Recommendations of the advisor and the advising system to others by the advisee.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Academic Advisement

"Academic advisement is assistance given to students regarding the attainment of their educational and vocational goals. It primarily involves educational planning to help students identify a career goal, choose an appropriate curriculum, select suitable courses, and follow procedures necessary to meet their objectives. Academic advisement fosters progressive development that integrates parts of personal and career goals with academic opportunity" (O'Banion, 1972, p. 62).

Adult Student

A beginning or returning student who is twenty-five years of age or older (Bishop and Van Dyke, 1977; Bostaph, 1976; Clark and Trombley, 1978).

Career (Occupational) Curriculum

"A course of study intended to provide a marketable skill upon completion of a terminal program at a community college. Students engaged in a career program do not expect immediately to continue their formal education beyond the two-year institution" (Virginia Community College System Policy Manual, 1982, p. 2A-2).

Community Colleges

"A comprehensive institution of higher education offering programs of instruction generally extending not more than two years beyond the high school level, which shall include, but not be limited to, courses in occupational and technical fields, the liberal arts and sciences, general education, continuing adult education, pre-college and

pre-technical preparatory programs, special training programs to meet the economic needs of the region in which the college is located, and other services to meet the cultural and educational needs of the region" (VCCS Policy Manual, 1982, p. 2A-1).

Counselor

An individual with the full-time responsibility of providing personal, vocational, and academic advisement to students. This person's educational background and experience is normally in the area of student personnel services and may involve some training in personal counseling (Dameron and Wolf, 1974).

Faculty Advisor

"An individual with full-time instructional responsibilities who provides academic advisement to students as part of or in addition to the normal teaching load" (Daniels and Kiernan, 1965, p. 33).

Full-Time Student

"Students enrolled for 12 or more credits in a quarter" (VCCS Policy Manual, 1982, p. 6-23).

Part-Time Student

"Students enrolled for fewer than 12 credit hours in a quarter" (VCCS Policy Manual, 1982, p. 6-23).

Traditional Student

Because many authors have found that college students in their late teens and early twenties are in an extended adolescence (Chickering, 1969; Jackson, 1977; Levinson et al., 1976), a traditional student is a student who is 24 years of age or younger.

Transfer Curriculum

"A course of study leading into advanced undergraduate education at senior institutions. Students in a transfer curriculum expect to continue their formal education at a four-year college or university" (VCCS Policy Manual, 1982, p. 2A-2).

Significance of the Study

Although academic advising is being regarded as an important concern on college campuses, as witnessed by a proliferation of articles in professional journals (Bachhuber, 1977; Biggs, 1975; Brown, 1975; Burrell & Trombler, 1983; Friendlanger, 1983; Grites, 1977; Mahoney, 1978; Quezada, Rosa & Jones-Loheyde, Katherine, 1984; Teague, 1977), dissatisfaction with advising is also widespread (Carney and Barek, 1976; Donk and Oetting, 1968). Since most academic advising programs serve traditional adolescent students, the advising system neglects the other fifty-five percent of the students in the Virginia Community College System (for the 1984 Fall quarter) who were over 25 years of age (Harris, 1984). The Instruction Committee from Tidewater Community College (1982) reported that nearly all of the schools in the VCCS not only used the same academic advising delivery system, but also applied it to both traditional and adult students. This is the first investigation to determine if the advising delivery system was satisfying VCCS student needs (Appendix 2).

This study was significant because it was the first to assess the students' perceptions of the academic advising delivery system at three of the Virginia Community Colleges to determine whether the system

satisfies the needs of both the traditional students and the growing number of adult students, the career and the transfer students, and the full- and part-time students. This study can be used by community college administrators in identifying strengths and weaknesses of the advising delivery system in meeting the students' needs.

Delimitations of the Study

This study investigated the extent to which the advising delivery system at three small Virginia community colleges in a rural setting satisfied the needs of the traditional and adult, career and transfer, and full- and part-time students. Generalizations from the study will need to be made in light of the unique characteristics of the sample and region.

The instrument developed by Thomas Grites was used to survey the students. Although Grites had excellent validity and reliability data, the differences in responses between positive and negative questions measuring the same trait could indicate that the instrument may not be totally suited for measuring academic advising traits for rural community college students.

Chapter 2

RELATED RESEARCH AND LITERATURE

The review of literature is presented in three major sections: (1) The Importance of Academic Advising, (2) Academic Advising Delivery Systems, (3) and the Change in Community College Student Population.

The Importance of Academic Advising

An early attempt to meet the non-academic needs of students was the tutorial system established at Princeton University in 1808 in which the preceptor acted as "the guide, philosopher, and friend of the student" (Barry and Wolf, 1963, p. 20). Academic advisement was first given in an informal manner by the president and faculty of the early colonial colleges. There was no real need for a systematic program of advisement for these early collegiates since the programs were rigid, course offerings were limited, student bodies were small, and relationships between students and faculty were close (Leonard, 1956).

Eliot's introduction of the elective system at Harvard and the enactment of the Morrill Act brought about a variety of curricula and a growth in college enrollments which necessitated the establishment of a more organized approach to advisement. Gilman at Johns Hopkins took the lead in 1876 by forming the nation's first system of faculty advisors. He later appointed a professor to be "chief of the advisors," or the dean, as he has come to be known (Cowley, 1950, p. 21).

Harvard followed by selecting faculty to act as a board of freshman advisors in 1889 (Rudolph, 1962). By 1940, almost every college and university had established some formal system of academic advisement (Wrenn, 1941).

Today there is growing interest in academic advising among faculty and administrators in colleges and universities across the country. A new organization, the National Academic Advising Association, whose 500 members are administrators and practitioners of academic advising, was formed in 1976. The American College Testing Program compiled two comprehensive advising resource documents and completed a national survey in which 820 institutions of higher education responded to questions about their academic advising programs (Ryan, 1980). Academic advising is increasingly being regarded as an important concern on college campuses as witnessed by a proliferation of articles in professional journals (Bachhuber, 1977; Biggs, 1975; Brown & Myers, 1975; Burrell & Trombler, 1983; Friendlander, 1983; Grites, 1980; Mahoney, 1978; Quezada, Rosa & Jones-Loheyde, 1984; Teague, 1977).

"Although it has not enjoyed a top priority status, academic advising has been and continues to be the primary means of helping students benefit from an array of programs offered on most college and university campuses" (Grites, 1980, p. 40). In several studies academic advising was found to be the service most frequently used by the students (American College Testing Program, 1970; Appleton, 1983; Carney and Barak, 1976; Hoyt, 1971). The literature suggests that good academic advising programs result in better student attitudes, self concepts, intellectual and interpersonal development, increases in

student enrollment and performance, and retention (Appleton, 1983; Glennen, 1976; Grites, 1981; Hadley, 1976; Kapraun and Coldren, 1982; Noel, 1976; Trombler and Holmes, 1981).

Rebecca Shaw (1981) compiled reports on the outcome of student-faculty interaction (which is promoted by the advising system) results in the following benefits for students: (1) higher academic achievement (Astin, 1977; Lavin, 1965; Rock, Centra, & Linn, 1970; Wallace, 1963); (2) higher aspiration (Grigg, 1965; Phelan, 1979; Thistlethwaite, 1960, 1962; Weidman, 1979; Wilson, 1975); (3) personal and social development (Alberti, 1972; Astin, 1977; Chickering and McCormick, 1973; Pascarella and Terenzini, 1978; Terenzini and Pascarella, 1980); and (4) college satisfaction (Astin, 1977; Pascarella and Terenzini, 1976; Wilson et al., 1975). Student attrition, or the more positive concept, student retention, has become a primary focus of administrators in the 1980's. The concept is simple: The more students who remain in the institution, the fewer who must be recruited from a shrinking pool (Grites, 1979). Hadley (1976) reported considerable improvement in retention and better than expected academic performance for exit-prone students assigned to a specially trained team of faculty advisors. Crockett (1978b) cited advising as a cornerstone of student retention and he related research findings on student persistence to advising outcomes. He concluded that students tend to stay in college if they are committed to a career goal, if they achieve grades commensurate with their abilities, and if they develop a positive attitude about the institution. Crockett believed that a well delivered advising program contributes to all these factors.

The results of a national survey of administrators in 1,600 colleges and universities revealed that the most common institutional response to reducing student attrition was the improvement of academic advising and counseling programs (Beal and Noel, 1979). Leslie Kolyai (1982), Chancellor of the Los Angeles Community College District, called for the revitalization of academic advisement as a means of increasing the number of students who make satisfactory progress toward completing their educational courses and programs.

Grites (1979) further stated that the future indicates even more reasons to concentrate on academic advising as a retention process. The investment in a college education continues to result in higher lifetime earnings and more productive members of society; therefore, economic and social benefits accrue from the retention of college students. Grites concluded that the advising process can help accommodate the future needs of students, institutions, and society by helping to retain more students in college.

The American College Testing Program (1978) attributes the renewed interest in academic advising to:

1. changing admission and enrollment patterns;
2. greater student choice of curriculum;
3. accountability and consumerism issues;
4. increase in the number of atypical students; and,
5. relationship of academic preparation to the world of work (pp. 16-17).

Grites (1978) also indicated that a renewed interest had been shown in academic advising and he discussed six reasons for the new focus on academic advising:

1. a recognition that academic advising is an integral and necessary part of the higher education process;
2. a concern for individual growth and development;
3. an interest in increasing student retention;
4. greater student choice of curriculum than ever before;
5. an increase in the number of non-traditional students on campus; and,
6. a growing concern by students about the linkage between their academic preparation and the world of work.

In a national study by Beal and Noel (1979), inadequate academic advising was reported as the most important negative factor influencing student retention. The most important positive factor was a caring attitude of faculty and staff. Academic advisement of students has been identified as "the foundation of an educational institution's guidance and counseling component" (Hardee, 1970, p. 24). Meyers (1964) and Moore (1965) hold advising to be an essential element of the general purpose of education. O'Banion (1972a) believes that advising occupies a central position in the education process.

Creamer and Atwell (1984) believed that advising was the most important aspect of student services and related directly to excellence in teaching and learning for at least four reasons:

1. academic advising underpins both teaching and counseling;

2. academic advising is the basis of all educational planning by all students;
3. academic advising is a process inherent in all educational roles; and,
4. academic advising summons all educators to intra-institutional cooperation (p. 19).

Despite academic advising's importance, dissatisfaction with the advising seems widespread (Carney and Barek, 1976; Donk and Oetting, 1968; Korim, 1981). Johnson and Sprandel (1975) stated "almost every study of undergraduate education has cited the poor quality of academic advising that students receive in their department as a major problem" (p. 17). In 1969-70 the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education sponsored what was perhaps the largest survey of academic opinion ever made, including 70,000 undergraduates, 30,000 graduates, and 60,000 faculty members. As a result of their findings, the commission recommended that enhanced emphasis should be placed on advising as an increasingly important aspect of higher education (Mash, 1978).

In most instances, investigators have found that academic advisement programs have fallen far short of meeting the educational goals they were intended to achieve (Friendlander, 1983). Much of the criticism of academic advisement is captured in the comments of Harper and others (1981) who note that the major criticism of colleges and universities is probably their lack of sophistication and preciseness in the academic advising system. They further state that, at best, the advising system is hit or miss at most institutions, and at worst, non-

existent at others. Trombley and Holmes (1980) have observed that although virtually every institution is pledged to provide academic advisement for each student, many faculty feel frustrated by its demands, students complain about advising inadequacies, and administrators disagree over who has responsibility for advising tasks. Several investigators have also pointed to the inadequacies of advising, particularly in monitoring student progress toward educational objectives (Vener and Knupka, 1980; Spencer and others, 1982). Consequently, "At a time when advances are being made in teaching and counseling students, the problems of academic advising remains unsolved in the American college" (Jurich and Polson, 1979, p. 249).

Academic Advising Delivery Systems

The term delivery system has a limited definition in relation to academic advising in this study and has the same definition used by O'Banion, Fordyce & Goodwin (1972), who defined academic advising in terms of the advisement approach and characterized the delivery system on the basis of the institutional personnel who were actually performing the advising function: that is counselors only, faculty only, team advisement, student advisement, etc.

O'Banion, Fordyce & Goodwin (1972) reported results of a survey conducted during the 1967-68 academic year which gathered data on academic advisement at two-year institutions regarding: (a) number of responding community colleges utilizing various systems, and (b) system preferred by those responsible for academic advisement if

unlimited resources were available. The delivery systems reported by the community colleges were instructor-counselor, counselor-instructor, only counselors, only instructors, selected instructors, students and special program planners. The majority of two-year colleges use a complimentary system of both instructors and counselors, with the instructors having primary responsibility for the advisement. Respondents also indicated a desire for increased use of counselors, both in the counselor-only category and in combination with instructors. Some of the advising delivery systems discovered in the literature review were faculty advising, counselor advising, faculty-student advising, combination of counselor and faculty advising, student advising, advising centers, computer assisted advising, and group advising.

Because 95% of the colleges in O'Banion, Fordyce & Goodwin's study and all of the Virginia Community Colleges use either counselor, faculty or team advisement, the discussion of advising delivery systems will be limited to faculty advising, counselor advising, and team advising.

The first advising delivery system is a faculty advising system. Most colleges use a faculty advising system in order to improve the quantity of faculty-student interaction outside the classroom (Moore, 1976). Regardless of the pattern, academic advising refers to a formal advising system in which faculty comprise the major component of the system. Thus, advising requires faculty to assume responsibility outside the more traditional roles of teacher and scholar (Aitken and

Conrad, 1977). Carstensen & Silberhorn's (1979) survey further revealed that the Instructional faculty have been the primary providers of academic services and that 79 percent of the advising programs use the faculty advising system.

Austin (1977) stated that student faculty interaction has a stronger relationship to student satisfaction with the college experience than any other involvement variable or, indeed any other student or institutional characteristic. Further, students who interact frequently with faculty are more satisfied with all aspects of their institutional experience, including student friendships, variety of courses, intellectual environment, and even administration of the institution (Astin, 1977). Colleges have responded to this need for more faculty-student contact by employing the faculty advising system as a means of promoting and encouraging faculty-student contact (Hines, 1981; Hines, Krause, and Endieveri, 1980; Moore, 1976). The faculty member must be an integral part of an academic advising system because the faculty member represents a field of study and a degree of expertise in the students' chosen fields of study (Borland, 1973; Kramer and Gardner, 1983; Landry, 1981). In addition, Lloyd, Jones and Smith (1953) assert that, "Instructors are the pivotal persons around whom more effective advising programs must be developed" (p. 13). The belief that faculty members should be responsible for advising was so strong at Portland Community College in Oregon that the president sets the example by advising a small group of students himself (O'Banion, 1972b).

Another justification for the teaching faculty's assuming the major advisory responsibility is the similarity between the two functions. Crookston (1972a) views academic advisement as an aspect of teaching based on a contract between student and teacher in which both student and teacher gain from the relationship. The instructional aspect of education has been described as communication between teacher and student during which changes in the learner's behavior occur as a result of information furnished or ideas transmitted by the teacher (Crittenden, 1968; Lunstedt, 1966). The advisement component of education has been broadly defined as not simply program planning but also including the development of the advisee's interpersonal, problem-solving, and decision-making skills by means of evaluation and encouragement (Crookston, 1972). The concept of an exchange of facts and feelings between teacher and student to provide direction and change behavior is common to both functions. Seen in this manner, faculty advising becomes congruent with the teaching role (Daniels and Kiernan, 1965, p. 30; Hallberg, 1964, p. 114; Hardee, 1970, p. 9).

Evans and Neagley (1973) cite the following reasons why community college administrators favored academic advisement by instructors:

1. Regular college instructors have an interest and talent in counseling, which the college should encourage;
2. Instructors as counselors encourages improved relationships between the academic program and the guidance and counseling services;

3. Instructors in the various curriculum areas have a more specific knowledge of their specialties than counselors;
4. Instructors have personal contact with students in their classes; therefore they have more opportunities to counsel students informally on the spot or by appointment; and,
5. The limited supply of professionally trained counselors at present demands that they be assisted by either regular instructors, aides, or both (p. 222).

On the other hand, some researchers offer the following reasons for not involving faculty members in the advising system:

1. Because of their lack of preparation for the advisement task, instructors may cause irreparable harm to students by giving them the wrong advice.
2. Many instructors are not really interested in counseling and some who are interested do not have the type of personality that lends itself to advisement.
3. If student advisement represents part of the faculty load, instructors' time - for which they are compensated - could be more expertly and efficiently utilized by the assignment of extra classes (Evans and Neagley, 1973, p. 222).

A second academic advising delivery system is advisement by counselors only. El Centro College (Texas), Santa Fe Junior College (Florida), and William Rainey Harper College (Illinois) each assign the advising duties to full-time professional counselors (O'Banion, 1972b, p. 184). Their rationale is that program planning is essentially a

counseling problem which cannot be handled by instructors due to time restrictions and training limitations. In a comparative study at C. W. Post Center of Long Island University, both students and faculty favored academic advisement by full-time counselors over either faculty advising or any other program (Sheffield & Meskill, 1972). However, since academic counselors rated poorly on both reliability of academic leave and information, promptness of counseling sessions, and since desired contact between students and faculty decreased under the new program, the system adopted by L. I. U. included some faculty members.

A sequential development of academic advisement with responsibility for decision-making placed upon the individual student is also the foundation of the system proposed by Dameron and Wolf (1974). However, faculty are excluded from the team of advisors. The first two steps outlined by O'Banion (1972a), exploration of life and vocational goals, would come under the province of the professional counselor. Direction for selection of program and courses, steps three and four, would become the responsibility of a pre-professional guidance associate.

Evans and Neagley (1973) cite several arguments in favor of assigning academic advisory duties to professionally trained counselors, including:

1. Academic advisement, a complicated procedure, requires full-time professionally trained personnel.
2. Counselors do a better job in providing students with current practical information (course requirements, probationary

policies, graduation requirements, transfer procedures, and other academic areas of concern).

3. Through contacts made during academic advisement, counselors can discover students in need of other types of counseling.

Opponents of employing full-time counselors cite the following reasons:

1. Due to the large number of counselors required, the assignment of academic advisement to counselors is too costly.
2. Counselors should spend their time primarily in vocational and personal guidance not academic guidance.
3. Students associate academic counselors with that role, and they are less likely to seek help from them in other areas (Evans and Neagley, 1973).

The third type of advising delivery system is team advisement. Most team advisement systems emphasize a coordinated effort by faculty, student personnel workers, administrative staff, and student aides (Bergstresser, 1950; Daniels & Kiernan, 1965; Grahn and others, 1983; Hardee, 1970; Shaffer, 1959; Sheffield & Meskill, 1972). Perhaps the best known academic advising system, geared to the community college but adaptable to four-year institutions and universities as well, is that proposed by O'Banion (1972a). It is based on the concept of academic advisement as a developmental process in which the student makes personal decisions based upon information furnished by the advisor in a non-coercive manner. The process consists of five sequential steps: (a) Exploration of Life Goals, (b) Exploration of

Vocational Goals, (c) Program Choice, (d) Course Choice, and (e) Scheduling Courses. The first two steps require the expertise of professional student personnel counselors. The third and fourth steps may continue with the help of counselors but can best be facilitated through faculty advisement. Specially trained student assistants can provide the necessary assistance to accomplish step Five. All participants work as a coordinated team under the supervision of a professional counselor; each is utilized when and where his/her expertise is most appropriate.

The VCCS uses a team advisement approach. The Instruction Committee of Tidewater Community College (May, 1982) in Virginia Beach, Virginia surveyed all of the Virginia community colleges concerning their academic advising programs. The Committee found that the instructional faculty had the primary responsibility for advisement and reported the following:

"In essence, most faculty advising programs involve a joint effort by counseling and faculty. Usually, counseling advises all new students and those in non-degree and non-certificate programs. From the second quarter onward, degree and certificate students are assigned a faculty advisor. The student normally meets with the advisor each quarter to discuss and obtain approval for the following quarter's courses. The faculty member keeps a folder for each student containing grades and results of advising sessions" (p. 3).

Change in Community College Population

The 18-21 age group has traditionally provided colleges with three-fourths of their enrollees. That segment of the population will shrink by more than 25 percent before 1995 (Gravlich, 1977; Older Students, 1979). In 1978, 33.3 percent of all students enrolled in higher

education were over 25 (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1979). Fifty-five percent of the students in the Virginia community college system for the 1984 fall quarter were 25 or over (Harris, 1984). Participation in adult education programs at four-year colleges and universities increased 15 percent from 1969 to 1975 and 94.8 percent at two-year colleges during the same period (Grant and Lind, 1979).

As educational planners and budgets officers know too well, the number of 18 to 23 year olds in the U.S. population will peak in 1980 and then drop until 1995, when it will begin to rise again (Cross, 1979). In 1975, 93.9 million people were 24 and younger. By 1990 predictions indicate a drop to 89.9 million for this age group (Apps, 1980). Cross (1983) termed the change in student enrollment as the "new wave." One of Cross' "new wave" of students was part-time adult learners.

Campbell (1978) summarized the U.S. population when he stated the following:

Socially, there is simply a rapidly growing number of adults. The general population boosted by the post World War II baby boom accounts for that. Between 1947 and 1957 about 43 million children were born. The number of adults in their thirty-five to forty-five group currently is 23 million and will reach 41 million by the year 2000. By contrast, the birth rate has been steadily declining. In 1957, the fertility rate was 3.8 children per woman while in 1976, it fell to 1.8 (p. 2).

