



Research Brief

Volume 5 Number 1, September 1997

1996 Academic Advising Survey

Table of Contents

<u>Introduction</u>	<u>Highlights</u>
<u>Survey Results</u>	
<u>Advisor's Knowledge</u>	<u>Advisor's Accessibility</u>
<u>Advisor's Familiarity with Students</u>	<u>Advisor's Professionalism</u>
<u>Advisor's Interaction Style</u>	<u>Advisor's Use of Available Technology</u>
• <u>Outcomes of Advising</u>	
• <u>Frequency of Meetings with Advisor</u>	
<u>Summary</u>	<u>Conclusion</u>
<u>References</u>	
<u>Tables</u>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ <u>Table 1</u>: Demographic Characteristics of Survey Respondents Compared to Undergraduate Population ■ <u>Table 2</u>: Age Group Difference in <u>Importance</u> of Advisor's Knowledge ■ <u>Table 3</u>: School Group Difference in Satisfaction with Advisor's Accessibility ■ <u>Table 4</u>: Schools with Significant Dissatisfaction Ratings on "Advisor's Familiarity with Student" items ■ <u>Table 5</u>: School Difference in Satisfaction with Advisor's Professionalism ■ <u>Table 6</u>: School Differences in Overall Satisfaction with Advisor ■ <u>Table 7</u>: Characteristics of Advising Judged Most Important and Items with the Highest and Lowest Levels of Student Satisfaction 	

Highlights

- Overall, IUPUI students view their advisors as having satisfactory knowledge about academic requirements and feel that they are treated fairly and with respect by their advisors. These areas of highest advising satisfaction are also the ones to which students attach the greatest importance.
- Students are less satisfied with their advisor's familiarity with them as individuals and with the impact of their lives outside college on their academic progress.

- A notable number of students, although less than half, are less than satisfied with the accessibility of their advisor.
- Younger students express more intensive advising needs, especially with regard to career guidance in relation to their major field of study.
- Women generally attach greater importance to a variety of aspects of advising than do men, but there are no notable gender differences in satisfaction with advising.
- There are very few differences in attitudes toward advising among members of different ethnic groups. However, where those few differences exist, African American students express lower levels of satisfaction than members of other minority groups and than the majority white population.
- There are some notable and consistent differences in satisfaction toward various aspects of advising among students in different academic schools.

(Back to [Table of Contents](#), [List of Tables](#))

Introduction

Several research studies have shown that students' perceptions about the advising they receive are associated with their academic performance and persistence in college (Metzner, 1989; Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991; Tinto, 1993). Prompted by IUPUI's concern with student performance and persistence, a questionnaire designed to assess the effectiveness of academic advising at IUPUI was mailed to 1,200 randomly selected undergraduate students sampled during the Spring semester of 1996. With an initial mailing and a follow-up letter, 450 students responded, representing a 38% response rate. The sample size was chosen to allow for analysis of differences by academic school. However, due to a relatively low response rate, some schools had too few respondents to consider reliably as a separate unit.

It is important to note that this survey was administered one and one half years ago. Since that time, several schools have engaged in notable efforts to improve academic advising. The findings from this survey should be viewed as a baseline against which changes in student attitudes and opinions can be gauged. Plans are underway to repeat this or a similar survey in the coming months to assess the effectiveness of recent efforts to improve student academic advising.

Table 1 compares the demographic characteristics of survey respondents to the population from which they were drawn. The respondents closely represent the population in terms of racial composition and course-load status but included a significantly higher proportion of females, were slightly older on average and tended to have higher grades.

Table 1. Demographic Characteristics of Survey Respondents Compared to Undergraduate Population

	Resp.	Pop.
Gender		
Male	31%	40%
Female	69%	60%
Race		
African American	7%	9%
Other Minority	4%	3%
Non-Minority	85%	88%
Average Age	28.7	26.1
Course Load		
Full-Time	53%	51%
Part-Time	47%	49%
Average GPA	2.96	2.69
School		
ALHT (Allied Health)	8%	6%
BUS (Business)	7%	4%
EDUC (Education)	8%	6%
EGTC (Engr & Tech)	14%	10%
LBA (Liberal Arts)	9%	9%
NUR (Nursing)	6%	5%
SCI (Science)	5%	6%
SCS (Cont. Studies)	6%	3%
UEC & UEC/p	28%	33%
All Other	9%	18%

(Back to [Table of Contents](#), [List of Tables](#))

School representation in the survey followed the population proportions with some notable exceptions. The Schools of Business, Engineering and Technology, and Continuing Studies were over-represented among respondents, whereas the Undergraduate Education Center (regular and preparatory program) and several of the smaller schools (combined into an "All Other" category) were under-represented.

