Ampirik Araştırma / Original Empirical Research

www.yuksekogretim.org

Yükseköğretim Dergisi
Journal of Higher Education (Turkey)

The Views of Undergraduate Students and Academic Advisors on the Academic Advising Process

Akademik Danışmanlık Uygulamasına İlişkin Lisans Öğrencilerinin ve Akademik Danışmanların Görüşleri

Yeşim Çapa Aydın[1,2], Oya Yerin Güneri[1,2], Esra Eret[2], Funda Barutçu Yıldırım[2]

[1]Department of Educational Sciences, Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey
[2]Center for Advancing Learning and Teaching, Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey

Özet

Bu çalışmanın amacı Ankara'da bir devlet üniversitesinde uygulanan akademik danışmanlık sürecine ilişkin öğrencilerin ve akademik danışmanlık yapan öğretim üyelerinin görüşlerini incelemektir. Çalışmada tarama ve ilişkisel araştırma desenleri kullanılmıştır ve veriler çevrim içi anket yoluyla 130 akademik danışmandan ve 840 lisans öğrencisinden elde edilmiştir. Verilerin analizinde betimleyici ve çıkarımsal istatistik yöntemleri kullanılmıştır. Bulgular, akademik danışmanların ve öğrencilerin bir akademik dönem içinde çoğunlukla bir ya da iki kez görüştüklerini ve bu görüşmelerin sıklıkla ders kaydı ve ders onayı hakkında olduğunu göstermiştir. Akademik danışmanlık sürecine ilişkin akademik danışmanların görüşleri, öğrencilerinkinden daha olumlu bulunmuştur. Öğrencilerin akademik danışmanlığa ilişkin memnuniyet düzeylerini yordayan faktörler arasında yüz yüze görüşmelerin sıklığı, akademik danışmanlık kapsamında yapılan etkinliklerin sayısı ve akademik danışmanın özellikleri yer almaktadır.

Anahtar sözcükler: Akademik danışmanlık, danışanların ve danışmanların görüşleri, yükseköğretim.

Abstract

The current study investigated the views of both students and academic advisors regarding the academic advising in a state university in Ankara. The study utilized survey and correlational research design methods. The data were collected from 840 undergraduate students and 130 advisors through an online survey, and were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics. The findings indicated that the advisors and their students met once or twice during an academic semester, mostly to talk about issues related to course registration and approval. Moreover, the academic advisors had significantly more positive opinions towards academic advising than did the students. Lastly, the frequency of face-to-face appointments, the number of advising activities, and advisor characteristics were found to predict overall student satisfaction regarding academic advising.

Keywords: Academic advising, higher education, views of advisors and advisees.

The history of academic advising dates back to the 17th century where administrators and faculty members in colleges acknowledged that students require guidance outside the class regarding personal, moral, and academic issues. Over time, the informal guidance provided in colleges has been transformed into formal campus services offered by experts (Cook, 2009). However, the characteristics, roles, and responsibilities of academic advisors in higher education institutions are still debatable. Conflicting views about the roles and functions of academic advisors may result from various questions regarding who an advisor is, who an advisee is, what kind of training is provided to advisors, what the delivery type of the advising is, and which theoretical approach is being used by the advisors (Robbins, 2012). Oftentimes, the theoretical approaches used in academic advising and employing faculty members as advisors are related to the mission of the institutions. According to the prescriptive approach, the faculty member is the authority who tells students which courses to take and when to take them. Students are rather passive in the process. In developmental advising, on the other hand, the faculty perceive students as individuals who are motivated for their personal and professional development that are eager to develop a plan of study with the advisor rather than only having extrinsic motivation for grades (Christian & Sprinkle, 2013). Understanding this perception of the faculty, students would be more willing to take part in the academic advising process and contribute more to their own development. Moreover, as described by Barbuto,

İletişim / Correspondence:
Esra Eret
Center for Advancing Learning and Teaching, Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey
e-mail: eseret@metu.edu.tr

Yükseköğretim Dergisi / Journal of Higher Education (Turkey), 9(2), 139–148. © 2019 Deomed
Geliş tarihi / Received: Nisan / April 4, 2018; **Kabul tarihi / Accepted:** Eylül / September 22, 2018
Bu makalenin atıf künyesi / Please cite this article as: Çapa Aydın, Y., Yerin Güneri, O., Eret, E., & Barutçu Yıldırım, F. (2019). The views of undergraduate students and academic advisors on the academic advising process. *Yükseköğretim Dergisi*, 9(2), 139–148. doi:10.2399/yod.18.042
A part of this study was presented at European Conference on Educational Research (ECER), September 6–10, 2015, Budapest, Hungary.