Otto (1979) translated the decline in the U.S. birth rates into students entering educational institutions at all levels:

Grade schools have witnessed this erosion since 1968 and the high schools met a similar fate in the middle of 1970. The colleges are now (1979) facing this trend for the first time. Although the birth rate peaked in 1959, no appreciable decline in the college student body was experienced until the fall of 1979. We have not seen the full impact as yet: it is coming in the 1980's. After

all, the peak of graduating high school students was reached in June 1979 (p. 4).

Harrington (1977) called the increase in enrollment of older students the major change in college and university enrollment patterns during the past decade. Demographic projections of the National Center for Educational Statistics indicate that the trend of increased numbers of older students attending higher education will continue into the next decade (NCES, 1976, 1978). Colleges are actively recruiting adult students to maintain a stable enrollment as undergraduate enrollments of younger students are beginning to level off or decline (Russell and Schnid, 1980; Weatherfold, 1979).

Increased enrollment of older students was especially evident in two-year colleges between 1969 and 1979 when the older students' total enrollment doubled. Much of the increase was attributed to the increased number of adults 25 years and older attending colleges (Drake, 1978; Gleazer, 1973; Twenty-Year Trends, 1978; U.S. Bureau, 1977; Zwerling, 1980). According to figures reported by the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, the number of students under age 25 decreased 3 percent from 1972 to 1976. During the same time span, the number of students aged 25 and older increased 5.5 percent (Drake, 1978).

Parnell (1984) reported that National Center for Education Statistics Surveys revealed that college enrollment increased from 9.2 million in fall of 1972 to 12.4 million in fall 1982. Parnell further stated that students 25 years of age and over accounted for 28.0 percent of the enrollment in 1972 and for 35.6 percent of the total in

1982. Part-time students constituted 34.1 percent of the entire student body in 1972 compared with 78.0 percent in 1982.

The increased participation of adults enrolled in the nation's community colleges has produced an apparent need to provide effective and relevant services and programs to an increasingly older clientele (American Council on Education, 1974; Adult Student, 1968; Comly, 1975; Goldberg, 1980; Governanti & Clowes, 1982; Krings, 1976; National Center, 1972, 1976; Thompson, 1971; U.S. Congressional Record, 1975). Colleges must stop treating adult part-time students as if they were traditional students with lighter course loads (Eddy, 1979); clearly they are different students with distinct needs.

Both the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education (1973) and the American Council on Education (Higher Education, 1972) have noted that colleges and universities must modify their present philosophy and environment to accommodate the older student. The Carnegie Commission reported on a vast array of procedural, environmental, psychological, financial, and institutional barriers to be reexamined and modified.

Another major change in the community college student body is the decrease in the number of transfer students. Koltai (1982) noted that the plight of transfer-oriented education in American community colleges has reached disaster proportions and that the problem demands urgent attention. What was once the primary mission of community colleges, preparing undergraduates for transfer to four year institutions, has now declined to a point where it is struggling to survive in many states (McCurdy, 1981).

Knoell (1982) argued that transfer education has moved from being the dominant function of community colleges to being one of many functions - still important but enrolling a much smaller proportion of students than in the past. Several authors have warned that the variety of functions attempted by community colleges could threaten the transfer program (Cohen, 1980; Haywarde, 1981). Cohen (1980) warns that the institutional legitimacy of community colleges can be seriously threatened if quasi-educational activities (such as fairs and recreational programs) are used to replace the dwindling number of courses and counseling services to transfer students.

There are many reasons for the decline in transfer students. Kissler (1981) stated that this decline is due in large part to the successful efforts to broaden access to those who had not previously gone to college, the significant expansion of the community education function which is not aimed at preparing transfer students; and the tremendous increase in vocational programs, most of which do not prepare students to transfer. McCurdy (1981) argued that transfer education declined because of a sluggish economy, a market glutted with college graduates, the resultant decline in benefits of a B.A. degree, the increased demand for technical specialists, federal and state support of college-level vocational programs, and the increased popularity of the occupational or career curriculum.

The Appalachian Education Laboratory (AEL) Lifelong Learning (Adams, 1981) staff found in its initial contacts with community colleges in Appalachia that many part-time adults are on campus only in

the evening after most faculty have left. Since part-time adult students arrive in time for class and leave immediately after, there is little time left for academic advising. The AEL staff reported that one area community college counselor stated, "The [part-time] adults are the forgotten students. Those adults who do participate in academic advisement are likely to find themselves in a process geared toward the traditional, younger students" (pp. 27-28).

The change in the community college student enrollment has created a need for an assessment or evaluation of the effectiveness of academic advising (Ryan, 1980). One of the most important services the new wave of students receive once they have been admitted is academic advising (Tang, 1981). Does the academic advising system need to be changed to meet the needs of the new wave of students attending community colleges? Some counseling researchers believe that academic advising delivery systems should be different for the older student (Hansen and Lenning, 1973; Nayman and Potter, 1980), the part-time students (Creamer and Atwell, 1984), and the transfer students (Knoell, 1982).

Summary

The literature review revealed that academic advising is perceived by students, faculty, and administrators as a very useful service to maximize the opportunity for students to complete their educational objectives, however, dissatisfaction with advising was widespread. Various methods of delivering the advising services to students were

discussed. Finally, the change in the student population in the community colleges since the late 60's and early 70's were discussed.

If educators fail to recognize the unique characteristics of the new wave of students (career, part-time, and adult students) and make appropriate modifications in the advising process, the result may be learner frustration, failure, disenchantment, and ultimately dropping out prior to program completion (Adams, 1981).

Chapter 3

METHODOLOGY

This chapter describes the research design, the population of students at New River Community College, Southwest Community College, and Wytheville Community College from which the samples were drawn, the research instrument, and the research procedures and analyses.

Design

The purpose of this study was to assess the students' perceptions of academic advising at three small rural Virginia community colleges (New River, Southwest, and Wytheville Community Colleges) in terms of traditional and transfer, full- and part-time, and career and transfer students.

A questionnaire developed by Thomas Crites that measured ten different advising traits was distributed to a random selection of students at New River, Southwest, and Wytheville Community Colleges. Comparative analyses using chi square tests and frequency distributions were conducted between traditional and adult, full- and part-time, and career and transfer students. A polarized analyses of all the groups of students was also conducted.

Population

The population in this study included all of the students at New River, Southwest, and Wytheville Community Colleges. Table 1 gives specific enrollment for the 1972 and the 1984 fall quarters for the three schools. An analysis of Table 1 revealed the following patterns from the 1972 fall quarter to the 1984 fall quarter:

1. Enrollment had increased nearly 40% at Wytheville, 50% at New River, and 62% at Southwest.
2. The percentage of the student body attending part-time had increased substantially at all three schools from 1972 to 1984. All three schools had over 50 percent of their 1984 fall students attending part-time.
3. All three colleges had at least half of its 1984 fall enrollment consisting of females. Wytheville Community College was the only school during the 1972 fall quarter that had females comprising over half of the student body.
4. While the percentage of transfer students from 1972 to 1984 decreased at all three colleges, the percentage of occupational students increased at NRCC and WCC from 1972 to 1984, and remained nearly the same at SWVCC.

TABLE 1

1972 and 1984 Fall Enrollment for
New River, Southwest, and Wytheville Community Colleges

	HEAD YEAR COUNT	FULL TIME (% OF TOTAL)	PART TIME (% OF TOTAL)	MALES (% OF TOTAL)	FEMALES (% OF TOTAL)	TRANSFER (% OF TOTAL)	OCCUPA- TIONAL (% OF TOTAL)
New River Community College	1972 1368 1984 2753	727 (54) 859 (31)	641 (46) 1894 (69)	864 (63) 1092 (40)	504 (37) 1661 (60)	237 (18) 333 (12)	1131 (82) 2420 (88)
Southwest Virginia Community College	1972 1371 1984 3626	578 (42) 1202 (33)	793 (58) 2424 (67)	993 (72) 1751 (48)	378 (28) 1875 (52)	462 (34) 1091 (30)	909 (66) 2535 (70)
Wytheville Community College	1972 1035 1984 1700	648 (63) 748 (44)	387 (37) 952 (56)	510 (49) 635 (37)	525 (51) 1065 (63)	231 (22) 135 (8)	804 (78) 1565 (92)

The VCCS did not maintain enrollment statistics by age until the 1977 fall quarter; therefore, very little comparative data by age was available. For the 1981 fall quarter, 52 percent of New River's students, 51 percent of Southwest's students, and 54 percent of Wytheville's students were 25 or older.

Table 2 gives the enrollment for the 1983 spring quarter at the three schools from which the sample was taken. The table indicates the following enrollment patterns: (1) full-time, 39.3 percent, and part-time, 60.7 percent; (2) adults, 48.2 percent, and traditional, 51.8 percent; (3) career, 81.4 percent, and transfer, 18.6 percent.

Sample

A total of 353 students were sampled from New River (120 sampled), Southwest (120 sampled) and Wytheville (113 sampled) community colleges during the 1983 spring quarter. The groups investigated in this study were traditional and adult, full and part, and career and transfer students. A polarization of the groups resulted in eight classifications:

1. Full-time traditional career
2. Full-time traditional transfer
3. Full-time adult career
4. Full-time adult transfer
5. Part-time traditional career
6. Part-time traditional transfer
7. Part-time adult career
8. Part-time adult transfer

TABLE 2

1983 Spring Enrollment for New River,
Southwest, and Wytheville Community Colleges

Number and percent of total	FULL	PART	ADULT	TRADI- TIONAL	CAREER	TRANSFER	TOTAL ENROLLMENT
New River Community	951 37.5%	1969 67.5%	1603 54.9%	1317 45.1%	2579 88.3%	341 11.7%	2920
Southwest Community	1109 42.5%	1501 57.5%	1228 47.1%	1382 52.9%	1780 68.2%	830 31.8%	2610
Wytheville Community	728 46.4%	840 53.6%	589 37.6%	979 62.4%	1422 90.7%	146 9.3%	1568
TOTAL	2788 39.3%	4310 60.7%	3420 48.2%	3678 51.8%	5781 81.4%	1317 18.6%	7098

Ferguson (1976) stated that Yate's collection for continuity should be used where any of the expected frequencies is less than 5; therefore, it was arbitrarily determined to survey 15 students in each of the eight categories at each school to insure sufficient numbers in the expected frequencies.

A computer program was used to identify all of the students in each of the eight categories at the schools and 15 students for each category were randomly selected at each of the three schools. Because of a limited number of students in some of the categories and the random selection process, only 113 students were randomly selected at Wytheville as compared to 120 at New River and 120 at Southwest (see Table 3). A total of 217 students returned the questionnaires for a 61.47 percent return. A systematic telephone follow-up survey was conducted on 27 students who did not return the questionnaire.

Instrumentation

The Advising Satisfaction Questionnaire (ASQ) developed by Grites (1974) was used to assess the students' reported perception with the VCCS advising model. "The ASQ was one of two research tools used to assess student perceptions and self-perceptions of faculty members in the related roles of classroom teacher and academic advisor" (Grites, 1974, p. 29). It was created by combining instruments constructed in previous doctoral research (Murry, 1971; Peterson, 1970; Rosenberg, 1969). Sixteen items of the ASQ were derived from the Perception Scale developed by Rosenberg (1969) and Murry (1971). The paired items were

Table 3

Random Student Sample Distribution at
New River, Southwest, and Wytheville Community Colleges

# Sampled	S T U D E N T		S T A T U S		P R O G R A M	
	Tradi- tional	Adult	Full	Part	Career	Transfer
# Returned						
New River Com. College (120 sampled)	60 38	60 34	60 46	60 26	60 32	60 40
Southwest Va. Comm. College (120 sampled)	60 35	60 32	60 48	60 20	60 41	60 27
Wytheville Com. Comm. College (113 sampled)	59 34	54 43	54 45	59 32	60 27	53 50
TOTAL RETURNED	107	109	139	78	100	117

Total sampled	- 353					
Total returned	- 217					
Return Rate	- 61.47%					

based on eight advisor characteristics identified in the literature as relating to successful academic advisement: (a) Advisor Knowledge of and Interest in Advisee, (b) Accessibility of Advisor, (c) Discussion of Non-Academic Problems, (d) Advisor Knowledge of Institutional Regulations of Requirements, (e) Warmth and Friendliness of Advisor, (f) Frequency of Contact, (g) Freedom and Encouragement to be Open, and (h) Elimination of Enrollment Errors by Advisor. Two questions were composed for each of the eight characteristics, one worded positively and the other negatively to minimize response set bias. Table 6 contains the positive and negative questions on the ASQ that address the advising characteristics above. The "A" questions are positively worded and the "B" questions are negatively worded.

Grites derived the remaining seven items of the ASQ from the Satisfaction Subscale of Peterson's (1970) college advisement survey. The focus of this group of questions was on the general feeling of satisfaction with the advisor and the advising system, and recommendation by the advisee and advising program to others. All 23 items were arranged in a random order. Five alternative responses were provided: Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Tend to Agree (TA), Tend to Disagree (TD), and Strongly Disagree (SD).

Four additional descriptive items were added requesting information on the respondent's curriculum (either career or transfer), number of hours registered, sex, and frequency of contact with academic advisors. An open ended question about additional advising services was also included. The complete questionnaire is shown in Appendix 3.

TABLE 4

ADVISING TRAITS AND RELATED SURVEY
INSTRUMENT QUESTIONS

(A's identify positive questions, and B's negative questions; questionnaire number in parentheses)

1. Advisor Knowledge of and Interest in Advisee
 - A. (16) I feel that my advisor knows me as an individual and is interested in me as a person.
 - B. (1) I doubt that my advisor knows who I am or anything about me.
2. Accessibility of Advisor
 - A. (3) When I need to see my advisor, I have little difficulty in setting up an appointment with him.
 - B. (13) Although my advisor has fairly definite office hours when he is available for advising, he is so busy it is almost impossible to see him.
3. Discussion of Non-Academic Problems
 - A. (20) My relationship with my advisor is such that I would not hesitate to seek his advice on most subjects or problems I might have.
 - B. (9) If I have a problem of a personal nature, I would not think of going to my advisor to discuss it.
4. Advisor Knowledge of Institutional Regulations and Requirements
 - A. My advisor appears well informed on course requirements, regulations, etc. and I can place a great deal of confidence in any suggestions he might make regarding this matter. (6)
 - B. (18) My advisor seems to know little more about course offerings, regulations, that I do.
5. Warmth and Friendliness of Advisor
 - A. (22) In our meetings together, my advisor appears warm, interested, and patient with me.
 - B. (7) My advisor appears cold, doesn't pay much attention to what I am saying, and is rather brisk in his manner with me.
6. Frequency of Contact
 - A. (10) I usually meet with my advisor at least one or more times a quarter other than at registration (or pre-registration).

Table 4 (continued)

6. B. (19) About the only time I use my advisor is at registration (or pre-registration) and sometimes not even then.
- A.2 (11) I am satisfied with my advisor.
- A.3 (17) I feel satisfied as a result of my talks with my advisor.
7. Freedom and Encouragement to be Open
- A. (12) My advisor makes me feel at ease and by his manner encourages me to discuss anything which might be helpful to me.
- B. (4) My advisor usually appears so rushed that I hesitate to ask many of the questions or to discuss areas which I feel would be helpful to me.
10. Recommendation by the Advisor of the Advisor and advising model to others.
- A.1 (5) I feel I could recommend my advisor to another student.
- A.2 (21) Colleges should provide advisors like mine.
- A.3 (2) I feel that other colleges should provide advisement like this College provides.
8. Elimination of Enrollment Errors by Advisor
- A. My advisor is not only well informed about course requirements and regulations, but is also sufficiently conscientious about my enrollment each semester so that I am not handicapped with enrollment errors.
- B. Since my advisor is not very knowledgeable or conscientious about his advising responsibilities, I can reasonably expect him to make some kind of enrollment error when I seek his help during pre-registration or registration. (23)
9. Satisfaction with the Advisor and the Advising System
- A.1 (8) I have been satisfied with my advisement.

The data was also obtained by using a 5 point Likert scale (strongly agree, agree, tend to agree, tend to disagree, strongly disagree) rather than the traditional 6 point Likert scale (strongly agree, agree, tend to agree, disagree, tend to disagree, strongly disagree).

Reliability

The 14 paired items developed by Rosenberg (1969) produced a .88 split-half reliability estimate. Another pair of items was added by Murry (1971) with the assumption of a similar reliability estimate. A test-retest reliability of .84 and split-half reliability of .93 was reported by Peterson (1970) for the seven items of the Satisfaction Subscale. The student form of the ASQ, the combined 23-item instrument, yielded an alpha coefficient of .99 (Grites, 1974).

Validity

Support for the content validity of Rosenberg's (1969) instrument came from item construction based on desirable advisor characteristics found in the literature and judged to be accurate by three academic advisor experts. Murry (1971) reported the content validity to be sufficient by indicating how the instrument sampled those situations about which conclusions could be drawn. Another independent validity check was conducted (Rosenberg, 1969) by correlating the two-item scale scores with the satisfaction ratings measured by judges from a free response section of the questionnaire. The resulting correlation coefficient of .86 supported the concurrent validity of the instrument.

A concurrent validity check was made by Grites (1974), by correlating the 7-item subscale with the entire 23-item instrument. A correlation coefficient of .98 was obtained.

Procedures and Analyses

Permission to conduct the study was obtained from the Virginia Community College System's office and the Presidents of the three colleges participating in the study (Appendix 4 - telephone approval was obtained from New River Community College). The Presidents also agreed to allow the Coordinator of Admissions and Records at Southwest and New River and the Assistant to the President at Wytheville to serve as the contact person on the campuses in conducting the study. All of the contact persons agreed in advance to assist with the study. A computer program using the Statistical Analysis System (SAS) was written to select the sample randomly, insuring sufficient numbers of respondents for each classification in the study. The sample contained the student's name, social security number, classification type (that is, part- or full-time, traditional or adult, and career or transfer) and the student's classes and respective teachers during the 1983 spring quarter. The total sample consisted of 353 students.

The contact person on each campus distributed the questionnaires to the students' teacher who was most likely to cooperate in the study. A letter from each of the respective college presidents was attached to each of the questionnaires instructing the teachers to distribute the questionnaires to the students with the request that they complete the surveys on their own and return them at the next class meeting

(Appendix 5). No class time was used by students to complete the questionnaire. Questionnaires were coded so that a follow-up could be done with nonrespondents.

All analyses were performed using the chi square test. All levels of statistical significance for the chi square tests were actual levels computed rather than a prior criteria. An alpha level of .10 was established as a cut-off level for reporting that statistically significant associations were present.

Individual analyses were conducted for each of the 23 questions on the study with each of the three independent variables of students (traditional or adult), program (career or transfer), and status (full- or part-time). A polarization analyses was conducted on the following classifications: full-time traditional career, full-time traditional transfer, full-time adult career, full-time adult transfer, part-time traditional career, part-time traditional transfer, part-time adult career, and part-time adult transfer. A distribution of perceptions was reported for the services advisees indicated they would use if available as well as for the advisees' desired frequency of meetings with the advisor.

Telephone surveys were used to determine if there was any significant difference in the perceptions of the students who returned the questionnaire and those who did not return them. Twenty-seven students were systematically surveyed. Every tenth student in each of the eight categories was telephoned. The chi square test ($\alpha = .10$) was used to determine significant differences between the student responses

on the original questionnaire and the student responses on the telephone questionnaire (see Table 4). A significant difference was found between the original students and those surveyed by phone for 20 of the 23 questions. In general, the students surveyed originally were more pleased with the advising delivery system than were those surveyed by telephone. For example, although about the same percentage of the original students surveyed (77%) and those surveyed by phone (74%) were pleased with the advisors' knowledge of, and interest in, advisees, three times as many of the original students surveyed (25%) as the students surveyed by phone (7%) indicated strong satisfaction with the advisor's knowledge of, and interest in, advisees. This seems reasonable because about 63% of the students surveyed by phone and only about 36% of the students surveyed originally were part-time students. Part-time students generally attend at night when advisors are not as accessible; thus, part-time students do not have the same opportunities as the full-time day students to develop effective relationships with faculty advisors. As a result, the telephone surveys were not included in the final analysis of the study.