Elizabeth Goering and Ron Sandwina, faculty members in the Department of Communication Studies, developed the questionnaire. It was developed, in part, by asking IUPUI students to respond to the following question: "What are the important aspects of academic advisement?" After analysis of the responses to this question, the co-authors identified five general factors, wrote items to assess each factor, then pretested and modified the instrument to improve the clarity of some questions. The final survey included 39 items that addressed satisfaction with and importance of advisor's **knowledge, accessibility, familiarity with students, professionalism and interaction style**. A single item relating to advisor's use of available technologies was added to assess the impact on perceived advising effectiveness of recent technology-based advising tools.

For each survey item, students indicated their satisfaction according to a 5-point agreement scale (strongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree, strongly disagree) and perceived importance on a corresponding 5-point scale (very important, important, undecided, unimportant, very unimportant). The survey also included 11 items that assessed agreement with important outcomes associated with advising such as overall satisfaction with advising, importance of advising to the overall academic experience, and whether the student would recommend his or her advisor to other students.

The instrument concluded with two open-ended questions asking what students liked most and least about their advisor, and additional questions asking students to self-report background information such as how frequently they met with their advisor and whether they attended IUPUI on a full- or part-time basis. Other background data presented in this research brief (age, ethnicity, gender and grade point average) were gathered from the institutional records by matching respondents' identification numbers.

(Back to [Table of Contents](#), [List of Tables](#))

Survey Results

The results of the survey are presented here first according to the factors that Goering and Sandwina identified through their focus group study. This is followed by an overall summary that examines the highest levels of importance, and the highest and lowest levels of satisfaction across the various factors.

For reporting purposes, the 5-point satisfaction and importance scales were treated as ranging from -2 to +2 with zero (0) as the neutral midpoint. Thus, averages above zero are on the "positive" side (satisfied or important), and averages below zero are on the "negative" side (dissatisfied or unimportant) of the scales.

Advisor's Knowledge

The first section of the survey dealt with student perceptions of their advisor's knowledge about degree requirements, rules and policies, course content, scheduling of courses, career opportunities and the general accuracy and adequacy of information provided to students. All items were rated according to student satisfaction and perceived importance. The highest levels of student satisfaction in this area were for items related to the advisor's knowledge of degree requirements and academic rules and policies. More than four out of five students agreed or strongly agreed that their advisor was knowledgeable in these areas. There was no item for which more than 13 percent of the students disagreed or strongly disagreed. However, a majority, or near majority of students were undecided about their advisor's knowledge related to career opportunities and conducting a job search. As is commonly found when satisfaction and importance scales are compared, students tended to rate items higher on the 5-point importance scale than on the 5-point satisfaction scale. Although one cannot compare directly responses on these two different scales, one can look at the relative difference between satisfaction and importance across items. The largest differences between average levels of satisfaction and importance for this section of the survey were in **knowledge about career opportunities in the major** (satisfaction, 0.48; importance, 1.26), **knowledge about how to conduct a job search** (satisfaction, 0.24; importance, 0.97), and **provides accurate information** (satisfaction, 0.88; importance, 1.47). These are the items that reflect the greatest 'gap' between students' perceived needs for advising and what they feel they receive. African American students were less satisfied on average with advisor **knowledge about general requirements needed for a degree in their schools** (.78 for African Americans; overall mean 1.18) and **knowledge about degree requirements in their majors** (.75 for African Americans; overall mean 1.13). There were no statistically significant group differences in the frequency of meetings with an advisor on the basis of ethnicity. As might be expected, younger students (18 to 22 years old) thought it was somewhat more important than older students that advisors have knowledge about how to conduct a job search and about career opportunities in the major. Students in this age category were more likely to attend full-time whereas higher proportions of students over age 23 reported attending on a part-time basis. This is perhaps an indication that these students were employed which might have contributed to the lower importance assigned to career opportunities and job search by older students. These age differences are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2. Age Group Difference in Importance of Advisor's Knowledge