A review of Table 5 indicated that the largest difference between the telephone and regular surveys among the three independent variables was the full- or part-time status of the students. The regular surveys consisted of 64.06 percent full- and 35.94 percent part-time students. The distribution was almost reversed for the telephone surveys with 37.06 percent full- and 62.96 percent part-time students. The author also noted that over 90 percent of the part-time students were non-

TABLE 5

Regular and Telephone Survey Responses and the Chi Square Probabilities to Academic Advising Questions (A's identify Positive questions and B's identify Negative questions)

Question	Strongly Agree	Agree	Tend to Agree	Tend to Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total Agree	Total Disagree	Chi Square Probability
1. Advisor Knowledge of and Interest in Advisee								
A. Regular	56 25.81%	69 31.80%	44 20.28%	33 15.21%	15 6.91%	77.88%	22.12%	0.0632*
Telephone	2 7.41%	13 48.15%	5 18.52%	7 25.93%	0 0.00%	74.07%	25.93%	
B. Regular	11 5.07%	21 9.68%	15 6.91%	52 23.96%	118 54.38%	21.66%	78.34%	0.0205*
Telephone	0 0.00%	8 29.63%	0 0.00%	5 18.52%	14 51.85%	29.63%	70.37%	
2. Accessibility of Advisor								
A. Regular	55 25.46%	90 41.67%	21 9.72%	28 12.96%	22 10.19%	76.85%	23.15%	0.2426
Telephone	3 11.11%	16 59.26%	1 3.70%	5 18.52%	2 7.41%	74.07%	25.93%	
B. Regular	7 3.26%	8 3.72%	20 9.30%	115 53.49%	65 30.23%	16.28%	83.72%	0.0965*
Telephone	0 0.00%	4 14.81%	1 3.70%	15 55.56%	7 25.93%	18.51%	81.49%	
3. Discussion of Non-Academic Problems								
A. Regular	46 21.40%	72 33.49%	39 18.14%	35 16.28%	23 10.70%	73.03%	26.98%	0.0750*
Telephone	3 11.11%	11 40.74%	4 14.81%	9 33.33%	0 0.00%	66.66%	33.33%	

*p < .10

Table 5 (continued)

Question	Strongly Agree	Agree	Tend to Agree	Tend to Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total Agree	Total Disagree	Chi Square Probability
B. Regular	36	50	43	52	35			
Telephone	16.67%	23.15%	19.91%	24.07%	16.20%	59.73%	40.27%	0.0635%
	3	12	1	8	3			
	11.11%	44.44%	3.70%	29.63%	11.11%	59.26%	40.74%	
4. Advisor Knowledge of Institutional Regulations and Requirements								
A. Regular	91	83	29	9	4			
Telephone	42.13%	38.43%	13.43%	4.17%	1.85%	93.99%	6.02%	0.0234
	5	15	2	4	1			
	18.52%	55.56%	7.41%	14.81%	3.70%	81.49%	18.51%	
B. Regular	19	30	16	51	99			
Telephone	8.84%	13.95%	7.44%	23.72%	46.05%	30.23%	69.77%	0.0099*
	4	8	2	10	3			
	14.81%	29.63%	7.41%	37.04%	11.11%	51.85%	48.15%	
5. Warmth and Friendliness of Advisor								
A. Regular	75	77	42	17	4			
Telephone	34.88%	35.81%	19.53%	7.91%	1.86%	90.22%	9.77%	0.0081%
	3	19	2	2	1			
	11.11%	70.37%	7.41%	7.41%	3.70%	88.89%	11.11%	
B. Regular	5	3	11	64	134			
Telephone	2.30%	1.38%	5.07%	29.49%	61.75%	8.76%	91.24%	0.0711*
	0	2	2	12	11			
	0.00%	7.41%	7.41%	44.44%	40.74%	14.82%	85.18%	

Table 5 (continued)

Question	Strongly Agree		Tend to Agree		Tend to Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Total Agree	Total Disagree	Chi Square Probability
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N			
6. Frequency of Contact											
A. Regular	29	64	28	56	35	35	56.82%	43.18%		0.0365*	
Telephone	13.62%	30.05%	13.15%	26.29%	16.43%	1					
	0	11	2	13	1						
B. Regular	0.00%	40.74%	7.41%	48.15%	3.70%	63	49.15%	51.85%			
Telephone	25	35	30	62	63						
	11.63%	16.28%	13.95%	28.84%	29.30%	6	41.86%	58.14%		0.0964*	
	0	8	2	11	6						
	0.00%	29.63%	7.41%	40.74%	22.22%		37.04%	62.96%			
7. Freedom and Encouragement to be Open											
A. Regular	62	90	32	25	8		84.79%	15.21%		0.0517*	
Telephone	28.57%	41.47%	14.75%	11.52%	3.69%	1					
	3	19	1	3	1						
B. Regular	11.11%	70.37%	3.70%	11.11%	3.70%	94	85.18%	14.82%			
Telephone	11	10	11	91	94						
	5.07%	4.61%	5.07%	41.94%	43.32%	10	14.75%	85.25%		0.1066	
	0	4	3	10	10						
	0.00%	14.81%	11.11%	37.04%	37.04%		25.92%	74.08%			
8. Elimination of Enrollment Errors by Advisor											
A. Regular	63	77	41	24	10		84.18%	15.82%		0.0761*	
Telephone	29.30%	35.81%	19.07%	11.16%	4.65%	0					
	4	17	3	3	0						
B. Regular	14.81%	62.96%	11.11%	11.11%	0.00%	126	88.89%	11.11%			
Telephone	4	6	11	67	126						
	1.87%	2.80%	5.14%	31.31%	58.88%	9	9.81%	90.19%		0.0030*	
	0	4	0	14	9						
	0.00%	14.81%	0.00%	51.85%	33.33%		14.81%	85.19%			

*p < .10

Table 5 (continued)

Question	Strongly Agree		Tend to Agree		Tend to Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Total Agree	Total Disagree	Chi Square Probability
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N			
9. Satisfaction with the Advisor and the Advising System	A1. Regular	70	82	36	14	14	14	14	87.04%	12.96%	0.0008*
		32.41%	37.96%	16.67%	6.48%	6.48%	6.48%	6.48%	1	92.60%	7.40%
	A2. Regular	73	93	27	14	14	8	8	89.77%	10.23%	0.0483*
		33.95%	43.26%	12.56%	6.51%	6.51%	3.72%	3.72%	1	92.60%	7.40%
A3. Regular	Telephone	4	20	1	1	1	1	1	92.60%	7.40%	0.0781*
		14.81%	74.07%	3.70%	3.70%	3.70%	3.70%	3.70%	7	85.58%	14.42%
	Telephone	52	82	50	24	24	7	7	81.48%	18.52%	0.1188
		24.19%	38.14%	23.26%	11.16%	11.16%	3.26%	3.26%	0	17.51%	82.49%
B1. Regular	Telephone	7	11	20	60	60	119	119	7.41%	82.59%	0.0008*
		3.23%	5.07%	9.22%	27.65%	27.65%	54.84%	54.84%	11	88.89%	11.11%
	Telephone	0	1	1	14	14	11	11	0.00%	92.59%	0.0008*
		0.00%	3.70%	3.70%	51.85%	51.85%	40.74%	40.74%	9	85.65%	14.35%
10. Recommendations by the Advisee of the Advisor and Advisee Program to Others	A1. Regular	83	77	25	22	22	9	9	85.65%	14.35%	0.0841*
		38.43%	35.65%	11.57%	10.19%	10.19%	4.17%	4.17%	0	85.18%	14.82%
	A2. Regular	69	66	48	18	18	13	13	85.52%	14.48%	0.0075*
		32.24%	30.84%	22.43%	8.41%	8.41%	6.07%	6.07%	0	88.89%	11.11%
Telephone	6	17	1	3	3	0	0	22.22%	77.78%	0.0008*	
	22.22%	62.96%	3.70%	11.11%	11.11%	0.00%	0.00%				

*p < .10

Table 5 (continued)

Question	Strongly Agree		Tend to Agree		Tend to Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Total		Chi Square Probability
	Agree	Disagree	Agree	Disagree	Agree	Disagree	Agree	Disagree	Agree	Disagree	
A3. Regular	61 28.24%	72 33.33%	60 27.78%	16 7.41%	7 3.24%	0 0.00%	89.35%	10.65%	89.35%	10.65%	0.0004*
Telephone	3 11.11%	21 77.78%	2 7.41%	1 3.70%	0 0.00%	0 0.00%	96.30%	3.70%	96.30%	3.70%	

*p < .10

curricular students, taking only one class, such as aerobics. The non-curricular students were included in the study to attempt to get the opinions of a cross section of the study body of the three colleges. Many of the non-curricular students indicated that they did not meet with advisors enough to form an opinion about the advising delivery system. Most of those contacted by phone gave answers because of the specific request by the author; however, most reaffirmed their contention that they did not meet with the faculty advisors enough to evaluate the advising system fairly and accurately. Because of the significant differences between the original and telephone surveys and the telephone part-time students' lack of knowledge about the advising delivery systems, the telephone surveys were not used in the final analyses of the study.

All analyses were performed using the chi square test. All levels of statistical significance for the chi square tests were actual levels computed rather than a prior criteria. An alpha level of .10 was established as a cut-off level for reporting that statistically significant associations were present.

TABLE 6

Regular and Telephone Survey
of Students at Three Different
Community Colleges

	REGULAR (n = 217) Number (% of total)	TELEPHONE (n = 27) Number (% of total)
Full	139 (64.06)	10 (37.04)
Part	78 (35.94)	17 (62.96)
Traditional	107 (49.54)	13 (48.15)
Adult	109 (50.46)	14 (51.85)
Career	100 (46.08)	17 (62.96)
Transfer	117 (53.92)	10 (37.04)

Chapter 4
DATA ANALYSIS

The null hypotheses for this study follow. There is no difference in traditional and adult, full- and part-time, and career and transfer students' perceptions of these aspects of academic advising:

1. Advisors' knowledge of and interest in advisees;
2. Accesibility of advisors;
3. Discussion of non-academic problems;

4. Advisor knowledge of institutional regulations and requirements;
5. Warmth and friendliness of advisor;
6. Frequency of contact;
7. Freedom and encouragement to be open;
8. Elimination of enrollment errors by advisors;
9. Satisfaction with advisor and the advising system; and,
10. Recommendations of the advisor and the advising model to others by the advisee.

In testing these hypotheses, the data consisted of students' responses to a series of questions concerning ten different academic advising traits (see Chapter 3). Students were requested to select one of five possible responses relative to each statement: Strongly disagree, tend to disagree, tend to agree, agree, strongly agree. Contingency tables were constructed and chi-square analyses were conducted for each advising trait measured by the survey instrument. The contingency tables included the number and percentage of students

responding to each measurement on the likert scale, the percentage of students who agreed (responses of tend to agree, or strongly agree) or disagree (responses of tend to disagree, or strongly disagree), and the chi square probability. The level of significance was established as .10. In light of this type of study (where life and death issues are not at stake), the .10 level of significance seemed appropriate to use in gathering data about student perceptions of advising.

Each table refers to a particular question on the survey instrument. All of the questions are identified with the letter A for positive questions, and the letter B for the negative questions.

Each cell of a given contingency table reflected the number of persons fitting into it on the basis of their responses to the questionnaire and the percentage of the total that they constitute respectively. Each grouping of tables was followed by a narrative treatment of the data. Data in the narrative was rounded to the nearest whole percent.

An advising trait was determined to be statistically significant different if the chi square probability of the positive, negative, or both types of questions measuring the advising trait was .10 or less.

All students were grouped together (traditional and adult, career and transfer) and then broken into (polarized into) either full-time or part-time students. This polarization resulted in eight categories of students:

1. Full-time traditional career (FTC)
2. Full-time traditional transfer (FTT)
3. Full-time adult career (FAC)
4. Full-time adult transfer (FAT)
5. Part-time traditional career (PTC)
6. Part-time traditional transfer (PTT)
7. Part-time adult career (PAC)
8. Part-time adult transfer (PAT)

1. Advisor Knowledge of and Interest in Advisee

Tables 7 and 8 contain the percentages of students' perceptions of advisors' knowledge of, and interest in, advisees. There were statistically significant differences between adult and traditional students for both the positive (QIA) and the negative (QIB) questions concerning advisors' knowledge of and interest in the advisees and the variable student. The adults (approximately 85%) agreed more than the traditional students (approximately 70.00%) that the advisors were knowledgeable of and interested in advisees. About one-fourth of the traditional and only about one-tenth of the adult students indicated that they tended to disagree with the positive question (QIA) concerning advisors' knowledge of and interest in advisees.

The career and transfer students also showed statistically significant differences (IA) in their perception of the advisors' knowledge of and interest in the advisees. Over 20% more career (89%) than transfer (68%) students agreed that the advisors were knowledgeable of, and interested in, advisees. About 90% of the career

Table 7
Students' Responses to Advisors' Knowledge and Interest in Advisees

Q1A. I feel that my advisor knows me as an individual and is interested in me as a person.
Q1B. I doubt that my advisor knows who I am or anything about me.

	Strongly Tend to		Tend to		N	Mean	Total		Chi Square
	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree			Agree	Disagree	
Q1A	8	24	19	32	107	3.374	70.90%	29.91%	
Traditional	7.48%	22.43%	17.76%	29.91%					
Adult	7	9	25	37	100	4.060	85.42%	14.54%	0.0570*
Career	3	8	19	40	100	3.860	89.00%	11.00%	
Transfer	12	25	25	29	117	3.274	68.37%	31.63%	0.0033*
Full	8	16	30	44	139	3.678	82.73%	17.27%	
Part	7	17	14	25	78	3.308	69.23%	30.77%	0.1591
Q1B	59	18	9	14	107	1.991	28.04%	71.96%	
Traditional	55.14%	16.82%	8.41%	13.08%					
Adult	59	34	6	7	100	1.930	15.45%	84.55%	0.0709*
Career	59	28	4	5	100	1.570	13.00%	87.00%	
Transfer	59	24	11	16	117	2.043	29.06%	70.94%	0.6420
Full	79	37	8	9	139	1.748	16.55%	83.45%	
Part	39	15	7	12	78	2.089	30.77%	69.23%	0.1442

*p < .10

and only about 70% of the transfer students indicated that they disagreed with question 1B.

There was no statistically significant difference between full and part-time students' perception of advisors' knowledge of and interest in advisees. About 80% of the full and about 70% of the part-time students agreed with question 1A concerning advisors' knowledge of and interest in advisees.

Table 8 contains the percentage distribution and the chi square probability for the polarization of students' perceptions of advisors' knowledge of, and interest in, advisees. There were statistically significant differences among the polarization categories in the students' perceptions of advisors' knowledge of, and interest in, advisees. Only about 40% of the part-time traditional transfer students agreed with question 1A. All of the full-time adult career students agreed with question 1A. In the first 4 categories (full-time adult career, full-time adult transfer, full-time traditional career, full-time traditional transfer) about 20% more of the categories with career students than the categories with transfer students responded more favorably to the advisors' knowledge of, and interest in, advisees.

2. Accessibility of Advisor

Table 9 contains the percentages of students' perceptions about the accessibility of advisors. There was a statistically significant difference for the positive question between traditional and adult students' perceptions of the accessibility of advisors. Eighty-one

Table 8

Q1. Advisor Knowledge of and Interest in Advisee

- A. I feel that my advisor knows me as an individual and is interested in me as a person.
- B. I doubt that my advisor knows who I am or anything about me.

	1A			1B		
	Disagree	Agree	N	Disagree	Agree	N
Full Time Adult Career	0 0.00	36 100.00	36	35 97.22	1 2.78	36
Full Time Adult Transfer	7 23.33	23 76.67	30	24 80.00	6 20.00	30
Full Time Traditional Career	4 12.50	28 87.50	32	29 87.50	12 12.50	41
Full Time Traditional Transfer	13 31.71	28 68.29	41	29 70.73	12 29.27	41
Part Time Adult Career	4 21.05	15 78.95	19	14 73.68	6 26.32	19
Part Time Adult Transfer	5 20.00	20 80.00	25	20 80.00	5 20.00	25
Part Time Traditional Career	3 23.08	10 76.92	13	10 76.92	3 23.08	13
Part Time Traditional Transfer	12 57.14	9 42.86	21	10 47.62	11 52.38	21
TOTAL	48	169	217	170	47	217

Table 9
Students' Responses to the Accessibility of Advisors

Q2A. When I need to see my advisor, I have little difficulty in setting up an appointment with him.
Q2B. Although my advisor has fairly definite office hours when he is available for advising, he is so busy it is almost impossible to see him.

	Strongly Disagree		Tend to Disagree		Tend to Agree		Strongly Agree		N	Mean	Total Agree	Total Disagree	Chi Square
	Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Disagree					
Q2A	8	12	16	46	25	107	3.636	81.31%	18.69%				
Traditional	7.48%	11.21%	14.95%	42.99%	23.36%								0.0700*
Adult	14	16	5	44	30	109	3.550	72.48%	27.52%				
	12.84%	14.68%	4.59%	40.37%	27.00%								
Career	11	13	6	43	27	100	3.620	89.00%	11.00%				
	11.00%	13.00%	6.00%	43.00%	27.00%								0.0033*
Transfer	11	15	15	47	28	116	3.569	68.37%	31.63%				
	9.48%	12.93%	12.93%	40.52%	24.14%								
Full	14	14	12	60	39	139	3.691	79.80%	20.14%				
	10.07%	10.07%	8.63%	43.17%	28.06%								0.3750
Part	8	14	9	30	16	77	3.415	71.41%	28.59%				
	10.39%	18.18%	11.69%	38.95%	20.78%								
Q2B	28	59	12	2	4	105	2.000	17.14%	82.86%				
Traditional	26.67%	56.19%	11.43%	1.90%	3.81%								0.3850
Adult	38	56	8	6	3	110	1.927	15.45%	84.55%				
	33.64%	50.91%	7.27%	5.45%	2.73%								
Career	30	53	10	4	2	99	1.939	13.00%	87.00%				
	30.30%	53.54%	10.10%	4.04%	2.02%								0.0643*
Transfer	35	62	10	4	5	116	1.983	29.06%	70.94%				
	30.17%	53.45%	8.62%	3.45%	4.31%								
Full	45	74	9	4	6	138	1.928	13.77%	86.23%				
	32.61%	53.62%	6.52%	2.90%	4.35%								0.1965
Part	20	41	11	4	1	77	2.026	20.78%	79.22%				
	25.97%	53.25%	14.29%	5.19%	1.30%								

*p < .10

percent of the traditional and 72% of the adults agreed that they had no trouble in seeing advisors. Only about 15% of both traditional and adult students agreed that they experience difficulty in seeing advisors.

The career and transfer students also showed statistically significant differences in their perceptions of the accessibility of advisors. Approximately 90% of the career and only about 70% of the transfer students agreed that advisors were available when needed. There were no statistically significant differences between full and part-time students' perceptions of the accessibility of advisors. Approximately 10% more full- than part-time students felt advisors were accessible when needed.

There were no statistically significant differences among the polarization categories in the students' perception of the accessibility of advisors (Table 10). Only about 60% of the full-time adult career students and approximately 90% of the full-time traditional career students agreed that advisors were accessible when needed. About 70% of the part-time adult career and over 80% of the part-time traditional career students agreed that advisors were accessible. Approximately 70% of the part-time adult transfer students and the part-time traditional transfer students agreed with question 2A. Nearly 40% of the part-time traditional career students and 25% of the part-time traditional transfer students agreed that advisors were too busy to see advisees (Q2B).

Table 10

Q2. Accessibility of Advisor

- A. When I need to see my advisor, I have little difficulty in setting up an appointment with him.
- B. Although my advisor has fairly definite office hours when he is available for advising, he is so busy it is almost impossible to see him.

	1A			1B		
	Disagree	Agree	N	Disagree	Agree	N
Full Time Adult Career	13 36.11	23 63.89	36	30 83.33	6 16.67	36
Full Time Adult Transfer	4 13.33	26 86.67	30	25 83.33	5 16.67	30
Full Time Traditional Career	3 9.38	29 90.63	32	29 93.55	2 6.45	31
Full Time Traditional Transfer	13 31.71	28 68.29	41	17 41.46	24 58.54	41
Part Time Adult Career	6 31.58	13 68.42	19	16 84.21	3 15.79	19
Part Time Adult Transfer	7 29.17	17 70.83	24	22 88.00	3 12.00	25
Part Time Traditional Career	2 15.38	11 84.62	13	8 61.54	5 38.46	13
Part Time Traditional Transfer	7 33.33	14 66.67	21	15 75.00	5 25.00	20
TOTAL	50	166	216	180	35	215

Table 11
Students' Responses to Discussion of Non-Academic Problems

Q3A. My relationship with my advisor is such that I would not hesitate to seek his advice on most subjects or problems I might have.

Q3B. If I have a problem of a personal nature, I would not think of going to my advisor to discuss it

	Strongly Tend to Disagree		Tend to Disagree		Agree		Strongly Agree		N	Mean	Total Agree	Total Disagree	Chi Square
	Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree			%	%	Probability
Q3A	13	19	24	33	18	18	107	3.224	70.09%	29.91%			
Traditional	12.15%	17.76%	22.43%	30.84%	16.82%								
Adult	10	16	15	39	28		108	3.546	75.93%	24.07%			0.2491
	9.26%	14.81%	13.89%	36.11%	25.93%								
Career	5	13	19	38	25		100	3.650	82.00%	18.00%			
	5.00%	13.00%	19.00%	38.00%	25.00%								
Transfer	18	22	20	34	21		115	3.157	65.22%	32.78%			0.0550*
	15.65%	19.13%	17.39%	29.57%	18.26%								
Full	16	15	27	46	35		139	3.496	77.69%	22.31%			
	11.51%	10.79%	19.42%	33.09%	25.18%								
Part	7	20	12	26	21		76	3.842	64.47%	35.53%			0.0324*
	9.21%	26.32%	15.79%	34.21%	14.47%								
Q3B	16	29	18	24	19		106	3.009	57.55%	42.55%			
Traditional	15.09%	27.36%	16.98%	22.64%	17.92%								
Adult	19	23	25	26	17		110	2.991	61.82%	38.18%			0.6978
	17.27%	20.91%	22.73%	23.64%	15.45%								
Career	20	29	18	23	9		99	2.717	50.50%	49.50%			
	20.20%	29.29%	18.18%	23.23%	9.09%								
Transfer	15	23	25	27	27		117	3.239	67.53%	32.47%			0.0377*
	12.82%	19.66%	21.37%	23.08%	23.08%								
Full	27	31	29	33	19		139	2.899	58.27%	41.73%			
	19.42%	22.30%	20.86%	23.74%	13.67%								
Part	8	21	14	17	17		77	3.182	62.34%	37.66%			0.2537
	10.39%	27.27%	18.18%	22.08%	22.08%								

*p < .10

3. Discussion of Non-Academic Problems

Table 11 contains the percentage of students' perceptions of their willingness to discuss non-academic problems with advisors. There were no statistically significant differences between traditional and adult students' willingness to discuss non-academic problems with advisors. Both the traditional and the adult students agreed about equally concerning their willingness to discuss non-academic problems with advisors.

There was, however, a statistically significant difference between career and transfer students' willingness to discuss non-academic problems with advisors. In both the negative and positive questions, the career students indicated more than the transfer students a willingness to discuss non-academic problems with advisors. About 50% of the career students and only about 30% of the transfer students indicated, in question 3B, their willingness to discuss non-academic problems with their advisors.

There were statistically significant differences between full- and part-time students' perceptions of their willingness to discuss non-academic problems with advisors. Nearly 80% of the full and approximately 60% of the part-time students indicated in question 3A their willingness to discuss non-academic problems with advisors.

There was a statistically significant difference among the polarization categories in the students' willingness to discuss non-academic problems with advisors (Table 12). About 90% of the full-time adult career and the full-time traditional career students agreed that

Table 12

Q3. Discussion of Non-Academic Problems

- A. My relationship with my advisor is such that I would not hesitate to seek his advice on most subjects or problems I might have.
- B. If I have a problem of a personal nature, I would not think of going to my advisor to discuss it.

	3A			3B		
	Disagree	Agree	N	Disagree	Agree	N
Full Time Adult Career	4 11.11	32 88.89	36	20 55.56	16 44.44	36
Full Time Adult Transfer	10 33.33	20 66.67	30	4 13.33	26 86.67	30
Full Time Traditional Career	4 12.50	28 87.50	32	17 53.13	15 46.88	31
Full Time Traditional Transfer	13 31.71	28 68.29	41	17 41.46	24 58.54	41
Part Time Adult Career	6 31.58	13 68.42	19	6 31.58	13 68.42	19
Part Time Adult Transfer	6 26.09	17 73.91	23	12 48.00	13 52.00	25
Part Time Traditional Career	4 30.77	9 69.23	13	6 50.00	6 50.00	12
Part Time Traditional Transfer	11 52.38	10 47.62	21	5 23.81	16 76.19	21
TOTAL	58	157	215	87	129	216

they would seek the advisors advice on most subjects or problems. Only about 70% of the full-time adult transfer and the full-time traditional transfer students agreed with question 3A. Approximately 70% of the part-time adult career, the part-time adult transfer, and the part-time traditional career students agreed that they would seek advisors' advice on most subjects; however, over 50% of the part-time traditional transfer students indicated that they would not seek the advice of advisors on most subject matters. Nearly 90% of the full-time adult transfer and about 80% of the part-time traditional transfer students indicated that they would not discuss personal problems with advisors.

4. Advisor Knowledge of Institutional Regulations and Requirements

Table 13 contains the percentages of students' perceptions of advisors' knowledge of institutional regulations and requirements. There was no statistically significant difference between traditional and adult students' perception of advisor knowledge of institutional regulations and requirements. Question 4A indicated that nearly 95% of both the traditional and the adult students had confidence in the advisors' knowledge of school regulations and requirements; however, Q4B indicated that nearly 38% of the traditional and only 23% of the adult students felt advisors were not knowledgeable about course offerings and regulations.

There were statistically significant differences between career and transfer students concerning their perceptions of the advisors' knowledge of institutional regulations and requirements. About the same number of career and transfer students (approximately 90%)

Table 13
 Students' Responses to Advisors' Knowledge of
 Institutional Regulations and Requirements

Q4A. My advisor appears well informed on course requirements, regulations, etc., and I can place a great deal of confidence in any suggestions he might make regarding this matter.
 Q4B. My advisor seems to know little more about course offerings, regulations, than I do.

	Strongly Tend to Disagree		Tend to Disagree		Tend to Agree		Strongly Agree		N	Mean	Total Agree	Total Disagree	Chi Square Probability
Q4A	12	5	17	40	43	107	4.187	93.46%	6.54%				
Traditional	1.87%	4.67%	15.89%	37.38%	40.19%								
Adult	3	4	12	43	48	109	4.211	94.50%	5.50%				0.8549
Adult	1.83%	3.67%	11.01%	39.45%	44.04%								
Career	1	4	7	37	51	100	4.330	95.00%	5.00%				
Career	1.00%	4.00%	7.00%	37.00%	51.00%								
Transfer	3	5	22	46	40	116	3.991	93.11%	6.84%				0.0397*
Transfer	2.59%	4.31%	18.97%	39.66%	34.48%								
Full	2	8	19	48	62	139	4.151	92.80%	7.20%				
Full	1.44%	5.76%	13.67%	34.53%	44.60%								
Part	2	1	10	35	29	77	4.142	96.10%	3.90%				0.3137
Part	2.60%	1.30%	12.99%	45.45%	37.66%								
Q4B	40	26	9	19	12	106	2.405	37.73%	62.27%				
Traditional	37.74%	24.53%	8.49%	17.92%	11.32%								
Adult	59	25	7	11	7	109	1.917	22.93%	77.07%				0.1197
Adult	54.13%	22.94%	6.42%	10.09%	6.42%								
Career	47	19	4	19	11	100	2.280	34.00%	66.00%				
Career	47.00%	19.00%	4.00%	19.00%	11.00%								
Transfer	52	32	12	11	8	115	2.052	20.95%	73.05%				0.0520*
Transfer	45.22%	27.83%	10.43%	9.57%	6.96%								
Full	66	32	8	20	13	139	2.152	29.50%	70.50%				
Full	47.48%	23.02%	5.76%	14.39%	9.35%								
Part	33	19	8	10	6	76	2.171	31.58%	68.42%				0.7484
Part	43.42%	25.00%	10.53%	13.16%	7.69%								

*p < .10

indicated that advisors were knowledgeable about institutional regulations and requirements; however, about 50% of the career and only about 30% of the transfer students indicated they strongly agreed with question 4A.

There was no statistically significant difference between full- and part-time students' perceptions of the advisors' knowledge of institutional regulations and requirements. Nearly all of the full- and part-time students (about 90%) were pleased with the advisors' knowledge of institutional regulations and requirements.

There was a statistically significant difference among the polarization categories concerning the students' perceptions of the advisors' knowledge of institutional regulations and requirements (Table 14). Nearly all categories agreed substantially (from 87 to 100%) that advisors were well informed on course requirements and regulations (Q4A). Nearly 50% of the full-time traditional career, part-time traditional career, and part-time traditional transfer students agreed that advisors did not know much about course offerings (Q4B).

5. Warmth and Friendliness of Advisor

Table 15 contains the percentages of students' perceptions of the warmth and friendliness of advisors. There was no statistically significant difference between traditional and adult students' perceptions of advisors' warmth and friendliness to advisees. Nearly 90% of both the traditional and the adult students felt advisors were warm and friendly with advisees. There were statistically significant

Table 14

Q4 - Advisor Knowledge of Institutional
Regulations and Requirements

- A. My advisor appears well informed on course requirements, regulations, etc., and I can place a great deal of confidence in any suggestions he might make regarding this matter.
- B. My advisor seems to know little more about course offerings, regulations, than I do.

	4A			4B		
	Disagree	Agree	N	Disagree	Agree	N
Full Time Adult Career	2 5.56	34 94.44	36	25 69.44	11 30.56	36
Full Time Adult Transfer	2 6.67	28 93.33	30	25 83.33	5 16.67	30
Full Time Traditional Career	1 3.13	31 96.88	32	17 53.13	15 46.88	31
Full Time Traditional Transfer	5 12.20	36 87.80	41	31 75.61	10 24.39	41
Part Time Adult Career	1 5.26	18 94.74	19	17 89.47	2 10.53	19
Part Time Adult Transfer	1 4.17	23 95.83	24	17 70.83	7 29.17	24
Part Time Traditional Career	1 7.69	12 92.31	13	7 53.85	6 46.15	13
Part Time Traditional Transfer	0 0.00	21 100.00	21	11 55.00	9 45.00	21
TOTAL	13	203	216	150	65	215

Table 15
Students' Responses to the Warmth and Friendliness of Advisors

Q5A. In our meetings together, my advisor appears warm, interested, and patient with me.
Q5B. My advisor appears cold, doesn't pay much attention to what I am saying, and is rather brisk in his manner with me.

	Strongly Disagree	Tend to Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	N	Mean	Total Agree	Total Disagree	Chi Square Probability
Q5A	2	8	24	40	106	3.867	90.50%	9.44%	
Traditional	1.89%	7.55%	22.64%	37.74%	30.19%				
Adult	2	9	18	37	43	4.009	89.91%	10.09%	0.6260
	1.83%	8.26%	16.51%	33.94%	39.45%				
Career	0	7	13	43	36	4.090	92.92%	7.08%	
	0.00%	7.07%	13.13%	43.43%	36.36%				
Transfer	4	10	29	34	39	3.810	87.93%	12.02%	0.0397*
	3.45%	8.62%	25.00%	29.31%	33.62%				
Full	4	11	24	49	50	3.942	89.13%	10.87%	
	2.90%	7.97%	17.39%	35.51%	36.23%				
Part	0	6	18	28	25	4.090	92.21%	7.79%	0.5009
Q5B	62	36	7	0	2	1.542	8.42%	91.68%	
Traditional	57.94%	33.64%	6.54%	0.00%	1.87%				
Adult	72	28	4	3	3	1.518	9.10%	90.09%	0.2207
	65.45%	25.45%	3.64%	2.73%	2.73%				
Career	70	21	6	2	1	1.430	9.00%	91.00%	
	70.00%	21.00%	6.00%	2.00%	1.00%				
Transfer	64	43	5	1	4	1.501	8.55%	91.45%	0.0669*
	54.70%	36.75%	4.27%	0.85%	3.42%				
Full	92	35	6	3	3	1.489	8.63%	91.37%	
	66.19%	25.18%	4.32%	2.15%	2.16%				
Part	42	29	5	0	2	1.602	8.97%	91.03%	0.2128
	53.85%	37.18%	6.41%	0.00%	2.56%				

*p < .10

differences between the career and the transfer students' perceptions of the warmth and the friendliness of advisors. About the same number of career and transfer students (90%) indicated that they thought the advisors were friendly; however, question 5B revealed that 70% of the career and only about 50% of the transfer students indicated that they strongly disagreed with the statement that advisors were cold, unattentive, and brisk.

There were no statistically significant differences between the full- and the part-time students' perceptions of the warmth and the friendliness of advisors. Both full- and part-time students (about 90%) felt advisors were friendly.

There were no statistically significant differences among the polarization categories concerning the students' perceptions of the warmth and friendliness of advisors (Table 16). Nearly all of the categories agreed substantially that advisors were friendly. All of the full-time traditional career students agreed with question 5A.

6. Frequency of Contact

Table 17 contains the percentages of students' perceptions of the frequency of contact advisees would like to have with advisors. There was no statistically significant difference between traditional and adult students' perceptions of the frequency advisees should meet with advisors. About 50% of the traditional and adult students indicated that they meet with the advisors at least once a quarter other than at registration.

Table 16

Q5 - Warmth and Friendliness of Advisor

- A. In our meetings together, my advisor appears warm, interested, and patient with me.
- B. My advisor appears cold, doesn't pay much attention to what I am saying, and is rather brisk in his manner with me.

	5A			5B		
	Disagree	Agree	N	Disagree	Agree	N
Full Time Adult Career	3 8.57	32 91.43	35	33 91.67	3 8.33	36
Full Time Adult Transfer	4 13.33	26 86.67	30	27 90.00	3 10.00	30
Full Time Traditional Career	0 0.00	32 100.00	32	31 96.88	1 3.13	31
Full Time Traditional Transfer	8 19.51	33 80.49	41	36 87.80	5 12.20	41
Part Time Adult Career	3 15.79	16 84.21	19	16 84.21	3 15.79	19
Part Time Adult Transfer	1 4.00	24 96.00	25	24 96.00	1 4.00	25
Part Time Traditional Career	1 7.69	12 92.31	13	11 84.62	2 15.38	13
Part Time Traditional Transfer	1 5.00	19 95.00	20	20 95.24	1 4.76	21
TOTAL	21	194	215	198	19	217

Table 17
Students' Responses to the Desired Frequency of Contact with Advisors

	Strongly Disagree	Tend to Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	N	Mean	Total Agree	Total Disagree	Chi Square Probability
Q6A.	I usually meet with my advisor at least one or more times a quarter other than at registration (or pre-registration).								
Q6B.	About the only time I use my advisor is at registration (or pre-registration) and sometimes not even then.								
Q6A	17	28	32	16	106	3.018	57.54%	42.46%	
Traditional	16.04%	26.42%	30.19%	15.09%					
Adult	18	28	32	14	107	2.962	57.01%	42.99%	0.9448
Adult	16.82%	26.17%	29.91%	13.08%					
Career	12	23	41	13	100	3.200	65.00%	35.00%	
Career	12.00%	23.00%	41.00%	13.00%					
Transfer	23	33	23	17	113	2.895	50.43%	49.57%	0.0327*
Transfer	20.35%	29.20%	20.35%	15.04%					
Full	15	34	46	27	138	3.260	63.76%	36.24%	
Full	10.87%	24.64%	33.33%	19.57%					
Part	20	22	18	3	75	2.493	44.00%	56.00%	0.0026*
Part	26.67%	29.33%	24.00%	4.00%					
Q6B	29	30	14	18	106	2.641	41.45%	58.55%	
Traditional	27.36%	28.30%	13.21%	16.98%					
Adult	34	32	21	7	109	2.403	39.45%	60.55%	0.1549
Adult	31.19%	29.36%	19.27%	6.42%					
Career	34	32	16	9	100	2.340	34.00%	66.00%	
Career	34.00%	32.00%	16.00%	9.00%					
Transfer	29	30	19	16	115	2.678	48.57%	51.31%	0.1671
Transfer	25.22%	26.09%	16.52%	13.91%					
Full	50	45	17	13	139	2.266	31.66%	68.34%	
Full	35.97%	32.37%	12.23%	9.35%					
Part	13	17	18	12	76	2.986	60.52%	39.48%	0.0015*
Part	17.11%	22.37%	23.68%	15.79%					

*p < .10

There was a statistically significant difference between career and transfer students' perceptions of the frequency advisees should meet with advisors. Sixty-five percent of the career and only about 50% of the transfer students indicated that they met with advisors at least once a quarter. Nearly 50% of the transfer and only about 30% of the career students agreed that they only used advisors at registration, if at all.

There was also a statistically significant difference between full- and part-time students' perceptions of the frequency advisees should meet with advisors. Twice as many part-time students (about 60%) as full-time students (about 30%) agreed that they only met with advisors at registration, if at all.

There were statistically significant differences among the polarization categories concerning the students' perceptions of the frequency of contact advisees should have with advisors (Table 18). Less than 50% of the full-time traditional transfer, part-time adult career, part-time adult transfer, and part-time traditional transfer students indicated that they met with advisors at least one or more times a quarter. Over 62% of the part-time adult transfer, about 53% of the part-time traditional career, and 78% of the part-time traditional transfer students indicated that they only used advisors during registration.

7. Freedom and Encouragement to be Open

Table 19 contains the percentages of students' perceptions of the advisors' ability to encourage advisees to be free to discuss any

Table 18

Q6 - Frequency of Contact

- A. I usually meet with my advisor at least one or more times a quarter other than at registration (or pre-registration).
- B. About the only time I use my advisor is at registration (or pre-registration) and sometimes not even then.

	6A			6B		
	Disagree	Agree	N	Disagree	Agree	N
Full Time Adult Career	11 30.56	25 69.44	36	26 72.22	10 27.78	36
Full Time Adult Transfer	11 37.93	18 62.07	29	21 70.00	9 30.00	30
Full Time Traditional Career	6 18.75	26 81.25	32	24 75.00	8 25.00	32
Full Time Traditional Transfer	21 51.22	19 46.34	41	24 58.54	17 41.46	41
Part Time Adult Career	12 63.16	7 36.84	19	10 52.63	9 47.37	19
Part Time Adult Transfer	12 52.17	11 47.83	23	9 37.50	15 62.50	24
Part Time Traditional Career	6 46.15	7 53.85	13	6 46.15	7 53.85	13
Part Time Traditional Transfer	12 60.00	8 40.00	20	5 25.00	15 75.00	20
TOTAL	91	121	213	125	90	215

Table 19
Students' Responses to the Advisors' Ability to Encourage
Advisees to be Free and Open

- Q7A. My advisor makes me feel at ease and by his manner encourages me to discuss anything which might be helpful to me.
Q7B. My advisor usually appears so rushed that I hesitate to ask many of the questions or to discuss areas which I feel would be helpful to me.

	Strongly Tend to Tend to		Strongly		N	Mean	Total Agree	Total Disagree	Chi Square Probability
	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree					
Q7A	3	14	20	41	107	3.738	84.12%	15.88%	
Traditional	2.80%	13.08%	18.69%	38.32%					
Adult	5	11	12	49	110	3.854	85.45%	14.55%	0.4354
	4.55%	10.00%	10.91%	44.55%					
Career	1	7	12	51	100	4.000	92.00%	8.00%	
	1.00%	7.00%	12.00%	51.00%					
Transfer	7	18	20	39	117	3.623	78.63%	21.37%	0.0178*
	5.98%	15.38%	17.09%	33.33%					
Full	7	12	20	56	139	3.848	86.33%	13.67%	
	5.04%	8.63%	14.39%	40.29%					
Part	1	13	12	34	78	3.705	82.05%	17.95%	0.1875
Q7B	39	50	8	3	107	1.960	16.82%	83.18%	
Traditional	36.45%	46.73%	7.48%	2.80%					
Adult	55	41	3	7	110	1.700	12.73%	87.27%	0.0824*
	50.00%	37.27%	2.73%	6.36%					
Career	48	43	3	2	100	1.710	9.00%	91.00%	
	48.00%	43.00%	3.00%	2.00%					
Transfer	46	48	8	8	117	1.990	19.65%	80.35%	0.2218
	39.32%	41.03%	6.84%	6.84%					
Full	61	57	6	7	139	1.870	15.11%	84.89%	
	43.88%	41.01%	4.32%	5.04%					
Part	33	34	5	3	78	1.830	14.10%	85.90%	0.9017
	42.31%	43.59%	6.41%	3.85%					

*p < .10

topics of interest. There was a statistically significant difference between traditional and adult students' perceptions of advisors' encouraging advisees to be free to discuss anything of interest and concern. Both Q7A and Q7B indicated that approximately 85% of the traditional and the adult students felt advisors encouraged freedom and openness; however, Q7B revealed that 50% of the adults and only about 36% of the traditional students strongly disagreed that advisors encouraged advisees to be free and open.

There was also a statistically significant difference between career and transfer students' perception of advisors' ability to encourage freedom and openness in advisees. Over 90% of the career and not quite 80% of the transfer students felt advisors encouraged openness and freedom in advisees. Also, nearly 25% of the transfer students and only about 10% of the career students felt advisors were too rushed to answer advisees' questions.

There was no statistically significant difference between full- and part-time students' perception of the advisors' ability to encourage freedom and openness in advisees. About the same number of full- and part-time students (about 85%) felt advisors encouraged openness and freedom in advisees.

There was no statistically significant difference among the polarization categories concerning the students' perceptions of the advisors' ability to encourage advisees to be free to discuss any topics of interest (Table 20). Most of the categories agreed substantially (from 80 to 96%) that advisors encouraged students to

Table 20

Q7 - Freedom and Encouragement to be Open

- A. My advisor makes me feel at ease and by his manner encourages me to discuss anything which might be helpful to me.
- B. My advisor usually appears so rushed that I hesitate to ask many of the questions or to discuss areas which I feel would be helpful to me.

	7A			7B		
	Disagree	Agree	N	Disagree	Agree	N
Full Time Adult Career	3 8.33	33 91.67	36	33 91.67	3 8.33	36
Full Time Adult Transfer	6 20.00	24 80.00	30	23 76.67	7 23.33	30
Full Time Traditional Career	1 3.13	31 96.88	32	29 90.63	3 9.38	32
Full Time Traditional Transfer	9 21.95	32 78.05	41	33 80.49	8 19.51	41
Part Time Adult Career	3 15.79	16 84.21	19	18 94.74	1 5.26	19
Part Time Adult Transfer	4 16.00	21 85.00	25	22 88.00	3 12.00	25
Part Time Traditional Career	1 7.69	12 92.31	13	11 84.62	2 15.38	13
Part Time Traditional Transfer	6 28.57	15 71.43	21	16 76.19	5 23.81	21
TOTAL	33	184	217	185	32	217

discuss a variety of topics and concerns. Only about 78% of the full-time traditional transfer and approximately 71% of the part-time traditional transfer students agreed with question 7A. About 20% of the full-time adult transfer and the part-time traditional transfer students agreed that advisors were too rushed to take time for advisees.

8. Elimination of Enrollment Errors by Advisor

Table 21 contains the percentages of students' perceptions of advisors' skill in eliminating enrollment errors. There was no statistically significant difference between traditional and adult students' perceptions of advisors' ability to eliminate enrollment errors. Between 80% and 90% of both traditional and adult students indicated that they felt advisors knew enough about course requirements to assist advisees to eliminate enrollment errors.

There were statistically significant differences between career and transfer students' perception of advisors' ability to eliminate enrollment errors. Over 90% of the career and only about 80% of the transfer students felt advisors were informed about course offerings. Over 25% of the transfer students and only about 10% of the career students believed advisors were not well informed and caused enrollment errors.

There were no statistically significant differences between full- and part-time students' perception of advisors' ability to eliminate enrollment errors (Table 21). About 90% of both the full- and part-time students felt advisors eliminated enrollment errors.

Table 21
Students' Responses to the Advisors' Ability to
Eliminate Enrollment Errors

Q8A. My advisor is not only well informed about course requirements and regulations, but is also sufficiently conscientious about my enrollment each semester so that I am not handicapped with enrollment errors.
Q8B. Since my advisor is not very knowledgeable about his advising responsibilities, I can reasonably expect him to make some kind of enrollment error when I seek his help during pre-registration or registration.