	Overall	18 - 22 (N=141)	23 - 30 (N=152)	31 - 40 (N=97)	Over 40 (N=60)
Knowledge about career opportunities in your major	1.26	1.42	1.25	1.16	1.04
Knowledge about how to conduct a job search	0.97	1.17	0.88	0.95	0.75
Percent attending on a part-time basis	47%	20%	46%	74%	72%

Note. Differences are statistically significant for all three items at $p < .05$; the first two items were evaluated according to an F-test and the third using a chi-square test for independence.

There were some notable differences in satisfaction with advisor's knowledge by School. Students from Education, Continuing Studies, and UEC rated the majority of items in the **satisfaction with advisor's knowledge** scale lower than the overall mean for the items, while students from Business, Liberal Arts, Allied Health, Engineering & Technology, and Nursing generally rated items higher than the mean. However, the means for all items were on the positive side of the scale. There were few school differences, and none notable, in student perceptions of importance for the knowledge-related items.

(Back to [Table of Contents](#), [List of Tables](#))

Advisor's Accessibility

Respondents were asked to rate their satisfaction with and the importance of two items regarding advisor accessibility: whether their advisor is readily available; and whether they are flexible in arranging meeting times. While nearly two thirds of the respondents (63%) agreed or strongly agreed that their advisor was flexible, fewer (57%) indicated that their advisor is readily available. On the other hand, nine out of ten students felt that these two aspects of advisor accessibility were important or very important. Thus there was a large gap between perceived importance and level of satisfaction with regard to advisor accessibility.

There were no differences in satisfaction with accessibility by gender, ethnicity, age or GPA. There were differences by school, as shown in Table 3, with students in Education indicating notably lower levels of satisfaction with advisor flexibility and students in Education and the UEC relatively lower satisfaction with advisor availability. Students in Business, Liberal Arts, and Science indicated the highest levels of satisfaction in this area.

Table 3. School Group Difference in Satisfaction with Advisor's Accessibility

My advisor is...	IUPUI	AHLT N=37	BUS N=31	EDUC N=34	EGTC N=62	LIBA N=41	NURS N=27	SCI N=21	SCS N=26
flexible in arr. mtgs	0.71	0.71	1.06	0.06	0.9	0.97	0.88	0.9	0.65
readily available	0.55	0.66	0.65	0.21	0.68	0.78	0.76	0.76	0.5

Note. Differences are statistically significant for both items at $p < .05$ according to an F-test (ANOVA).

On average, women attributed higher levels of importance to advisor accessibility than men. However, it is interesting to note that students in the School of Education, which has a majority of women, attributed the lowest average level of importance in this area (average of 1.00 on the scale of -2 to +2). Students in other schools with a majority of women (e.g., Nursing and Allied Health) indicated relatively high levels of importance for advisor accessibility but the highest school average was found among students with Liberal Arts majors (1.71).

(Back to [Table of Contents](#), [List of Tables](#))

Advisor's Familiarity with Students

Of the eight items that made up the scale related to advisor familiarity with students, respondents were most satisfied with advisor willingness to work with a student to achieve his/her goals (mean 0.62; 54% agreed or strongly agreed) and being treated as an individual (mean 0.60; 59% agreed or strongly agreed). Students were least satisfied with their advisor's familiarity with their career goals (mean 0.27; 26% disagree or strongly disagree) and their advisor's understanding of how the student's personal life can affect academic progress (mean 0.22; 25% disagree or strongly disagree). Other items on this scale included qualities such as knowing students by name, familiarity with student academic goals, and ability to help students set goals. Overall, more students responded negatively to questions in this section than