	Strongly Disagree	Tend to Disagree	Agree	Tend to Agree	Strongly Agree	N	Mean	Total Agree	Total Disagree	Chi Square Probability
Q8A	5	14	23	39	25	106	3.738	82.07%	17.93%	
Traditional	4.72%	13.21%	21.70%	36.79%	23.58%					
Adult	5	10	18	38	38	109	3.854	80.24%	13.76%	0.4154
	4.59%	9.17%	16.51%	34.86%	34.86%					
Career	3	6	16	44	31	100	3.000	91.00%	9.00%	
	3.00%	6.00%	16.00%	44.00%	31.00%					
Transfer	7	18	25	33	32	115	3.623	78.27%	27.73%	0.0377*
	6.09%	15.65%	21.74%	28.70%	27.83%					
Full	7	15	24	47	45	138	3.848	84.06%	15.94%	
	5.07%	10.87%	17.39%	34.06%	32.61%					
Part	3	9	17	30	18	77	3.705	84.41%	15.59%	0.6419
Q8B	3.90%	11.69%	22.08%	38.96%	23.38%					
Traditional	58	37	6	4	1	106	1.960	10.37%	89.63%	
	54.72%	34.91%	5.66%	3.77%	0.94%					
Adult	68	30	5	2	3	108	1.700	9.53%	90.47%	0.5146
	62.96%	27.78%	4.63%	1.85%	2.78%					
Career	65	25	4	4	1	99	1.710	9.09%	90.91%	
	65.66%	25.25%	4.04%	4.04%	1.01%					
Transfer	61	42	7	2	3	115	1.990	10.44%	89.56%	0.2177
	53.04%	36.52%	6.09%	1.74%	2.61%					
Full	87	39	6	4	2	138	1.870	8.70%	91.30%	
	63.04%	28.26%	4.35%	2.90%	1.45%					
Part	39	28	5	2	2	76	1.830	11.84%	88.16%	0.5329
	51.32%	36.84%	6.58%	2.63%	2.63%					

*p < .10

Table 22

Q8 - Elimination of Enrollment Errors by Advisor

- A. My advisor is not only well informed about course requirements and regulations, but is also sufficiently conscientious about my enrollment each semester so that I am not handicapped with enrollment errors.
- B. Since my advisor is not very knowledgeable about his advising responsibilities, I can reasonably expect him to make some kind of enrollment error when I seek his help during pre-registration or registration.

	8A			8B		
	Disagree	Agree	N	Disagree	Agree	N
Full Time Adult Career	1 2.78	35 97.22	36	33 94.29	2 5.71	35
Full Time Adult Transfer	8 27.59	21 72.41	29	27 90.00	3 10.00	30
Full Time Traditional Career	4 12.50	28 87.50	32	29 90.63	3 9.38	32
Full Time Traditional Transfer	9 21.95	32 78.05	41	37 90.24	4 9.76	41
Part Time Adult Career	3 15.79	16 84.21	19	17 89.47	2 10.53	19
Part Time Adult Transfer	3 12.00	22 88.00	25	21 87.50	3 12.50	24
Part Time Traditional Career	1 7.69	12 92.31	13	11 84.62	2 15.38	13
Part Time Traditional Transfer	5 25.00	15 75.00	20	18 90.00	2 10.00	20
TOTAL	34	181	215	193	21	214

There was no statistically significant difference among the polarization categories concerning the advisors' ability to eliminate enrollment errors (Table 22). Although most of the categories agreed that advisors assisted in eliminating enrollment errors, only about 70% of the full-time adult transfer and 75% of the part-time traditional transfer students agreed with question 8A.

9. Satisfaction with the Advisor and the Advising System

Table 23 contains percentages of students' perceptions of their satisfaction with the advisor and the advising system. There were no statistically significant differences for the positive questions between traditional and adult students' perceptions of their satisfaction with the advisor and the advising system. From 82 to 92% of students in traditional and adult groups agreed that they were satisfied with the advising system. However, there was a statistically significant difference for the negative question between traditional and adult students' perceptions of their satisfaction with the advisor and the advising system. About 21% of the traditional and only about 14% of the adult students indicated that they were frustrated with the advisors. Furthermore, about 1% of the adult students and approximately 6% of the traditional students indicated that they strongly agreed that advisors gave them a feeling of frustration.

There were statistically significant differences for both the positive and negative questions between career and transfer students' perceptions of their satisfaction with the advisor and the advising system. Over 90% of the career and about 80% of the transfer students

Table 23
Students' Responses to Their Satisfaction with the
Advisor and the Advising System

Q9A.1 I have been satisfied with my advisement.
Q9A.2 I am satisfied with my advisor.

	Strongly Disagree	Tend to Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	N	Mean	Total Agree	Total Disagree	Chi Square Probability
A9A.1	8	8	23	31	107	3.738	89.00%	14.96%	
Traditional	7.48%	7.48%	21.50%	34.58%					
Adult	6	6	13	45	109	3.854	85.04%	11.00%	0.2847
	5.50%	5.50%	11.93%	41.28%					
Career	6	3	15	40	100	3.000	91.00%	9.00%	
	6.00%	3.00%	15.00%	40.00%					
Transfer	8	11	21	42	116	3.623	83.62%	16.38%	0.3080
	6.90%	9.48%	18.10%	36.21%					
Full	8	12	21	51	139	3.848	85.61%	14.39%	
	5.76%	8.63%	15.11%	36.69%					
Part	6	2	15	31	77	3.705	89.61%	10.39%	0.3960
	7.79%	2.60%	19.48%	40.26%					
Q9A.2	5	8	17	44	107	3.859	87.85%	12.15%	
Traditional	4.67%	7.48%	15.89%	41.12%					
Adult	3	6	10	49	108	4.083	91.66%	8.34%	0.4724
	2.78%	5.56%	9.26%	45.37%					
Career	3	3	9	45	99	4.151	93.93%	6.07%	
	3.03%	3.03%	9.09%	45.45%					
Transfer	5	11	18	48	116	3.813	86.21%	13.79%	0.1251
	4.31%	9.48%	15.52%	41.38%					
Full	7	11	14	61	138	3.913	86.96%	13.04%	
	5.07%	7.97%	10.14%	44.20%					
Part	1	3	13	32	77	4.077	94.80%	5.20%	0.2651
	1.30%	3.90%	16.88%	41.56%					

*p < .10

Table 23 (continued)

Q9A.3 I feel satisfied as a result of my talks with my advisor.
 Q9B. My advisor gives me a feeling of frustration.

	Strongly Disagree	Tend to Disagree	Agree	Tend to Agree	Strongly Agree	N	Mean	Total Agree	Total Disagree	Chi Square Probability
Q9A.3	4	15	26	40	21	106	3.556	82.08%	17.92%	
Traditional	3.77%	14.15%	24.53%	37.74%	19.81%					
Adult	3	9	24	42	31	109	3.816	88.99%	11.01%	0.4549
Career	0	8	25	42	24	99	3.828	91.91%	8.09%	
	0.00%	8.08%	25.25%	42.42%	24.24%					0.0681*
Transfer	7	16	25	40	28	116	3.568	80.17%	19.83%	
Full	5	17	31	50	36	139	3.683	84.17%	15.83%	
	3.60%	12.23%	22.30%	35.97%	25.90%					0.7984
Part	2	7	19	32	16	76	3.697	88.16%	11.84%	
Q9B	50	34	13	4	6	107	1.897	21.49%	78.51%	
Traditional	46.73%	31.78%	12.15%	3.74%	5.81%					0.0360*
Adult	69	26	7	7	1	110	1.590	13.63%	86.37%	
Career	63	22	10	2	3	100	1.680	15.00%	85.00%	
	63.00%	22.00%	10.00%	2.00%	3.00%					0.0918*
Transfer	56	38	10	9	4	117	1.863	19.66%	80.34%	
Full	72	40	12	8	7	139	1.834	19.42%	80.56%	
	51.80%	28.78%	8.63%	5.76%	5.04%					0.2617
Part	47	20	8	3	0	78	1.576	14.10%	85.90%	
	60.26%	25.64%	10.26%	3.85%	0.00%					

*p < .10

indicated they were satisfied with the advisors and the advising system.

There was no statistically significant difference between full- and part-time students' perception of their satisfaction with the advisor and the advising system. Between 80 and 95% of full- and part-time students were satisfied with the advisor and the advising system.

There were statistically significant differences for one of the questions among the polarization categories concerning the students' perceptions of their satisfaction with the advisor and the advising delivery system (Table 24). Question 9A3 revealed that 96% of the full-time adult career, 80% of the full-time adult transfer, 93% of the full-time traditional career, and only 70% of the full-time traditional transfer students indicated they were satisfied as a result of talks with their advisor. Nearly 30% of the full-time traditional transfer students indicated they were not satisfied with their advisement (9A1). Over one-fourth of the full-time traditional students indicated that advisors gave them a feeling of frustration (9B).

10. Recommendation of the Advisor and Advisee Program to Others by the Advisee

Table 25 contains percentages of students' perceptions of their willingness to recommend the advisors and the advising system to others. There was no statistically significant difference between traditional and adult students' willingness to recommend advisors and the advising system to others. All three questions revealed that more adult than traditional students would recommend the advisor or the

Table 24

99. Satisfaction with the Advisor and the Advising System

A.1 I have been satisfied with my advisement.

A.2 I am satisfied with my advisor.

A.3 I feel satisfied as a result of my talks with my advisor.

B. My advisor gives me a feeling of frustration.

A.1 A.2 A.3 B

	Dis- Agree	Dis- Agree	N	Dis- Agree	N	Dis- Agree	Total	Dis- Agree	N
Full time	3	33	36	2	33	35	36	31	36
Adult Career	8.33	91.67		5.71	94.29		94.44	86.11	13.89
Full Time	4	26	30	5	25	30	30	25	30
Adult Transfer	13.33	86.67		16.67	83.33		80.00	83.33	16.67
Full Time	2	30	32	2	30	32	32	29	32
Traditional Career	6.25	93.75		6.25	93.75		93.75	81.25	18.75
Full Time	11	30	41	9	32	41	41	30	41
Traditional Transfer	26.83	73.17		21.95	78.05		70.73	73.17	26.83
Part Time	2	17	19	2	17	19	18	17	19
Adult Career	10.53	89.47		10.53	89.47		88.89	89.47	10.53
Part Time	3	21	24	0	24	24	25	22	25
Adult Transfer	12.50	87.50		0.00	100.00		92.00	88.00	12.00
Part Time	2	11	13	0	13	13	13	11	13
Traditional Career	15.38	84.62		0.00	100.00		84.62	84.62	15.38
Part Time	1	20	21	2	19	21	20	17	21
Traditional Transfer	4.76	95.24		9.52	90.48		85.00	80.95	19.05
TOTAL	28	188	216	22	193	215	215	179	217

Table 25

Q10. Recommendation by the Advisee of the Advisor and Advisee Program to Others

- A.1 I feel I could recommend my advisor to another student.
- A.2 Colleges should provide advisors like mine.
- A.3 I feel that other colleges should provide advisement like this College provides.

	Strongly Disagree		Tend to Disagree		Tend to Agree		Strongly Agree		N	Mean	Total Agree	Total Disagree	Chi Square
	Count	Percentage	Count	Percentage	Count	Percentage	Count	Percentage			Count	Count	Probability
A.1 Traditional	5	4.72%	12	11.32%	13	12.26%	40	37.74%	106	3.849	61.96%	38.04%	
Adult	4	3.64%	10	9.09%	12	10.91%	37	42.73%	110	4.027	87.27%	12.73%	0.7662
Career	3	3.00%	8	8.00%	8	8.00%	37	44.00%	100	4.110	89.00%	11.00%	
Transfer	6	5.17%	14	12.07%	17	14.66%	40	34.48%	116	3.793	82.76%	17.24%	0.2735
Full	5	3.62%	15	10.87%	14	10.14%	48	34.78%	138	3.978	85.51%	14.49%	
Part	4	5.13%	7	8.97%	11	14.10%	29	37.18%	78	3.873	85.90%	14.10%	0.7975
A.2 Traditional	7	6.54%	12	11.21%	23	21.50%	35	32.71%	107	3.644	82.25%	17.75%	
Adult	6	5.61%	6	5.61%	25	23.36%	31	28.97%	107	3.850	88.78%	11.22%	0.6663
Career	3	3.03%	5	5.05%	20	20.20%	33	33.33%	99	3.939	91.91%	8.09%	
Transfer	10	8.70%	13	11.30%	28	24.35%	33	28.70%	115	3.539	80.01%	19.99%	0.0839*
Full	10	7.19%	13	9.35%	24	17.27%	43	30.94%	139	3.776	83.46%	16.54%	
Part	3	4.00%	5	6.67%	24	32.00%	23	30.67%	75	3.693	89.33%	10.67%	0.1325

*p < .10

Table 25 (continued)

	Strongly Disagree	Tend to Disagree	Tend to Agree	Strongly Agree	N	Mean	Total Agree	Total Disagree	Chi Square Probability
A.3	4	11	33	25	107	3.607	85.98%	14.02%	
Traditional	3.74%	10.28%	30.84%	23.36%					
Adult	3	5	27	36	109	3.935	92.66%	7.34%	0.2690
	2.75%	4.29%	24.77%	33.03%					
Career	1	4	24	32	100	3.970	95.00%	5.00%	
	1.00%	4.00%	24.00%	32.00%					
Transfer	6	12	36	29	116	3.577	84.48%	15.52%	0.0500*
	5.17%	10.34%	31.03%	25.00%					
Full	4	13	24	43	139	3.791	87.77%	12.23%	
	2.88%	9.35%	24.46%	30.94%					
Part	3	3	26	19	77	3.701	92.20%	7.80%	0.3079
	3.90%	3.90%	33.77%	23.38%					

advising program to others. Question 10A1 indicated that about 90% of the adults and only about 60% of the traditional students would recommend the advisor or the advising program to others.

There were statistically significant differences between career and transfer students' perceptions of their willingness to recommend the advisors and the advising system to others. Over 90% of the career and only about 80% of the transfer students would recommend the advisor and the advisee program to others. Question 10A3 indicated that over 15% of the transfer and only 5% of the career students believed other colleges should provide advisement like their college.

There was no statistically significant difference between full- and part-time students' perceptions of their willingness to recommend the advisors and the advisee program to others. Between 83 and 93% of the full- and the part-time students indicated that they would recommend their advisor and the advisee program to others.

There were statistically significant differences for one of the questions among the polarization categories concerning the students' willingness to recommend the advisor and the advising delivery system to others (Table 26). Over 40% of the full-time traditional transfer students disagreed with the statement that other colleges should provide advisement like their college (10A3). Over 20% of the full-time traditional transfer students indicated that they could not recommend their advisor to another student (9A1) and nearly 30% of the same group indicated that other colleges should not provide advisors like theirs (10A2).

Table 26

Q10 - Recommendation by the Advisee of the Advisor
and Advisee Program to Others

A.1 I feel I could recommend my advisor to another student.

A.2 Colleges should provide advisors like mine.

A.3 I feel that other colleges should provide advisement like this
College provides.

	10A1			10A2			10A3		
	Dis- agree	Agree	N	Dis- agree	Agree	N	Dis- agree	Agree	N
Full Time Adult Career	1 2.78	35 97.22	36	3 8.33	33 91.67	36	3 8.33	33 91.67	36
Full Time Adult Transfer	4 13.33	26 86.67	30	5 16.67	25 83.33	30	6 20.00	24 80.00	30
Full Time Traditional Career	3 9.38	29 90.63	32	3 9.38	29 90.63	32	1 3.13	31 96.88	32
Full Time Traditional Transfer	9 21.95	32 78.05	41	9 29.03	31 16.76	40	13 41.94	28 15.30	41
Part Time Adult Career	0 0.00	9 100.00	19	3 9.68	16 8.65	19	2 6.45	16 8.74	18
Part Time Adult Transfer	3 12.50	21 87.50	24	3 9.68	22 11.89	25	1 4.35	22 95.65	23
Part Time Traditional Career	1 7.69	12 92.31	13	2 15.38	11 84.62	13	2 15.38	11 84.62	13
Part Time Traditional Transfer	2 9.52	19 90.48	21	3 14.29	18 85.71	21	3 14.29	18 85.71	21
TOTAL	23	193	216	31	185	216	31	183	214

Advising Services

Question 24 on the survey instrument listed seven advising services and students were requested to circle the number of all services they would use if they were offered. Table 16 summarizes the responses. The traditional students indicated (45.8%) they would use student advisors and the adult students (25.7%) listed evening advising hours as the most preferred advising service. The career students listed student advisors (37.0%) and the transfer students listed student support groups (33.1%) and student advisors (33.1%) as their most preferred advising service. Full-time students listed student advisors (36%) and part-time students listed evening advising hours as their most preferred advising service. All of the groups listed Saturday advising hours as their least preferred advising service. The service preferred most by all groups was student advisors and student support groups were preferred second. The least preferred service among all groups was Saturday advising.

Question number 24 also had provisions for students to write other advising services not specifically listed that they would use. Only 14 students wrote in other advising services. Two students indicated identical service. The services indicated were (in no particular order):

1. specialized transfer advisors;
2. counseling;
3. transfer information;
4. a place to express the frustrations of college; and

Table 27
 Advising Services Students Indicated They Would Use

Total in Sample	Traditional	Adult	Career	Transfer	Full	Part						
	107	109	100	117	139	78						
	% of No. Total	% of No. Total	% of No. Total	% of No. Total	% of No. Total	% of No. Total						
Student Support Group	32	29.9	26	23.9	25	25.0	33	28.2	46	33.1	12	15.4
Student Meeting Room	24	22.4	17	15.6	20	20.0	21	17.9	33	23.7	8	10.3
Vocational Testing	11	10.28	24	22.0	19	19.0	16	13.7	21	15.1	14	18.0
Saturday Advising Hours	3	2.8	11	10.1	7	7.0	7	5.9	9	6.5	5	6.4
Evening Advising Hours	19	17.8	28	25.7	17	17.0	30	25.6	21	15.1	26	33.3
Tutoring	30	28.0	25	22.9	26	26.0	29	24.8	39	28.1	16	20.5
Student Advisees	49	45.8	21	19.3	37	37.0	33	28.1	50	36.0	20	25.6

5. job placement;
6. advice from employers and industry;
7. my own advisor and catalog since I'm very dissatisfied with my advisor;
8. a placement service or jobs program;
9. idea box;
10. more activities;
11. school psychologist; and
12. advice on financial aid.

The respondents were also asked to indicate whether they would prefer to meet with advisors once a quarter, once a year, twice a year, or only by request (Question 25). The responses are found in Table 28. Once a quarter was preferred by all of the groups and twice a year the least preferred. "By request" was the second preferred response for all the groups.

In order to get a general view of the survey results, Table 29 summarized the data for all academic advising traits and the independent variables. The table shows the total percentage (rounded to the nearest whole number) of students agreeing with each question on the survey form. Significant differences ($\alpha = .10$) is indicated by an * in the respective columns. The table demonstrates that the greatest difference was found between career and transfer students with career students rating the advising delivery system the higher. A more detailed discussion of the results are included in Chapter 5.

Table 28

Students' Desired Number of Meetings With Advisors

Total in Sample	Traditional		Adult		Career		Transfer		Full		Part	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	107		108		100		115		139		76	
Once a Quarter	60	56.1	71	65.7	59	59.0	72	62.6	89	64.0	42	55.3
Once a Year	4	3.7	3	2.8	1	1.0	6	5.2	4	2.9	3	3.9
Twice a Year	1	0.9	1	1.0	1	1.0	1	1.0	1	0.1	1	1.3
By Request	42	39.1	33	30.6	39	39.0	36	31.3	45	32.4	30	39.5

Table 29

STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF ACADEMIC ADVISEMENT IN RURAL VIRGINIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Percentage of Students Agreeing with Academic Advising Traits.

Question	Adult Traditional		Career Transfer		Full Part		Page # of Table		
Advisee 1A	85	71	*	89	68	*	83	69	53
Interest 1B	15	28	*	13	29		17	31	
Accessibility 2A	72	81	*	76	78		80	71	56
2B	15	17		15	16		13	21	
Discussions 3A	76	70		82	65	*	78	64	59
3B	62	58		51	68	*	58	62	
Regulations 4A	95	93		95	93	*	93	96	63
4B	23	38		34	21	*	30	32	
Friendliness 5A	90	91		93	88	*	89	92	66
5B	9	8		9	9	*	9	9	
Meetings 6A	57	58		65	50	*	64	44	69
6B	39	41		34	49		32	61	
Openness 7A	85	84		92	79	*	86	82	72
7B	13	17	*	9	20		15	14	
Scheduling 8A	80	82		91	78	*	84	84	76
8B	10	10		9	10		9	12	
Satisfaction 9A1	85	89		91	84		86	90	79
9A2	92	88		94	86		87	95	
9A3	89	82		92	80	*	84	88	80
9B	14	21	*	15	20	*	19	14	
Recommend 10A1	87	62		89	83		86	86	82
10A2	89	82		92	80	*	83	89	
10A3	93	86		95	84	*	88	92	

*Statistically significant ($p < .10$)

Chapter 5

DISCUSSION

This chapter summarizes and describes results along with implications and recommendations for future research.

Summary

A total of 353 students were surveyed at New River (n=120), Southwest (n=120), and Wytheville (n=113) Community Colleges to determine their perceptions of the academic advising delivery system. Contact persons on each campus distributed a questionnaire developed by Grites that assessed the students' perceptions about 10 different academic advising traits. The Chi Square test at .10 level of significance was used to analyze the responses according to students (traditional or adult), programs (career or transfer), and status (full or part-time). A polarized analysis of the different groups (traditional and adult, career and transfer, full and part-time) was also conducted to determine differences among various factions or groupings. What follows are the major hypotheses, results of the research, and discussion of related material.

Discussion

It was hypothesized that there would be no differences in the advisor's knowledge of and interest in advisees. There were

significant relationships between students (traditional or adult) and also between program (career or transfer). Adults indicated greater confidence in the advisors' knowledge of and interest in advisees than did the traditional students, and career students indicated greater interest than the transfer students. Among the polarized groups, all of the groups that included career students were more pleased about the advisors' knowledge of and interest in advisees. In summary, the adult, career, and full-time students were more pleased with the advisors' knowledge of, and interest in, advisees than were the traditional, career, and part-time students.

There was also a significant difference in the students' perceptions of the accessibility of advisors. Significantly more traditional students than adult students, and also significantly more career students than transfer students indicated advisors were available when needed. Among the polarized groups, the full-time traditional career and the full-time adult transfer students indicated they were the most pleased with the advisors' availability for appointments. The least satisfied groups were the full-time adult career, part-time traditional transfer, and part-time adult career students.

Career and transfer as well as full and part-time students showed significant differences in their perceptions of their willingness to discuss non-academic problems with advisors. More career than transfer and also more full than part-time students indicated a willingness to discuss non-academic problems with advisors. Among the polarized groups, the full-time adult-career students and the full-time

traditional-career students agreed more than other groups to seek advisors' advice on problems.

All groups (traditional and adult, career and transfer, full and part-time) indicated that advisors were well informed on course requirements and regulations. Although all indicated advisors were well informed, there was a significant difference between career and transfer students. More career than transfer students agreed that advisors were well informed on course requirements and regulations. Among the polarized groups, about 53% of the full-time traditional career students indicated that advisors were not well informed on course requirements.

Program (career or transfer) was the only variable that had a significant difference in the students' responses to the warmth and friendliness of advisors. Both career and transfer students indicated that advisors were warm and friendly to advisees; however, the career students indicated slightly higher opinions of advisors' warmth and friendliness. In summary, all of the groups and polarized groups agreed that advisors were friendly.

Both program and status variables showed significant differences in the students' desired frequency to meet with advisors. More career than transfer students and more full than part-time students indicated that they met with advisors once a quarter. Among the polarized groups, the part-time adult career students indicated the least desire to meet with a faculty advisor. In summary, 40% to 60% of students in all groups indicated that they did not meet with advisors at least once a quarter.

Career and transfer students and also traditional and adult students showed significant differences in their perception of advisors' ability to encourage freedom and openness in advisees. More career than transfer students and also more adult than traditional students indicated a high regard for advisors' ability to encourage freedom and openness in advisees. Among the polarized groups, the groups that included transfer students rated advisors the worst. Overall, advisors appear to be doing a good job in encouraging openness in advisees.

Program was the only variable that showed significant differences in the students' perception of advisors' ability to eliminate enrollment errors. More career than transfer students felt advisors were well informed about course offerings. Overall, all groups were pleased with advisors' ability to eliminate enrollment errors, however, over 30% of the transfer students indicated that advisors were not well informed about course offerings.

Significantly more career than transfer students were satisfied with the advising delivery system. This may be partly explained because transfer students are a small minority compared to career students. Also, many transfer students choose a community college because of a lack of finances or poor grades necessary to attend a four year school. Consequently, transfer students might perceive the entire community college (including the advising delivery system) in more negative terms than career students. Among the polarized groups, the full-time adult transfer and the full-time traditional transfer

students were the least satisfied groups with the advisors and the advising delivery system. Overall, all groups were basically satisfied with the advisors and the advising delivery system.

Program was the only variable that showed a significant difference in the students' willingness to recommend the advisees and the advising delivery system to others. Career students were more willing than transfer students to recommend the advisor and advising delivery system to others.

Understandably, students who are satisfied with the advising delivery system would be more inclined to recommend the system to others. About 40% of the traditional students would not recommend their advisor to another student and about 20% of the transfer students would not recommend their advisors to other colleges. Responses to questions confirmed that transfer students are not as pleased as career students with various aspects of the advising delivery system; however, 60% of the major group of students (traditional) also would not recommend the advising program to others.

The fact that adults indicated greater confidence in the advisors' knowledge of, and interest in, advisees than traditional students was very interesting. Most adults are on campus only in the evening after most faculty have left (Adams, 1981); consequently, adults do not see advisors as regularly as traditional students. The fact that the group of students who has the most contact with advisors (traditional students) are not as convinced as the adult students about the advisors' knowledge of, and interest in, advisees could imply that

advisors are not showing enough concern and interest to traditional student advisees during the academic advising meetings.

Career students indicating greater confidence in advisors' knowledge than transfer students fits the pattern of the majority students' being more satisfied than the minority. Gleazer (1980) indicated that most community college students are career students and Table 2, page 33 indicated that career students comprised from 68% to 90% of the students at the three schools in this study.

In general, full-time students were more pleased with the advisors' knowledge and interest in advisees than were the part-time students. This finding was expected because full-time students attend college mostly during the day when advisors were accessible. Although advisors are mainly available during the day, part-time students (who attend mostly at night) were evidently not being neglected totally, since about 70% of these part-time students indicated that they were pleased with advisors' knowledge of, and interest in, them as advisees.

In summary, the adult, career, and full-time students were more pleased with the advisors' knowledge of, and interest in, advisees than were the traditional, transfer, and part-time students. Among the polarization groups, all of the full-time, adult, career students agreed that advisors were interested in advisees. Only about 42% of the part-time traditional transfer students agreed that advisors were interested in advisees. Some degree of dissatisfaction was evident among all groups (especially the largest group, traditional students).

Implications are that advisors are not devoting enough concern and interest to many advisees during academic advising sessions.

The study by the Instruction Committee (1982) confirmed that advisors are available mainly during the day. Since adults and part-time students attend college mostly at night (Seigel, 1978) when advisors are not as accessible, it is understandable that traditional and full-time students would rate the accessibility of advisors more highly than adults and part-time students. There was no literature found to substantiate the difference in the career and transfer students' perception of the accessibility of advisors. Transfer students are more often full-time students because of the necessity of completing the community college to transfer to a four-year school. The full-time adult career student was one of the least satisfied groups with the accessibility of advisors. The full-time adult career students' responses to the accessibility of advisors does not fit the normal pattern of the high ratings given advisors by students who are at school during the day. Two possible explanations are: either the full-time adult career students are taking most classes at night when advisors are not as readily available, or the advisors during the day are not meeting the needs of the full-time adult career students. Also, full-time adult career students are a unique group in the sense that adults usually take part-time evening classes. Full-time adult career students are typically strong and aggressive students who strive to get the most from their education for the smallest amount of time

and cost. This type of student would be the most likely to complain when advisors are not immediately available.

Since many adults and part-time students attend at night, the implication is that advisors need to be available during evening hours. This need is intensified because a good percentage of all of the students indicated that they would discuss non-academic problems with advisors. More meetings between advisors and advisees would not only help the student with academic concerns, but would also assist the student with other personal problems. This would require advisors to know how and when to provide advice and assistance and when to refer the students to other professionals. Since the teaching faculty are the main academic advisors in the Virginia Community College System, the faculty will need some training in counseling skills in order to maximize the effectiveness of academic advising sessions. Since all groups indicated in question 4 that advisors were well informed on course requirements and regulations, the counseling aspect of the advising sessions seems to be the area that needs the greatest attention.

One benefit of academic advising is the opportunity provided students to discuss non-academic problems with advisors. Evans and Neagley (1977) noted that contacts made during academic advisement provides opportunities for advisors to discover students who are in need of other types of counseling. Many faculty believe their role as an advisor only encompasses class scheduling and other counseling should be handled by trained professional counselors. Unfortunately,

many colleges are experiencing reduction in forces and counselors are usually the first faculty to be terminated. If the community colleges are going to achieve their goals of meeting the need of the community by maximizing the opportunity for citizens to achieve educational and community goals, faculty will need to be able to at least identify non-academic concerns of students and also know how and when to refer students to other sources.

Not all students are willing to trust advisors with non-academic concerns. The advisors' ability to encourage freedom and openness in advisees determines to a large extent the degree to which students discuss non-academic concerns. Program (career or transfer) was the only variable that showed a significant relationship. Faculty teaching career as compared to transfer classes generally have closer relationships with students because of job placement, follow-up study, and on the job experiences of classes. Thus, career students have greater opportunity to develop good interpersonal relationships with faculty and therefore tend to be more willing to discuss non-academic concerns. More career (92%) than transfer students (79%) agreed that advisors encouraged advisees to be open in discussions. Career students are the overwhelming majority of students in the community college (Photiadis, 1982) and they mainly attend college during the day when advisors in this study were more available. Therefore, career students are expected to take more advantage of advisors' assistance. Although advisors were not as readily available at night for adult students, this study showed that adults would discuss non-academic

problems with advisors about as freely as traditional students. The implications are that although adults need advising services as much as traditional students, advisors are not building confidence among transfer students during advising sessions, thus, the transfer students might be neglected.

Good academic advising programs result in better student attitude, self concept, intellectual and interpersonal development, increases in academic performance, more full-time students, and higher retention rates (Glennen, 1978; Grites, 1981; Hudley, 1978; Noel, 1976). Students are more consumer oriented and want to know that their time and money is well spent on their education (Leavengoud, 1977). Consequently, continuous enrollment errors and lack of concern by advisors could frustrate some students to the point of quitting or giving up the attempt to complete their educational goals.

The most visible assistance advisors give is course or class selection. Although other benefits also result, class scheduling still remains one of the major purposes of academic advising. Over 30% of the transfer students indicated that advisors were not well informed about course offerings. The largest group of students among the polarized groups that would have the most contact with advisors would be the full-time traditional career students. Over 53% of this group indicated that advisors were not well informed on course requirements and regulations. This suggests that either advisors are not giving students correct course information, or students are not seeking advisor help and are making their own incorrect decisions about

courses. As was previously mentioned (page 97) the full-time traditional students also are the group to most likely complain when things do not go exactly as they would like.

"Academic advisors can be the human instrument for creating the harmonious meshing of the students' needs and the educational objectives set forth by the institution" (Choffman, 1976, p. 3). Thus, the personal relationships students form with faculty members through the advising process often is the most important bond students have with the institution (Smith, 1978). The first step is to get the students to use the advisors.

In all groups, from 40 to 60% of the students indicated that they did not meet with advisors at least once a quarter. Shaw (1981) reported that student-faculty interaction resulting from the advising system resulted in higher academic achievement, high aspiration, personal and social development, and college satisfaction. About half of the students in this study did not have the benefits mentioned by Shaw resulting from student-faculty interaction such as higher grades, lower attrition, and greater satisfaction. When asked about their desired frequency of contact with advisors, students overwhelmingly picked the response that gave them the most contacts with the advisors (in this question, once a quarter). It would appear that colleges need to provide more opportunity for students to contact their advisors. The question on additional advising services also indicated that student advisors, evening advising, and student support groups are

important services desired by students and should be considered when institutions provide opportunities for advisor-advisee contact.

Summary

In summary, generally the advising delivery system was rated as "good" by the students. Most advising traits received about an 80% favorable rating by the students and some traits received an even higher rating. There were statistically significant differences between traditional and adult students in 4 of the 10 academic advising traits measured by the questionnaire. In 7 of the 10 advising traits, the traditional students were more pleased about the academic advising delivery system than were the adult students. There were statistically significant differences between career and transfer students in 9 out of the 10 academic advising traits. There were statistically significant differences between full and part-time students in only 2 of the 10 academic advising traits. In 6 of the 10 advising traits, the full-time students were more pleased than were the part-time students. The largest difference among the groups was between career and transfer students. The transfer students showed the least satisfaction with the advising delivery system. The polarized group that showed the least satisfaction was the adult-transfer-part-time student group. There seems to be a great difference between the career and transfer students' perceptions of the advising delivery system. In all 10 advising traits, the career students were more pleased than were the transfer students. Results of the study indicated that the transfer

students are not as pleased about the advising delivery system as are the career students. Are the transfer students being ignored?

Lombardi (1979) seems to think they are. More research needs to be conducted on the extent to which academic advisors are meeting the needs of the career as well as the transfer students.

Recommendations

1. Clear and specific responsibilities of academic advisors need to be developed by the administration. If assisting and/or referring students with non-academic problems is determined to be a major responsibility of faculty advisors, then appropriate training sessions for teaching faculty need to be provided.
2. From 15 to 21% of the students indicated that faculty were too busy to see advisees or advisors were not available after regular working hours. The administration should to determine the maximum number of advisees that advisors can efficiently serve and the advisor-student ratio should be adjusted accordingly.
3. Respondents rated student advisors and student support groups very highly as useful advising services; therefore, student support groups and peer advisors should be incorporated as much as possible in the academic advising delivery system.
4. Additional research needs to be conducted on academic advising to the transfer and career students and the full-time career adult students. Some questions resulting from this study are:
 - a. What is the role of the "academic" advisor in assisting students in the community college setting?

- b. Do advisors need to be differentially trained to work with specific kinds (groups) of students (adults, career, transfer, full-time and part-time)?
- c. Is the academic advising delivery system ignoring the transfer students?
- d. Can the same academic advising delivery system meet the needs of both career and transfer students, or should there be a different system for each?
- e. Why are the transfer students less pleased than career students with the academic advising delivery system?
- f. What are the characteristics, driving forces, and concerns of the full-time career adult students?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adams, Walter W. and Barker, Sandra. (1981). A review of the literature as part of a report of the government sponsored Lifelong Learning Program. Appalachia Educational Laboratory—Division of Career Guidance.
- Adult Student Personnel Association. (1968). Counseling the Adult Student. Proceedings of the Sixth Annual Convention. Monticello, N. Y.. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 025 791)
- Aitken, Caroline D. and Conrad, Clifton F. (1977). Improving Academic Advising through Computerization. College and University, 53(1), Fall, 115-123.
- Alberti, R. (1972). Influence of the Faculty on College Student Development. Journal of College Student Personnel, 13(1), 18-23.
- American College Testing Program. (1978). Helping Students Grow: the Use of the ACT in the Academic Advising Process. Presentation made at the Fourth Annual National Seminar on College Student Retention. Washington, D.C., February 16-17.
- American College Testing Program. (1970). The Institutional Self-Study Service Manual. Part II: Using the Research Results. Iowa City, Iowa: Author.
- American Council on Education. (1974). Financing Part-Time Students—The New Majority in Post-Secondary Education. Washington, D.C.
- Appleton, Sheldon. (1983, March). The Impact of an Academic Advising Program: A Case Study. NACADA Journal, 3(1), 57-63.
- Apps, Jerold W. Six Influences on Adult Education in the 1980's. (1980, June). Lifelong Learning: The Adult Years, 3(10), 4-7.
- Aschenbrenner, A. J. (1963). The role of upperclass students as academic advisors for college freshmen. Journal of College Student Personnel, 4, 184-186.
- Astin, A. W. (1977). Four Critical Years. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bachhuber, T. D. (1977). Faculty: The Critical Variable for Successful Career Planning and Placement. Journal of College Placement, 3, 40-45.
- Barry, R. and Wolf, B. (1963). Modern Issues in Guidance Personnel Work. (2nd Ed.), New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University.

- Beal, D. Phillip and Noel, Lee. (1979). What Works in Student Retention. A national survey conducted jointly by the American College Testing Program and the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems.
- Bergstresser, J. L. (1950). Issues in faculty counseling. In E. G. Williamson (Ed.), Trends in Student Personnel Work. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Biggs, D. A. (1975). The Dynamics of Undergraduate Academic Advising. Research in Higher Education, 3, 345-347.
- Bishop, J. and Van Dyk, J. (1977). Can Adults Be Hooked on College? Journal of Higher Education, 48, 39-62.
- Borland, David T. (1973). Curricula, Planning Through Creative Academic Advising. NASPA Journal, 10: 211-217, January.
- Bostaph, C. P. (1976). A Study of Student Attitudes Toward Three Different Academic Advising Systems Currently Used in Three Different Undergraduate Schools at the University of Pittsburgh. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh.
- Boyer, E. L. (1974). Breaking Up the Youth Ghetto. In D. W. Vermilye (Ed.), Lifelong Learners—A Clientele for Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey Bass Publishers.
- Breneman, David W. and Nelson, Susan C. (1980). "Education and Training," Setting National Priorities: Agenda for the 1980's. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution.
- Brodzinski, Frederick R. (1980). Understanding The Adult Learner. New Directions for Student Services—Providing Student Services for the Adult Learner, (11), 1-6.
- Brown, C. and Myers, R. (1975). Student vs. Faculty Curriculum Advising. Journal of College Student Personnel, 16, 226-231.
- Brown, W. F. and Zunker, V. G. (1966). Student counselor utilization of four-year institutions of higher learning. Journal of College Student Personnel, 7, 41-46.
- Bryant, P. R. (1967). By their fruits ye shall know them. Journal of Higher Education, 38, 326-330.
- Burns, K. N. and Kishler, T. C. (1972). Centralized Academic Advising at Michigan State University. University College Student Affairs Office, Michigan State University.
- Burrell, Leon F. & Trombley, Toni B. (1983, March). Academic Advising with Minority Students on Predominantly White Campuses. Journal of College Student Personnel, 24(2), 121-126.

- Cameron, M. L. (1952). Evaluation of a faculty advisory program. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 12, 730-740.
- Campbell, Robert E. (1978). Perspectives on Adult Career Development and Guidance. Research and Development No. 181. Ohio State University, Columbus: National Center for Research in Vocational Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 203 216)
- Carney, G. and Barek, A. (1976). "A Survey of Student Needs and Student Personnel Services." Journal of College Student Personnel, 17(4), 319-323.
- Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. (1973). Toward a Learning Society: Alternative Channels to Life, Work, and Service. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Carstensen, Donald J. and Silberhorn, Constance. (1979, October). A National Survey of Academic Advising: Final Report. Iowa City: The American College Testing Program.
- Chathaparampil, J. (1970). Students' perceptions of their academic advisement at Michigan State University. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Michigan State University.
- Chickering, A. W. (1969). Education and Identity. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Chickering, A. W. & McCormick, J. (1973). Personality Development and the College Experience. Research in Higher Education. 1(1), 43-70.
- Chronicle of Higher Education, December 15, 1975.
- Clark, John and Trumbley, Toni. (1978, October). Student Self-Assessment Systems and Academic Advising. Paper Presented at the Second National Conference on Academic Advising, Memphis, Tennessee.
- Cogswell, J. F. and Estavan, D. F. (1965, August). Explorations in Computer-Assisted Counseling. Santa Monica, California Systems Development Corporation.
- Cohen, A. M. (1980, February 19). New Decade, New Campus, New Issues. Speech presented to faculty and staff at Oakton College, Morton Grove, Illinois. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 203 960)
- Cohen, A. M. (1982). The American Community College. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Comly, Luct T. (1975). Community-Based Educational and Career Information and Counseling Services for the Adult Public. Albany: New York State Education Department.
- Corrado, Thomas J. and Mangano, Joseph A. (1979). Responding to the Needs of Re-entry dults in Two-Year Colleges. Albany, N. Y.: State University of New York at Albany Two-Year College Development Center.
- Cowley, W. (1950). Some History and a Venture in Prophecy. In E. G. Williamson (Ed.), Trends in Student Personnel Work. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Creamer, Don & Atwell, Charles G. (1984, May). The Great Debate: Academic Advising. Community and Junior College Journal, 54(8), 18-20.
- Crittenden, B. S. (1968). Teaching, education, and indoctrination. Educational Theory, 18, 237-252.
- Crockett, David S. Ed. (1978a). Academic Advising: A Resource Document. Iowa City: The American College Testing Program.
- Crockett, D. S. (1978b). Academic Advising: Cornerstone of Student Retention. In L. Noel (Ed.) New Directions for Student Services: Reducing the Dropout Rate. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Crookston, B. B. (1972a). A Developmental View of Academic Advising As Teaching. J. College Student Personnel, 13: 12-17.
- Cross, Patricia. (1981). Adults As Learners. San Franciso: Jossey-Bass.
- Cross, Patricia K. (1979, January 11). Changing Students and the Impact on Colleges. Paper presented to the Educational Staff Seminar. Washington, D.C. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 168 423)
- Cross, Patricia K. (1983, Spring). The Impact of Changing Student Populations on Community Colleges. Community College Review, 10(4), 30-34.
- Dameron, J. D. and Wolf, J. C. (1974). Academic Advisement in Higher Education: A New Model. Journal of College Student Personnel, 15, 470-473.
- Daniels, R. P. and Kiernan, I. R. (1965). Faculty Counseling at F. I. T. Junior College Journal, 36, 23-25.

- Donk, L. J. and Oetting, E. R. (1968). Student-Faculty Relations and the Faculty Advising System. Journal of College Student Personnel, 9, 400-402.
- Drake, S. L. (1978). Research Report. Community and Junior College Journal. 48(5), 57.
- Eckard, P. J. (1977). Developmental Tasks of Older Female Students in Undergraduate Education. Paper presented at annual meeting of American Educational Research Association, New York. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 138 179)
- Eddy, Margot S. (1979, April). Part-Time Students. U. S. Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 163 831.
- Erikson, E. H. (1963). Childhood and Society (2nd ed.), New York: Norton.
- Erikson, Mildred B. (1979, March). Counseling Needs of Adult Students. Paper presented at the APGA Convention, New Orleans. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 039 569)
- Evans, N. D. and Neagley, R. L. (1973). Planning and Developing Innovative Community Colleges. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Feder, D. D. (1950). Selection and training of faculty counselors. In E. G. Williamson (Ed.), Trends in Student Personnel Work. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Friedenberg, E. Z. (1950). The measurement of student conceptions of the role of a college advisory system. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 10, 545-568.
- Friedlander, Jack. (1983, Summer). Using the Computer to Strengthen Academic Advisement Programs. Community College Review, 11(1), 52-58.
- Gaff, J. G. and Wilson, R. C. (1971). Faculty values and improving teaching. In G. K. Smith (Ed.), New Teaching, New Learning. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Higher Education.
- Gallagher, P. J. and Demos, G. A. (1970). The Counseling Center in Higher Education. Illinois: Charles C. Thomas.
- Geisler, M. P. and Thrush, R. S. (1975). Counseling Experiences and Needs of Older Women Students. Journal of the National Association for Women Deans, Administrators and Counselors, 39, 3-8.