in any other section. For all but one item (**advisor is willing to work with you to achieve your goals**), at least one in five students responded negatively to these statements regarding advisors' familiarity with students. The two items with the lowest mean rating are noted above, but there was one other item that had an even higher percentage of students disagreeing or strongly disagreeing: Advisor **knows your name**. Fully 30 percent of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed with this statement. The mean of this item was not as low as the two items noted above because a higher percentage of students strongly agreed with this statement (23%) compared to the two other statements (15% for each). This scale also revealed some relatively large disparities between student ratings of the importance of and satisfaction with level of familiarity. For example, mean satisfaction with advisor's **understanding with how your personal life affects your academic progress** was 0.22 while the mean importance rating for this item was 0.96. Other items with large disparities include **treats you as an individual, not a number** (satisfaction, 0.60; importance, 1.33) and **is familiar with your career goals** (satisfaction, 0.27; importance, 0.99). Only one item on this scale (**familiarity with career goals**) revealed a statistically significant group difference in student satisfaction on the basis of gender, ethnicity, age or GPA. While the campus-wide mean satisfaction rating with this item was 0.27, African American students were significantly less satisfied with advisor's familiarity with career goals (0.06) and other ethnic groups were significantly more satisfied (0.69). As would be expected given the predominant size of the group, the average satisfaction among White, non-Hispanic students was very similar to the mean (.25). Several statistically significant gender differences in importance ratings emerged. Women rated the following three attributes of an advisor higher in importance than men: **is able to help you set goals, is willing to work with you to achieve your goals, and is knowledgeable about student organizations in the major**. On five out of eight items in the scale, younger students (18-22 years old) rated items higher in importance than did the older cohort and higher than the campus-wide mean ($p < .05$). When respondents were disaggregated on the basis of school, statistically significant dissatisfaction ratings emerged concerning advisor familiarity with students. Students in the schools of Education and Continuing Studies, and in the Undergraduate Education Center, reported negative satisfaction on several items from the **advisor's familiarity with students** scale ($p < .05$) as shown in Table 4.

Table 4. Schools with Significant Dissatisfaction Ratings on Advisor's Familiarity with Student Items

Item: My advisor...	School	Avg. Satisfaction*
knows my name	Education	-0.38
	Continuing Studies	-0.15
	Undergraduate Education	-0.05
is familiar with my academic goals	Education	-0.13
understands how my personal life affects my academic progress	Education	-0.47
	Continuing Studies	-0.04
is knowledgeable about student organizations in my major	Education	-0.16

*Based on a 5-point scale ranging from -2 for very dissatisfied to +2 for very satisfied, with 0 as the neutral point

(Back to [Table of Contents](#), [List of Tables](#))

Advisor's Professionalism

The six items on this scale related to students' perceptions of how fairly they were treated by advising staff, whether or not phone calls were returned and information was provided on a timely basis, how clearly an advisor communicated the relative responsibilities of advisor and advisee, and the advisor's preparation for advising sessions with students. In general, students were most satisfied with how fairly they were treated by their advisor (mean, 1.04; 77% agreed or strongly agreed) and least satisfied with **making his or her duties, responsibilities and obligations clear to students** (mean, 0.39; 17% disagreed or strongly disagreed). The greatest disparity between mean satisfaction and mean importance among items on this scale appeared in the question asking how promptly advisors return student phone calls (0.41 mean satisfaction, 1.12 mean importance). Gender differences were most

pronounced for the same item, with women placing more importance on returning phone calls promptly than men (1.23 versus 0.88, respectively). There were statistically significant gender differences in mean importance ratings for five out of six items on the professionalism scale, with women rating all items more important than men. In fact, throughout the survey, wherever there were statistically significant differences in mean importance on the basis of gender, women rated items higher than men. There were some notable school differences in satisfaction ratings for **promptly returns your phone calls** and **makes his or her duties, responsibilities, & obligations clear to you**. Students from Liberal Arts, Nursing and "other schools" were among the most satisfied while students from Education were among the least satisfied. These results are summarized in Table 5.

Table 5. School Difference in Satisfaction with Advisor's Professionalism

My advisor...	IUPUI	AHLT N=37	BUS N=31	EDUC N=34	EGTC N=62	LIBA N=41	NURS N=27	SCI N=21	SCS N=26	UEC N=127
returns phone calls promptly	0.41	0.59	0.47	-0.13	0.42	0.69	0.68	0.55	0.42	0.19
makes his/her duties clear	0.39	0.41	0.45	0.06	0.36	0.70	0.60	0.38	0.23	0.32

Note. Differences are statistically significant for both items at $p < .05$ according to an F-test (ANOVA).