- Gleazer, E. J., Jr. (1980). The Community College: Values, Vision, & Vitality. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges.
- Gleazer, E. J., Jr. (1973). What's New for the Community Colleges. Community and Junior College Journal, 44, 6-10.
- Glennon, R. E. (1976). Intrusive College Counseling. The School Counselor. 24, 48-50.
- Goldberg, Joan C. (1980, Winter). Counseling the Adult Learner: A Selective Review of the Literature. Adult Education. 30(2), 67-81.
- Goldberg, Lois G. (1981, September). Peer Advising: A Supplement to, but not a Substitute for, Faculty Advising. NACADA Journal, 1(2), 41-43.
- Goodstein, L. D. and Grigg, A. C. (1959). Client satisfaction, counselors and the counseling process. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 38, 19-24.
- Governanti, Michael P. & Clowes, Darrel A. (1982, April-June). Adults' Motivations for Attending A Community College. Community/Junior College Quarterly, 6(3), 271-285.
- Grahn, Joyce & others. (1983, May). Faculty Team Approach to Group Advising. Journal of College Student Personnel, 24(3), 214-218.
- Grant, W. V. and Lind, C. G. (1979). Digest of Education Statistics 1979. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Gravlich, D. J. (1977, January 24). Adult Students Alter Face of U.S. Colleges. The Wall Street Journal, p. 1.
- Grede, John F. (1981). Changing Form and Focus of Occupational Education, New Directions for Community Colleges, (33), 1-10.
- Grigg, C. (1975). Recruitment to Graduate School. Research monograph No. 10, Atlanta, GA. Southern Regional Education Board, 1975.
- Grites, Thomas J. (1981, February). Academic Advising: An Atlas for Liberal Education. Forum For Liberal Education, 3(4), 2-4. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 197 697)
- Grites, Thomas J. (1979). Academic Advising: Getting Us Through the Eighties. AAHE-ERIC/Higher Education Research No. 7. Washington: American Association for Higher Education.

- Grites, Thomas J. (1980, August). Improving Academic Advising. Idea Paper No. 3. Manhattan, Ks.: Kansas State University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 202 411)
- Grites, Thomas J. (1974). Student perceptions and self perceptions of faculty members in the related roles of classroom teacher and academic advisor. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland.
- Grites, Thomas J. (1978). Training the Academic Advisor. In David S. Crockett (Ed. and trans.), Academic Advising: A resource document. American College Testing Program.
- Grites, T. J. (1977). Student Development Through Academic Advising: A 4x4 model. NASPA Journal, 14, 33-37.
- Gross, B. M. (1968). The Managing of Organizations. New York: The Free Press.
- Gustad, J. W. (1961). Policies and practices in faculty evaluation. Educational Record, 42, 194-211.
- Hadley, E. A. (1976). A Program to Improve Freshman-Sophomore Retention. In Choice Or Chance: Planning for Independent College Marketing and Retention. St. Paul: Northwest Area Foundation.
- Halfter, I. T. (1962). Comparative Academic Achievement of Young and Old. Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors, 25(2).
- Hallberg, E. C. (1964). Realism in Academic Advising. Journal of College Student Personnel, 6, 114-117.
- Hanson, G. T. and Lenning, O. T. (1973). Differences in Characteristics and Outlooks of Men and Women College Students at Various Age Levels. Paper presented at the North Central Special Interest Group for Community College Research, Ann Arbor. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 078 840)
- Hardee, M. D. (1970). Faculty Advising in Colleges and Universities. Washington: American Personnel and Guidance Association. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 041 326)
- Harper, H. and others. (1981). Advisement and Graduation Information System. Miami, FL: Miami-Dade Community College. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 197 776)
- Harris, John. (1982, January 1). VCCS Enrollment Trends (Fall Quarter Data). Letter to VCCS Presidents and others.

- Harris, John. (1984). VCCS Enrollment Trends (Fall Quarter Data). Letter to President and Others.
- Hardaway, F. (1976). Educating Adults. Community College Frontiers, 5(1), 4-7.
- Harrington, F. H. (1977). The Future of Adult Education: New Responsibilities of Colleges and Universities. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Harville, T. (1978). Adult Students at Catonsville Community College: What are they searching for? Catonsville, MD: Catonsville Community College.
- Havighurst, R. J. (1972). Developmental Tasks and Education (3rd ed.). New York: David McKay.
- Higher Education and the Adult Student (American Council on Education Special Report). Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, October, 1972. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 060 238)
- Hilbert, R. L. (1964). Teacher or Researcher? The Educational Forum, 28, 463-468.
- Hines, E. R. (1981). Policymaking for More Effective Academic Advisement in Two-Year Colleges. Research in Higher Education, 14(2), 119-134.
- Hines, Edward R. & Krause, Peggy & Endieveri, Frank J. (1980, January-March). Academic Advising in Two-Year College. Community/Junior College Research Quarterly, 4(2), 151-167.
- Hoffman, Morton. (1974). Academic Advising in Higher Education. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Northern Colorado.
- Holmes, David & Trombley, Toni. (1981, September). Defining the Role of Academic Advising in the Institutional Setting: The Next Phase. NACADA Journal, 1(2), 1-8.
- Hoyt, D. P. (1971). An Evaluation of Student Personnel Services at Kansas State University. (Research Report No. 16) Manhattan, Kansas: Kansas State University, Office of Educational Research.
- Hull, D. (1970). Maturity As a Variable in Predicting Academic Success. Columbia, Missouri: University of Missouri, College of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction No. ED 045 039)
- Instruction Committee, Is Faculty Advising of Students an Effective Way of Enhancing Student Retention? Tidewater Community College, Virginia Beach, Va., May, 1982.

- Jackson, B. L. (1977). Identification and Analysis of Activities Related to Developmental Tasks of College Students. NASPA Journal, 15, 11-19.
- Jamrich, J. (1955). Organizational Practices in Student-Faculty Counseling Programs in Small Colleges. Educational Administration and Supervision, 41, 139-144.
- Johnson, B. L. (1964). Starting a Community Junior College. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges.
- Johnson, J. and Sprandel, K. (1975). Centralized Academic Advising at the Departmental Level: A Model. University College Quarterly, 21, 16-20.
- Juola, A. E., Winburne, J. W., and Whitmore, A. (1968). Computer-assisted Academic Advisement. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 47, 146-150.
- Jurich, Anthony P. and Cheryl, Poison J. (1979, May). The Departmental Academic Advising Center: An Alternative to Faculty Advising. Journal of College Student Personnel. 20(3), 240-252.
- Kamm, R. B. (1950). An Inventory of Student Reaction to Student Personnel Services. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 10, 537-544.
- Kapraun, E. Daniel, Jr. & Coldren, Doris W. (1982, November). Academic Advising to Facilitate Student Retention. NACADA Journal, 2(2), 59-69.
- Kasworm, Carol B. (1978, October 18). Students Older Than Average: Research and Implications. A paper presented to the fifth annual conference on Open Learning and Non-Traditional Study, Kansas City, Kansas. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 176 039)
- Kasworm, Carol B. (1977, August). Undergraduate Support Services at the University of Georgia: A Comparison of the Needs of the Older and the Younger Student. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Georgia.
- Kent, L. (1966). Student Evaluation of Teaching. Educational Record, 47, 376-406.
- Kerlinger, Fred N. (1973). Foundations of Behavioral Research (2nd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.
- Kerr, Clark. (1980, May). Changes and Challenges Ahead for Community Colleges. Community and Junior College Journal, 50(8), 4-10.

- Kiell, N. (1957). Freshmen Evaluation of Faculty Counselors. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 35, 361-364.
- Kissler, G. R. (1981, May). From Junior Colleges to Community Colleges: The Effect on Four-Year Institutions. Paper presented at the Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research, Minneapolis, MN. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. Ed 205 226)
- Kissler, Gerald R. (1982, September). The Decline of the Transfer Function: Threats or Challenges? New Directions for Community Colleges, (39), 19-29.
- Koile, E. A. (1954). Faculty Counseling in Colleges and Universities. Teachers College Record, 55, 384-389.
- Knoell, Dorothy M. (1982, September). The Transfer Function--One of Many. New Directions for Community Colleges, (39), 5-17.
- Koltai, Leslie. (1982, December). General Education and the Transfer Function. New Directions for Community Colleges, (40), 99-107.
- Korim, Andrew W. (1981). Challenges Facing Community Colleges in the 1980's. New Directions for Community Colleges, (33), 11-20.
- Kramer, Gary L. (1984, April). Planning and Managing Academic Advising. NACADA Journal, 4(1), 29-37.
- Kramer, Howard C. & Gardner, Robert E. (1983, September). Advising By Faculty, Revised Edition. National Education Association: Washington, D.C.
- Krings, Donna. (1976). Meeting the Adult Counseling Needs. Adult Leadership, 24, 311-313.
- Landry, Margaret Ann. (1981, September). The Necessity for a Comprehensive Advising System. NACADA Journal, 1(2), 29-32.
- Lanvin, D. (1965). The Prediction of Academic Performance. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1965.
- Leavengood, L. (1977). Mid-Life Counseling: New Dimensions in Theory and Practice. Paper presented at annual convention of National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, Atlanta. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 136 181)
- Lenz, E. and Shaevitz, M. H. (1977). So You Want To Go Back To School: Facing Realities of Reentry. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Leonard, E. A. (1956). Origins of Personnel Services in Higher Education. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

- Levinson, D. J. (1978). The Seasons of a Man's Life. New York: Ballantine Books.
- Levinson, D. J., Darrow, C. M., Klein, E. B., Levinson, M. H., and McKee, B. (1976). Periods in the Adult Development of Men: Ages 18 to 45. The Counseling Psychologist, 6, 21-25.
- Lloyd-Jones, E. M. and Smith, M. R. (Eds.). (1953). Student Personnel Work as Deeper Teaching. New York: Harper and Brothers.
- Lombardi, John. (1979, December). The Decline of Transfer Education. Topical Paper 70. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education (DITGW). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 179 273)
- Love, L. L. & McCabe, J. E. (1940). Evaluation of a Faculty Advisory Program for Freshmen. Educational Research Bulletin, 19, 483-488.
- Lundstedt, S. (1966). Criteria for Effective Teaching. Improving College and University Teaching, 14, 27-31.
- Maclean, M. S. (1953). Counseling and the Tower of Babel. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 31, 357-362.
- Mahoney, J., Borgard, J., and Hornbuckle, P. (1978). The Relationship of Faculty Experiences and Advisee Load to Perceptions of Academic Advising. Journal of College Student Personnel, 19, 28-32.
- Mash, D. J. (1978, Spring). Academic Advising: Two Often Taken for Granted. The College Board Review (107), 32-36.
- McCurdy, J. (1981, November 4). California Community Colleges Attacked. The Chronicle of Higher Education, p. 11.
- McCutcheon, William R. (1983, May). Computer-Assisted Advising For Dental Students. Journal of Dental Education, 47(5), 321-324.
- McKeachie, W. J. and Solomon, D. (1958). Student Ratings of Instructors: A Validity Study. Journal of Educational Research, 51, 379-382.
- McLaughlin, Bonnie M. & Starr, Emily A. (1982, November). Academic Advising Literature Since 1965: A College Student Personnel Abstract Review. NACADA Journal, 2(2), 14-23.
- Medsker, L. L. (1972). The Crucial Role of Student Personnel Services in the Junior College. In T. O'Banion and A. Thurston (Eds.), Student Development Programs in the Community Junior College. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

- Medsker, L. L. & Tillery, D. (1971). Breaking The Access Barriers: A Profile of Two-Year Colleges. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Meyers, K. E. (1964). College Freshmen: A Faculty Responsibility. Improving College and University Teaching, 12, 9-10.
- Miller, D. D. and Haase, R. F. (1967). Student Evaluation of Teacher's Competence and Effectiveness. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 012 708)
- Moore, G. D. (1965). Faculty Advising and Professional Counseling - No Conflict. Journal of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, 2, 16-21.
- Moore, Kathryn M. (1976, September). Faculty Advising: Panacea or Placebo? Journal of College Student Personnel. 17(5), 371-375.
- Murry, J. P. (1971). The Comparative Effectiveness of Student-to-student and Faculty Advising Programs. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Kansas State University.
- National Center for Education Statistics. (1978). Participation in Adult Education, Final Report, 1975, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- National Center for Education Statistics. (1972). Projections of Educational Statistics. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- National Center for Educational Statistics. (1976). Projections of Educational Statistics to 1984-85. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Nayman, Robbie L. and Patten, George W. (1980). Offering Effective Students Development Programs for the Adult Learner. New Directions for Student Services—Providing Student Services for the Adult Learner, (11), 39-56.
- Noel, L. (1976). College Student Retention: A Campus Wide Responsibility. Journal of National Association of College Admissions Counselors. 21, 33-36.
- O'Banion, T. (1972a). An Academic Advising Model. Junior College Journal, 42, 62-69.
- O'Banion, T. (1972b). Exceptional Practices in Community Junior College Student Personnel Programs. In T. O'Banion and A. Thurston (Eds.), Student Development Programs in the Community Junior College. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

- O'Banion, T., Fordyce, J. W., and Goodwin, F. (1972). Academic Advising in the Two-Year College: A National Survey. Journal of College Student Personnel, 13, 411-419.
- Otto, George. (1979, November 30). With Declining Number of High School Graduates, Where Do We Find Enough Students for our Colleges in the 1980's? Paper presented at the Chicago City Colleges' Conference, Chicago, IL. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 181 947)
- Palinchak, Robert. (1973). The Evolution of the Community College. Metuchen, NJ: The Scarecrow Press, Inc.
- Palmer, James C. (1982, September). Sources and Information: Revitalizing Articulation and Transfer. New Directions for Community Colleges, (39), 99-107.
- Parnell, Dale. (1984, May). Five Critical Issues. Community and Junior College Journal, 54(8), 40-41.
- Pascarella, E.T. & Teranzini, P.T. (1971). Informal Interactions with Faculty and Freshmen Ratings of Academic and Non-Academic Experience of College. Journal of Educational Research, 70(1), 35-41.
- Pearce, F. C. (1967). A Study of Pre-registration Counseling. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 017 231)
- Perry, R. R. (1969). Evaluation of Teaching Behavior Seeks to Measure Effectiveness. College and University Business, 47, 18-22.
- Peterson, A. G. (1970). The College Advisement Survey: An Inventory of Student Perceptions of College Advisement. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois.
- Petschauer, Peter. (1983, Summer). Exxon and Higher Education: Reflections on One Student-to-Student Advising Program. College Student Journal, 17(2), 145-150.
- Phelan, W. T. (1979). Undergraduate Orientations toward Scientific and Scholarly Careers. American Educational Research Journal, 16(4), 411-422.
- Quezada, Rosa & Jones-Loheyde, Katherine. (1984, Spring). Hispanic Women: Advisees of High Potential. Improving College and University Teaching, 32(2), 95-98.
- Recer, J. D. (1968). Analysis of Alternative Academic Advisement Systems in University College at the University of Oklahoma. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oklahoma.

- Remley, Theodore Phant, Jr. (1980). Articulation in Higher Education. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Florida.
- Remmers, H. H. (1963). Rating methods in research on teaching. In N. L. Gage (Ed.), Handbook of Research on Teaching. Chicago: Rand-McNally.
- Rodin, M. and Rodin, B. (1972). Student Evaluations of Teachers. Science, 177, 1164-1166.
- Rock, D. A. & Centra, J. A. & Linn, R. L. (1970). Relationships Between College Characteristics and Student Achievement. American Educational Research Journal, 1970, 7(1), 109-121.
- Roelfs, Pamela. (1975). Teaching and Counseling Older College Students. Findings (2). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service Number ED 130 737)
- Rosenberg, F. L. (1969). A Study of Undergraduate Academic Advisement in a University Setting. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Iowa.
- Rudolph, F. (1962). The American College and University. New York: Vintage Books.
- Russell, Lawrence and Schmid, Gregory. (1980, May). Plenty of Clues to Future Trends. Community and Junior College Journal. 50(8), 28-31.
- Ryan, Carol C. (1980, October). Adult Student and Faculty Expectations of Academic Advising in a Non-Traditional University. Masters Thesis. University of Minnesota. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 203 216)
- Shaffer, R. H. (1959). Effect of Large Enrollments on Student Personnel Services. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 37, 626-632.
- Shaw, Rebecca. (1981, August). An Exploratory Study of Student Characteristics Associated With Informal Interaction With Faculty. Master's Thesis. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.
- Sheehy, G. (1977). Passages: Predictable Crises of Adult Life. New York: Bantam Books.
- Sheffield, W. and Meskill, V. P. (1972). Faculty Advisor and Academic Counselor: A Pragmatic Marriage. Journal of College Student Personnel, 13, 25-30.

- Siegel, B. (1978). The Older Student: Challenge to Academe. Paper presented at the annual conference of the California Association for Institutional Research, San Francisco. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 149 835)
- Slobin, K. Y. and Nichols, D. G. (1969). Student rating of teaching. Improving College and University Teaching, 17, 244-248.
- Smith, H. V., Jr. (1968). An Investigation of the Application of Computer-assisted Instruction and Information Retrieval System to Academic Advising in a Junior College. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Florida State University.
- Smith, Norman R. (1978). Institutional Environment. Philadelphia: Paper presented at the Invitational Conference on Student Retention.
- Spencer, R. W. (1976, April). Computer-assisted Advisement at Brigham Young University. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Personnel and Guidance Association, Chicago.
- Spencer, Robert W. & others (1982, March). Utilizing College Advising Centers to Facilitate and Revitalize Academic Advising. NACADA Journal, 2(1), 13-23.
- Stehr, B. W. (1956). Development of an Adequate Faculty Advisor System. Junior College Journal, 27, 194-196.
- Tang, E. P. (1981, June 25-27). Student Recruitment and Retention. Paper Presented at the 1981 Pacific Region Seminar of the Association of Community College Trustees, Portland, OR. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 207 620)
- Tead, O. (1953). Integrating Personnel and Teaching Functions in College. Educational Forum, 17, 401-411.
- Teague, G. V. (1977). A Comparison of Student Satisfaction With Academic Advisement at Eight Selected Maryland Public Community Colleges. Dissertation Abstracts International, 17, 7496A. (University Microfilms No. 77-12, 036)
- Terenzini, P. T. & Pascarella, E. T. (1980). Student/Faculty Relationships and Freshman Year Educational Outcomes: A Further Investigation. Journal of College Student Personnel, 21(6), 521-528.
- The Older Student Phenomenon: Planning Ahead. (1979, April). Southern Association of Colleges and Schools: Atlanta, Georgia. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 013 371)

- Thistlerwaite, D. (1960). College Press and Changes in Study Plans of Talented Students. Journal of Educational Psychology, 51(4), 222-234.
- Thistlerwaite, D. (1962). Fields of Study and Development of Motivation to Seek Advanced Training. Journal of Educational Psychology, 53(1), 53-64.
- Thompson, Clarence H. (1971). The Nature of Adult Students and the Scope of Counseling Services. Counseling Services for Adults in Higher Education. Edited by Martha L. Farmer, Metuchen, New Jersey: Scarecrow Press.
- Toven, J. P. (1950). Appraising a Counseling Program at the College Level. In A. H. Brayfield, Readings in Modern Methods of Counseling. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc.
- Trombley, T. B. and Holmes, D. (1980). The Changing Rules and Priorities of Academic Advising. Current Issues of Higher Education, 8(1), 20-24.
- Trombley, Toni & Holmes, David. (1981, September). Defining the Role of Academic Advising in the Institutional Setting: The Next Phase. NACADA Journal, 1(2), 1-8.
- Twenty year Trends in Higher Education. Fact File. Chronicle of Higher Education. November 13, 1978, 13.
- Tyler, R. W. (1960). The Evaluation of Teaching. In A. D. Albright and J. E. Barrows (Eds.), Preparing College Teachers. Louisville, Kentucky: University of Kentucky.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census. (1977, October). Current Population Reports, series P-20 No. 309. School Enrollment: Social and Economic Characteristics of Students, October 1976 (Advance Report). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, Table 5, p. 7.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census. (1979). Current Population Reports, Series P-20, No. 335, "School Enrollment--Social and Economic Characteristic of Students." October, 1978. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Printing Office.
- U.S. Congressional Record. 1975, Vol. 121, 17747-17748.
- Vener, A. M. and Knupka, L. R. (1980). Academic Advising/Career Counseling and The "New College Student." Journal of College Student Personnel, 21(3), 270-274.
- Virginia Community College System Policy Manual. Richmond, Virginia: State Board for Community Colleges, Revised 1982.