In addition, students who placed the highest importance on an advisor returning phone calls promptly were from the Schools of Science, Nursing, and Liberal Arts, while Business and Engineering and Technology students placed the least importance on this item.

(Back to [Table of Contents](#), [List of Tables](#))

Advisor's Interaction Style

In general students appeared to be satisfied with their advisor's interaction style. For four of the eight items (**treats you with respect, is friendly, is trustworthy, is approachable**), three-quarters or more students indicated satisfaction. The majority of students also agreed that their advisor was approachable and a good listener. However, fewer than half of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed that their advisor is open-minded when making decisions, shows genuine concern for them, and motivated them to do their best work. It should be noted that not many students disagreed with these statements, but rather many were undecided: Between one-third and two-fifths of the respondents indicated they were undecided as to whether their advisor had these attributes.

Several interesting group differences in ratings of importance of an advisor's interaction style are noted when responses were analyzed on the basis of age, grade point average, gender, and ethnicity. Younger students (18 to 22 years old) and students with the lowest grade point average (0.00 to 2.00) rated advisor **friendliness** and **ability to motivate them to do their best work** higher than the overall average. The importance of these two items declined steadily as student age and grade-point average increased. Women rated the following items as more important: **Treats you with respect, open-minded when making decisions, motivates you to do your best work** and **is friendly**. The only item that exhibited significant group differences on the basis of ethnicity was the importance of an advisor showing genuine concern for a student. With an overall mean of 1.19, African American students placed the least importance (0.93) and white non-Hispanics placed the most importance (1.24) on being shown genuine concern by their academic advisor.

Students from Liberal Arts and Business reported being more satisfied with their advisor's interaction style than the campus-wide average. This was true for all items in the scale for which statistically significant groups differences existed. Students in three schools (Education, Continuing Studies, and the Undergraduate Education Center) reported being less satisfied than the campus-wide average. Students from the School of Education reported dissatisfaction with their advisor's ability to motivate (-0.25) and show genuine concern (-0.03). The only item in the scale that generated a statistically significant difference in importance across schools was the advisor's ability to motivate students to do their best work. Students in the UEC reported the largest difference between importance of (1.10) and satisfaction

with (0.18) their advisor's ability to motivate them.

(Back to [Table of Contents](#), [List of Tables](#))

Advisor's Use of Available Technologies

In response to a single item, more than half of the students surveyed reported being undecided about their satisfaction with (63%) and the importance of (51%) their advisor's use of available technologies. On average, younger students placed more importance on advisor's use of available technologies than older students. There were no other notable group differences on the basis of gender, ethnicity, GPA or school.

(Back to [Table of Contents](#), [List of Tables](#))

Outcomes of Advising

Most students (82%) were satisfied or very satisfied with their choice of major, and only four percent expressed some level of dissatisfaction. Two-thirds of the respondents (66%) indicated satisfaction with their experiences in the major and only eight percent indicated some level of dissatisfaction. In a more direct assessment of the outcomes of advising, 79 percent of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed that the advisor/advisee relationship is important to a student's academic experience. Nearly two-thirds of the respondents (64%) were satisfied with their advisor while 15 percent expressed some dissatisfaction. And, although more than half (59%) would recommend their advisor to other students, about one in six students (17%) would not. Most students indicated they expected to continue their schooling at IUPUI and in their current major, but a notable number indicated some inclination to change their major (23%), transfer to another university (18%) or quit school altogether (11%).

In response to a single item, more than one out of three students (37%) indicated that they had an unpleasant experience with an advisor other than their present one. The percentage of students reporting an unpleasant experience with a previous advisor was highest among students in the School of Education (52%) but was also high among students in Nursing (48%), Allied Health (47%) and Science (47%). It cannot be determined from this survey whether the unpleasant advising experience occurred in their major school or in another school or the Undergraduate Education Center. However, only 35% of the students in the Undergraduate Education Center reported an unpleasant experience with a previous advisor.