- Wallace, W. (1963). Peer Groups and Student Achievement. Chicago, IL: National Opinion Research Center.
- Weatherford, Martha P. (1979, April). Changing Trends. The Older Student Phenomenon: Planning Ahead. Southern Association of Colleges and Schools: Atlanta, Georgia. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 194 489)
- Weidman, J. (1979). Nonintellective Undergraduate Socialization in Academic Departments. Journal of Higher Education, 50(1), 48-62.
- Wenrich, William J. (1976, Winter). Meeting the Occupational Needs of the Part-time Student. Community College Review, 4(3), 27-32.
- Wharton, W., McKean, J. and Knoght, R. (1966). Student Assistants for Faculty Advisors. Journal of College Student Personnel, 7, 37-40.
- Williams, R. C. (1969). Adult Education in the Community College. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 031 241)
- Williamson, D. C. (1972). An Outsider's Viewpoint--Friendly But Critical. In T. O'Banion and A. Thurston (Eds.), Student Development Programs in the Community Junior College. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Wilson, R. C., Gaff, J. G., Dienst, E. R., Wood, L. & Barry, J. L. (1975). College Professors and Their Impact on Students. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Wrenn, C. G. (1941). Role of Faculty Advisors in a Personnel Program. Occupationa, 19, 506-508.
- Zwerling, Steven L. (1980). The New "New Student": The Working Adult. New Directions for Community Colleges--Questioning the Community College Role (32), 93-99.

APPENDIX 1

Letters from Southwest, New River, and Wytheville
Community Colleges Concerning Their
Advising Program

January 20, 1983

Mr. Ron Hash
Coordinator of Admissions
and Records
Wytheville Community College
Wytheville, VA 24382

Dear Ron:

This letter is in reference to your request for information about the advising system at New River Community College.

Our advising system which began in 1970 was devised to accommodate the more traditional students who were attending college on a full-time basis. Although there have been some minor changes in the system since that time, it has remained basically the same.

Please let me know if you need additional information. Good luck as you progress on your dissertation.

Sincerely,

(Mrs.) M. T. McConnell
Coordinator of Admissions
and Records

MTM/gm



SOUTHWEST VIRGINIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE

RICHLANDS, VIRGINIA 24641, TELEPHONE (703) 964-2555
OFFICE OF ADMISSIONS

January 20, 1983

Mr. Ron Hash, Coordinator
Admissions and Records Office
Wytheville Community College
Wytheville, VA 24382

Dear Ron:

As a follow-up to our telephone conversation, I want to verify the fact that our institution has never conducted or participated in a comprehensive study or review of our faculty advisement program.

You also mentioned your belief that the "student mix" had changed in the VCCS. I agree. We (SVCC) opened in the fall of 1968 with 710 students, the vast majority of whom were 18-22 years of age, taking day classes, and enrolled in transfer curricula. Today, the majority of our students are enrolled in non-transfer programs, as many as half are enrolled in evening classes, and the average age of the student body is now approximately 28.

Hope this helps.

Sincerely,

Donald H. Smith
Coordinator of Admissions & Records

DHS/gh





Wytheville Community College, 1000 East Main Street, Wytheville, Virginia 24382, Telephone 703/228-5541

January 27, 1983

Mr. W. Ronald Hash
 Coordinator of Admissions and Records
 Wytheville Community College
 1000 East Main Street
 Wytheville, VA 24382



Dear Ron:

When Wytheville Community College became part of the Virginia Community College System in 1967, most of our students were enrolled in transfer programs. In fact, of the 620 students registering that Fall, 72% were in transfer programs, with only 28% in occupational-technical areas. Also, at that time, the vast majority of the enrollees were in the traditional 18-21-year old age group. By Fall 1981, the student profile had changed dramatically. That year, only 9% of the 1,890 students were in a transfer curriculum and 76% of the student body was 22 years of age or older.

The College academic advising program was set up during the early years, and therefore was geared to the younger, transfer-oriented individual. We have tried to keep up with the changing student body by making modifications to that system, but we have never undergone a thorough study of the student degree of satisfaction with academic advising. Since advising is so crucial to the success of students and the institution, such a study would be of great benefit to us. I would welcome your undertaking that investigation and wish to offer any assistance I might provide should you choose to do so.

For your information, I have attached a copy of the VCCS "Cooperation with Doctoral Studies and Research Projects" which should guide you in preparing an institutional proposal. If more information is needed, please do not hesitate to stop by or give me a call.

Sincerely yours,

Leonard F. O'Hara
 Dean of Instruction

re

Enclosure

cc: Dr. William F. Snyder

APPENDIX 2

Letter from the Virginia Community College System Concerning
the Academic Advising System



VIRGINIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM

JAMES MONROE BUILDING, 101 NORTH 14TH STREET, TELEPHONE AREA CODE 804/225-2117
MAILING ADDRESS: P.O. BOX 1558, RICHMOND, VIRGINIA 23212

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Ron Hash

FROM: Landy F. Watson

DATE: January 20, 1983

SUBJECT: Study of Student Academic Advising in the VCCS


Per our conversation today, I am not aware of any formal activities relating to subject item. I conducted a quick internal search and did not discover any documents that would suggest or indicate that a study of Student Academic Advising has been done on a system-wide basis.

I would like to suggest that you forward your request for review and approval of such a study for your dissertation to Dr. Perry Adams, Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs and Planning of the VCCS. He may be able, perhaps, to advise you or assist you procedurally with the development of the study.

If I can be of further assistance, just give me a call. Take care.

sk

cc: Dr. Perry Adams

	<p>MR. LANDY F. WATSON Student Services Coordinator Instructional Programs and Student Services VIRGINIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM</p>
<p>James Monroe Building, 101 North 14th Street Mailing Address: P.O. Box 1558 Richmond, Virginia 23212</p>	<p>Telephone 804/225-2124</p>

APPENDIX 3
Academic Advisement Questionnaire



Dear Student

I am conducting research in the area of academic advisement at three Virginia community colleges. You are one of a small number of students at the three community colleges who are being asked to give their opinions concerning their perceptions of the advisement system at their respective colleges. Your name was drawn in a random sample of all of the students at the three community colleges. In order that the results will truly represent the thinking of the students at the three community colleges, it is important that each questionnaire be completed and returned to your teacher who distributed it to you.

You may be assured of complete confidentiality. The questionnaire has an identification number for mailing purposes only. This is so that your name may be checked off the list when your questionnaire is returned. Your name will never be placed on the questionnaire. Please take time to complete the questionnaire in its entirety and return it at the next class meeting to the teacher who distributed it to you.

Thank you for your help.

Ronald Hash

ACADEMIC ADVISING SURVEY

ACADEMIC ADVISING CONCERNS

Directions: There are no right or wrong answers to the following statements. What is wanted are your own individual feelings about these statements. Read each statement carefully and decide how you feel about it. Then mark your answer on the space provided on the questionnaire.

- SA--STRONGLY AGREE
- A--AGREE
- TA--TEND TO AGREE
- TD--TEND TO DISAGREE
- SD--STRONGLY DISAGREE

MARK YOUR ANSWERS IN THE SPACE PROVIDED				
SA	A	TA	TD	SD

- | | | | | | |
|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| 1. I doubt that my advisor knows who I am or anything about me. | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 2. My advisor gives me a feeling of frustration. | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 3. When I need to see my advisor, I have little difficulty in setting up an appointment with him. | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 4. My advisor usually appears so rushed that I hesitate to ask many of the questions or to discuss areas which I feel would be helpful to me. | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 5. I feel I could recommend my advisor to another student. | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 6. My advisor appears well informed on course requirements, regulations, etc. and I can place a great deal of confidence in any suggestions he might make regarding these matters. | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 7. My advisor appears to be cold, doesn't pay much attention to what I am saying, and is rather brisk in his manner with me. | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 8. I have been satisfied with my advisement. | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |

SA--STRONGLY AGREE
A--AGREE
TA--TEND TO AGREE
TD--TEND TO DISAGREE
SD--STRONGLY DISAGREE

MARK YOUR ANSWERS IN THE SPACE PROVIDED				
SA	A	TA	TD	SD

- 9. If I had a problem of a personal nature, I would not think of going to my advisor to discuss it. _____
- 10. I usually meet with my advisor at least one or more times a quarter other than at registration (or pre-registration). _____
- 11. I am satisfied with my advisor. _____
- 12. My advisor makes me feel at ease and by his manner encourages me to discuss anything which might be helpful to me. _____
- 13. Although my advisor has fairly definite office hours when he is available for advising, he is so busy it is almost impossible to see him. _____
- 14. I feel that other colleges should provide advisement like this College provides. _____
- 15. My advisor is not only well informed about course requirements and regulations but is also sufficiently conscientious about my enrollment each semester so that I am not handicapped with enrollment errors. _____
- 16. I feel that my advisor knows me as an individual and is interested in me as a person. _____
- 17. I feel satisfied as a result of my talks with my advisor. _____
- 18. My advisor seems to know little more about course offerings, regulations, etc. than I do. _____
- 19. About the only time I use my advisor is at registration (or pre-registration) and sometimes not even then. _____
- 20. My relationship with my advisor is such that I would not hesitate to seek his advice on most subjects or problems I might have. _____
- 21. Colleges should provide advisors like mine. _____

SA--STRONGLY AGREE
 A--AGREE
 TA--TEND TO AGREE
 TD--TEND TO DISAGREE
 SD--STRONGLY DISAGREE

MARK YOUR ANSWERS IN THE SPACE PROVIDED				
SA	A	TA	TD	SD

22. In our meetings together, my advisor appears warm, interested, and patient with me. _____
23. Since my advisor is not very knowledgeable or conscientious about his advising responsibilities, I can reasonably expect him to make some kind of enrollment error when I seek his help during pre-registration or registration. _____
24. What other advising services would you USE if they were offered? Please circle the number of all services you would use.
- 1 STUDENT SUPPORT GROUP
 - 2 A STUDENT MEETING ROOM
 - 3 VOCATIONAL TESTING
 - 4 SATURDAY ADVISING HOURS
 - 5 EVENING ADVISING HOURS
 - 6 TUTORING
 - 7 STUDENT ADVISORS
 - 8 OTHER (please list) _____

Please circle the number of the ONE response for questions 25 through 29.

25. How often would you like to meet with your advisor?
- 1 ONCE A QUARTER
 - 2 ONCE A YEAR
 - 3 TWICE A YEAR
 - 4 ONLY IF I REQUEST A MEETING
26. Type of program (curriculum in which you are enrolled)
- 1 CAREER (I PLAN TO TERMINATE MY FORMAL EDUCATION AFTER COMPLETION OF MY WORK AT THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE)
 - 2 TRANSFER (I PLAN TO CONTINUE MY FORMAL EDUCATION AT A FOUR-YEAR COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY)
27. Number of hours you are currently registered?
- 1 0-6
 - 2 7-11
 - 3 12 OR MORE
28. Your sex
- 1 MALE
 - 2 FEMALE

29. Year at present school

- 1 FRESHMAN (45 OR LESS CREDITS COMPLETED)
- 2 SOPHOMORE (45 OR MORE CREDITS COMPLETED)

30. Number of quarter hours completed: _____

31. Your present age: _____ YEARS

Please feel free to write observations or comments you may have about the advising system in the space below.

Your contribution to this effort is greatly appreciated. If you would like a summary of results, please print your name and address on a separate sheet of paper (not on this questionnaire) and return it at your next class meeting with the completed questionnaire to the teacher who distributed it to you.

I wish to receive a summary profile of the results.

APPENDIX 4

Letters to and from the VCCS and the Presidents of
the Colleges requesting and receiving
permission to conduct the study

Wytheville, VA 24382
April 8, 1983

Dr. Elmo Roesler
Director of Planning and Evaluation
Virginia Community College System
P.O. Box 1558
Richmond, VA 23212

Dear Dr. Roesler,

I am Coordinator of Admissions and Records at WCC and am also working on my doctoral dissertation at VPI & SU. Attached is a proposal to conduct a research project at New River, Southwest, and Wytheville Community Colleges. If the study is endorsed by you, I plan to follow the prescribed VCCS procedures for research projects and ask each individual President for permission to conduct the study.

Thank you for your cooperation. Please inform me if you have additional questions.

Sincerely,

W. Ronald Hash



VIRGINIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM

JAMES MONROE BUILDING, 101 NORTH 14TH STREET, TELEPHONE AREA CODE 804/225-2117
MAILING ADDRESS: P.O. BOX 1558, RICHMOND, VIRGINIA 23212

April 18, 1983

Mr. W. Ronald Hash

wytheville, Virginia 24382


Dear Mr. Hash:

Thank you for your April 8 letter and the copy of your doctoral dissertation proposal, "Traditional and Adult Students Satisfaction With Academic Advisement in Rural Virginia Community Colleges". We have reviewed the proposal and believe it will make a valuable contribution to the Virginia Community College System by providing an evaluation of the effectiveness of academic advising for traditional and adult students in rural community colleges.

Therefore, permission is granted for you to seek assistance from the presidents of New River, Southwest, and Wytheville community colleges for carrying out the data collection phase of your research. Each president has the final authority to decide about cooperating with your research activities.

Best wishes for the successful completion of the study and your doctoral program. I will look forward to receiving a copy of the completed dissertation.

Please let me know if we can be of further assistance.

Sincerely, 

Elmo D. Roesler, Director
Planning and Evaluation

EDR:EM/ph

cc: Dr. William F. Snyder
Dr. Ed Morse

Wytheville, Virginia 24382
April 28, 1983

Dr. Charles R. King
Southwest Virginia Community College
Post Office Box SVCC
Richlands, VA 24641

Dear Dr. King:

I am Coordinator of Admissions and Records at Wytheville Community College and also pursuing my doctoral degree in Community College Administration at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. My dissertation topic is "Traditional and Adult Students Satisfaction with Academic Advisement in Rural Virginia Community Colleges." The colleges that I am requesting to participate in the study are New River, Southwest, and Wytheville Community Colleges. An adult student is defined as any student 25 years or older. All of the colleges participating in this study use the same academic advisement model.

Attached is the approval from the Virginia Community College System's office for the study to be conducted. I request permission to use the students and faculty at Southwest Community College in this study. If you grant permission for Southwest Community College to participate in this study, I would like to work with the Coordinator of Admissions and Records to obtain the computer print-outs to be used to systematically determine the students to participate in the study. Questionnaires and an accompanying letter from you (attached) would be distributed to the students' teachers with instructions for the students to complete the questionnaire on their own time and return it the next class meeting to the teacher. No class time will be used to complete the questionnaire. Only about 100 students will be surveyed at your school. The teacher will be instructed to return the completed questionnaires to the Coordinator of Admissions and Records on your campus.

This study will be very useful for community colleges who want to determine the effectiveness of their academic advisement program. Most academic advisement models were created to meet the needs of the traditional college students. This study will determine the effectiveness of the academic advisement model in satisfying the needs of both the traditional students and the growing number of adult students.

Thank you for your cooperation. A copy of the proposal that was sent to the VCCS Office is enclosed. A summary of the results of the study will be sent to you if your school agrees to participate in the study. Please contact me if you have additional questions.

Sincerely yours,

W. Ronald Hash

Wytheville, Virginia 24382
 April 28, 1983

Dr. H. Randal Edwards
 New River Community College
 State Route 100
 Drawer 1127
 Dublin, Virginia 24084

Dear Dr. Edwards

I am Coordinator of Admissions and Records at Wytheville Community College and also pursuing my doctoral degree in Community College Administration at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. My dissertation topic is "Traditional and Adult Students Satisfaction with Academic Advisement in Rural Virginia Community Colleges." The colleges that I am requesting to participate in the study are New River, Southwest, and Wytheville Community Colleges. An adult student is defined as any student 25 years or older. All of the colleges participating in this study use the same academic advisement model.

Attached is the approval from the Virginia Community College System's Office for the study to be conducted. I request permission to use the students and faculty at New River Community College in this study. If you grant permission for New River Community College to participate in the study, I would like to work with the Coordinator of Admissions and Records to obtain the computer print outs to be used to systematically determine the students to participate in the study. Questionnaires and an accompanying letter from you (attached) would be distributed to the students' teachers with instructions for the students to complete the questionnaire on their own time and return it the next class meeting to the teacher. No class time will be used to complete the questionnaire. Only about 100 students will be surveyed at your school. The teacher will be instructed to return the completed questionnaires to the Coordinator of Admissions and Records on your campus.

This study will be very useful for community colleges who want to determine the effectiveness of their academic advisement program. Most academic advisement models were created to meet the needs of the traditional college students. This study will determine the effectiveness of the academic advisement model in satisfying the needs of both the traditional students and the growing number of adult students.

Thank you for your cooperation. A copy of the proposal that was sent to the VCCS Office is enclosed. A summary of the results of the study will be sent to you if your school agrees to participate in the study. Please contact me if you have additional questions.

Sincerely Yours

W. Ronald Nash

Wytheville, Virginia 24382
April 28, 1983

Dr. William F. Snyder
Wytheville Community College
1000 East Main Street
Wytheville, Virginia 24382

Dear Dr. Snyder:

I am Coordinator of Admissions and Records at Wytheville Community College and also pursuing my doctoral degree in Community College Administration at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. My dissertation topic is "Traditional and Adult Students Satisfaction with Academic Advisement in Rural Virginia Community Colleges." The colleges that I am requesting to participate in the study are New River, Southwest, and Wytheville Community Colleges. An adult student is defined as any student 25 years or older. All of the colleges participating in this study use the same academic advisement model.

Attached is the approval for the Virginia Community College System's office for the study to be conducted. I request permission to use the students and faculty at Wytheville Community College in this study. If you grant permission for Wytheville Community College to participate in the study, I would like to work with the Administrative Assistant to the President to obtain the computer print outs to be used to systematically determine the students to participate in the study. Questionnaires and an accompanying letter from you (attached) would be distributed to the students' teachers with instructions for the students to complete the questionnaire on their own time and return it the next class meeting to the teacher. No class time will be used to complete the questionnaire. Only about 100 students will be surveyed at your school. The teacher will be instructed to return the complete questionnaires to the Coordinator of Admissions and Records on your campus.

This study will be very useful for community college who want to determine the effectiveness of their academic advisement program. Most academic advisement models were created to meet the needs of the traditional college student. This study will determine the effectiveness of the academic advisement model in satisfying the needs of both the traditional students and the growing number of adult students.

Thank you for your cooperation. A copy of the proposal that was sent to the VCCS office is enclosed. A summary of the results of the study will be sent to you if your school agrees to participate in the study. Please contact me if you have additional questions.

Sincerely yours.

W. Ronald Hash



SOUTHWEST VIRGINIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE

**RICHLANDS, VIRGINIA 24641. TELEPHONE (703) 964-2555
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT**

May 10, 1983

Mr. W. Ronald Hash

wytneville, Virginia 24382

Dear Mr. Hash:

We will be pleased to cooperate in your doctoral dissertaion study, as requested in your letter of April 28, 1983. Please feel free to work through our Dean of Student Services, Armand M. Opitz, or our Coordinator of Admissions and Records, Donald H. Smith.

We look forward to the possibility that current and future SVCC students will benefit from your research findings.

Sincerely yours,

Charles R. King

CRK:bb

**cc: Dean Armand M. Opitz
Dr. Donald H. Smith**





143

Wytheville Community College, 1000 East Main Street, Wytheville, Virginia 24382, Telephone 703/228-5541

May 2, 1983

Mr. W. Ronald Hash

Wytheville, VA 24382

Dear Ron:

I have reviewed with Jerry Beavers your request to use students, faculty, and staff at WCC in your dissertation research. Jerry has agreed to serve as liaison for the College in this matter and to assist you in obtaining computer print outs as his time permits. Therefore, your request to use students, faculty, and staff at WCC in this study is approved.

Good luck in completing your dissertation.

Sincerely, —

William F. Snyder
President

sd

cc: Dr. Jerry L. Beavers

APPENDIX 5

Cover Letters from College Presidents to their
respective faculty requesting their
cooperation in conducting the study

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Selected New River Community College Faculty

FROM: H. Randall Edwards

SUBJECT: Academic Advising Survey

DATE: May 20, 1983

The enclosed questionnaire is part of a study to compare traditional and adult students' satisfaction with academic advisement at three small rural Virginia community colleges. I think the study will be helpful in the College's efforts to identify and improve services to students.

Would you please distribute the questionnaires to the students in your class who are selected to be in the study and inform them to complete it on their own and return it to you at the next class meeting. Please return all completed questionnaires to the Admissions and Records Office.

gm



SOUTHWEST VIRGINIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE

**MICHLANDS VIRGINIA 24641. TELEPHONE (703) 964-2555
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT**

MEMORANDUM

TO: Selected SVCC Faculty
FROM: Dr. King
DATE: May 19, 1983
SUBJECT: Academic Advising Survey

The attached questionnaires are part of a study about traditional and adult students' perceptions of academic advisement at three small, rural Virginia Community Colleges. We believe that the results of the study can be very valuable in helping us to identify and improve critical services to SVCC students, therefore, we have agreed to participate.

Would you please help by distributing the attached questionnaires to the students in your classes who have been randomly selected to be in the study? Ask them to complete the questionnaire on their own and return it to you at the next class meeting. Please return all completed questionnaires as soon as possible to Don Smith in the SVCC Admissions Office by June 1.

Your cooperation is greatly appreciated.

CRK:bb

Attachments



WYTHEVILLE COMMUNITY COLLEGE
WYTHEVILLE, VA 24382

MEMORANDUM

TO: Selected Wytheville Community College Faculty
FROM: Dr. William F. Snyder, President
SUBJECT: Academic Advising Survey
DATE: May 18, 1983

The enclosed questionnaire is part of a study about traditional and adult students' perceptions with academic advisement at three small rural Virginia Community Colleges. I think the study will be helpful in the college's efforts to identify and improve services to students.

Would you please distribute the questionnaires to the students in your class who are selected to be in the study and inform them to complete it on their own and return it to you at the next class meeting. Please return all completed questionnaires as soon as possible to Mr. W. Ronald Hash in the WCC Admissions Office.

Thank you for your cooperation.

ns

Enclosure

**The vita has been removed from
the scanned document**