The perceived importance of the advisor/advisee relationship declined as GPA rose although the relationship was important to students across all grade categories with scores ranging from 1.43 for the lowest GPA to 1.00 for the highest GPA. School-based differences in student satisfaction with their advisor are presented in Table 6. Consistent with earlier results, School of Education students indicated the lowest average level of satisfaction with their advisors. However, it should be noted that School of Education students reported a significantly higher than average level of satisfaction with their overall experiences in the major department (0.94 versus a campus-wide mean of 0.76) and were also less likely to think about changing majors or to think about transferring to another university or college.

Table 6. School Differences in Overall Satisfaction with Advisor

	IUPUI	AHLT N=37	BUS N=31	EDUC N=34	EGTC N=62	LIBA N=41	NURS N=27	SCI N=21
Overall satisfaction with advisor	0.68	0.76	1.26	0.3	0.79	0.93	0.77	0.62

Note. Differences are statistically significant for both items at $p < .05$ according to an F-test (ANOVA).

(Back to [Table of Contents](#), [List of Tables](#))

Frequency of Meetings with Advisor

The overwhelming majority of students reported seeing their advisor once or twice a semester (44%) or once a year (31%). On average, students with lower grade point averages reported seeing their advisor more often than students with higher grade point averages. For example, 69% of the students whose grade point averages were below 2.0 reported seeing an advisor once or twice a semester compared to 41% of the students with a grade point average of 3.51 or above. Younger students reported seeking out advisors more often than did older students. In general, students under thirty years old reported meeting with an advisor once or twice a semester while students over thirty reported meeting with an advisor once a year.

Sixty percent or more of the students in the schools of Allied Health, Education and the Undergraduate Education Center reported meeting with their advisors one or more times a semester. A significant number of students from Nursing (26%), Science (14%), and Allied Health (11%) reported seeing their advisor three or more times a semester. However, an equal number of Nursing students (26%) and more Science (24%) and Allied Health (14%) students reported that they never met with an advisor.

Of those students who reported that they attended IUPUI on full time basis, 70% reported seeing an advisor one or more times a semester while 37% of those who attended on a part-time basis reported seeing an advisor one or more times a semester.

(Back to [Table of Contents](#), [List of Tables](#))

Summary

This analysis reports the results of a survey in which several dimensions of advising were considered, each through a series of questions. The five dimensions considered were: advisor knowledge, advisor accessibility, advisor familiarity with students, advisor professionalism, and advisor interaction style. Students indicated both their satisfaction with and the importance of each scale item. Table 7 displays the items from across all scales for which the largest number of respondents indicated high importance, high satisfaction and relatively low satisfaction.

Table 7. Characteristics of Advising Judged Most Important and Items with the Highest and Lowest Levels of Student Satisfaction

My advisor...	Dimension	Mean
Importance		
Is knowledgeable about the general requirements needed for a degree in my school	Knowledge	1.72
Is knowledgeable about the degree requirements for my major	Knowledge	1.72
Understands my school's academic rules & policies	Knowledge	1.60
Provides accurate information	Knowledge	1.59
Treats me with respect	Interaction Style	1.58
Treats me fairly	Professionalism	1.52
Highest Satisfaction		
Is knowledgeable about the general requirements needed for a degree in my school	Knowledge	1.18
Understands my school's academic rules & policies	Knowledge	1.17
Treats me with respect	Interaction Style	1.14
Understands university rules & policies	Knowledge	1.13
Is knowledgeable about the degree requirements for my major	Knowledge	1.13
Lowest Satisfaction*		
Understands how your personal life affects your academic progress	Familiarity	0.22
Is knowledgeable about how to conduct a job search	Knowledge	0.24
Is familiar with your career goals	Familiarity	0.27
Knows your name	Familiarity	0.28
Motivates you to do your best	Interaction Style	0.35

*One other item regarding advisors use of available technology had a lower mean (0.03), but was not listed because the majority of students were 'undecided' about both their satisfaction with and the importance of this item.

(Back to [Table of Contents](#), [List of Tables](#))

It is clear from Table 7 that students place a high premium on their advisor's knowledge about what is required to get them through their studies. But, they also feel it is important to be treated fairly and with respect. It is also clear that IUPUI students are generally satisfied with these aspects of their advisor's knowledge and rapport with students.

On the negative side, students expressed lower levels of satisfaction regarding the personal nature of their relationships with advisors. This may not be too surprising at a school as large as IUPUI. The fact that these items are not as high in importance may reflect that students accept this as a fact of life at a large university. On the other hand, it is clear that some students, particularly those who are younger, attach more importance to establishing a more familiar relationship with their advisor. It is also notable that several of the low satisfaction items relate to the advisor's role in guiding students to careers. Again, younger students attach more importance to this need.

Consistent significant differences were found in levels of satisfaction with advising across schools. In general, students from Business, Liberal Arts, Allied Health, Science, Engineering and Technology, and Nursing reported higher levels of satisfaction, with Business and Liberal Arts students among the most satisfied with their advising experiences. Students from Education, Continuing Studies and the Undergraduate Education Center reported relatively lower levels of satisfaction, with Education students among the least satisfied. On the other hand, School of Education students were generally satisfied with their choice of major and indicated a higher likelihood, as a group, of remaining enrolled at IUPUI as an Education major.

There were few school differences in importance of advising. However, when data were analyzed on the basis of gender, age, ethnicity and GPA, the opposite was true: several differences in levels of importance were revealed but few differences in levels of satisfaction emerged. Younger students were more concerned that their advisor had sufficient knowledge about the job search process and career opportunities, that their advisor helped them set goals, and that their advisor treated them as an individual in a friendly and open-minded manner. Younger students also felt that it was important for their advisor to motivate them to do their best work and that they have some understanding of how a student's

personal life can affect academic progress. Students with lower GPAs felt that it was more important for their advisor to be friendly and motivate them to do their best work.

Female students differed considerably from their male counterparts in terms of the relative importance they assigned to various characteristics of their advisor and the advising experience. In all cases in which significant differences existed, females rated items higher in importance than males. These items include:

- knowing school rules & policies
- knowing degree requirements in school and major area
- knowing student organizations in major area
- providing adequate and accurate information
- being flexible and available
- helping them set & achieve goals
- treating them fairly and with respect
- being open-minded and friendly
- returning phone calls promptly
- being well prepared for meetings

African American students were the only racial group that reported significant differences in levels of satisfaction with certain aspects of advising effectiveness. African Americans were generally less satisfied with their advisor's knowledge of degree requirements for their schools or majors, and were less satisfied with their advisor's familiarity with their career goals. African American students and minority students in general also felt that it was less important than did white students that advisors show genuine concern for them.

(Back to [Table of Contents](#), [List of Tables](#))

Conclusion

High quality academic advising has an indirect, positive effect on retention through its positive effect on student satisfaction and student grade point average according to Metzner (1989). The important aspects of academic advising to the undergraduates at IUPUI who responded to this survey were primarily related to advisor knowledge although there were clearly some meaningful differences in priorities across groups of students. For many students the quality of their relationship and interactions with their advisor were of major importance.

In general, IUPUI academic advisors have successfully attended to the most important aspects of the advising process but there are some groups of students for whom the experience is relatively less successful. It is also clear that there are areas of needed improvements particularly with regard to personalizing the advising experience, attending to the more intensive advising needs of younger students, and tying the advising experience more closely to career opportunities.

(Back to [Table of Contents](#), [List of Tables](#))

References

- Metzner, B. (1989). "Perceived quality of academic advising: The effect on freshman attrition." American Educational Research Journal, 26, 422-442.
- Pascarella, E. T. & Terenzini, P. T. (1991). How college affects students: Findings and insights from twenty years of research. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Tinto, V. (1993). Leaving college: Rethinking the causes and cures of student attrition (2nd ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

(Back to [Table of Contents](#), [List of Tables](#))

Research Brief is a periodic publication of the Office of Information Management and Institutional Research at [Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis](#).

This edition of Research Brief was written by **Jane Lambert**, research associate, and **Karen Black**, assistant to the Vice Chancellor for Planning and Institutional Improvement, and edited by **Victor Borden**, director of Information Management and Institutional Research. **Lynn Miller** conducted the survey analysis.

Go to [Office of Information Management and Institutional Research](#) Home Page