ORCID ID: Y. Çapa Aydın 0000-0002-5463-1989; O. Yerin Güneri 0000-0002-0565-4025; E. Eret 0000-0002-0908-8630; F. Barutçu Yıldırım 0000-0003-3630-1019

Story, Fritz, and Schinstock (2011), in developmental advising, "the advisor develops a stronger relationship with the advisee" (p. 656) so that the advisor and student together make decisions about their roles throughout the advising process. However, it should also be considered that students might benefit from different kinds of academic advising, be it prescriptive or developmental, at different times (Hatch & Garcia, 2017); and the type of advising could be changed according to student needs and characteristics, as some students might prefer more structured and directive advising.

The literature signifies the changing and increasing expectations from current academic advising programs; thus, the content and functions of advising activities are also changing. Academic advising is regarded as a complex guiding process which involves not only giving advice to students about academic issues such as degree requirements, course selection, campus integration, but also providing help regarding their mental or physical health needs (Champlin-Sharff, 2010), guiding students to link their academic, career, and life goals; leading students for the right academic and non-academic campus resources; informing students about the policies and procedures of the university, knowing about students' individual characteristics, and fostering students' skills to manage their academic life (Allen, Smith, & Muehleck, 2014).

Every educational setting has its own culture, and students are expected to adapt to this culture in order to succeed and get the maximum benefit from the setting until they graduate. Considering the culture of higher education, Strayhorn (2015) refers to academic advisors as "cultural navigators" and defines these cultural navigators as "individuals who strive to help students move successfully through education and life" (p. 59). Within this role, academic advisors are expected to know the culture of the institution and be aware of the all codes, values, traditions, regulations, principles, rules, or requirements so that they can transfer this information to students when necessary.

As described above, there are different academic advising programs, approaches, and expectations that may vary according to the type of institution, department or academic advisor. However, regardless of the program and approach, all advisors are expected to share a similar goal which is the graduation of students with the success that also involves equipping students with the tools they will need in life after the graduation (Teasley & Buchanan, 2013). While fulfilling this goal, successful advising has an influence on many aspects of college students' life as well. Reported by the studies in relation to academic advising, the relationship between advisor and advisee, the support of advisors, and the whole process of advising might have effects on student success and retention and other academic experiences (Shelton, 2003; Young-Jones, Burt, Dixon, & Hawthorne, 2013), student engagement (Young-Jones et al., 2013), and satisfaction with university (Ellis, 2014). According to Braun and Zolfagharian (2016), appropriate academic advising affects student satisfaction as one of the institutional factors; and therefore, it leads to higher rates of retention and increased on-time graduation. Therefore, by investing in increasing the effectiveness of academic advising programs, higher education institutions could also invest in the improvement of the quality of their services and outcomes.

In Turkey, the Law of Higher Education (no. 2547) does not specifically include information on "academic advising", however, item 22 of the law mentions the duties of the faculty members. The item states that the faculty member meets students on specific dates to provide help regarding their issues, and guides and leads them in accordance with the aims and principles of the Law of Higher Education. This brief statement can be taken as the definition of the academic advising role of faculty members. With respect to this statement of the law, some of the universities, such as Gazi, Hacettepe, Bahçeşehir, Trakya, and Anadolu, prepared their own documents outlining the aims and principles of academic advising, and mentioned the roles and responsibilities of academic advisors. In these documents, the academic advising process is mainly approached prescriptively and the primary roles of advisors are stated as registration approval, course registration and selection, and other official procedures in relation to academic life. The issues such as career guidance, adaptation to university life, and professional and personal development are also mentioned but generally not as strongly emphasized as the other roles. Many of the other higher education institutions present either no information or some brief information on advising as part of their regulation of undergraduate education. The literature in Turkey on academic advising in undergraduate education is also limited. The studies in relation to academic advising mainly concentrate on the advising during thesis supervision process and the relationship between supervisors and graduate students (Güçlü, Sezgin, Kılınç, & Kavgacı, 2011; Tonbul, 2014). With respect to academic advising in undergraduate education, by examining the university websites, Köser and Mercanlıoğlu (2010) evaluated how academic advising in Turkish universities is defined, and determined whether or not the institution had any specific documents or information on academic advising. They concluded that only 29 universi-

ties out of 132 prepared separate documents on the academic advising process. Another study was conducted by Demir and Ok (2001). In their study, the researchers investigated the perceptions of advisors and students to improve academic advising. The findings of this study revealed that there was a need for a more definite description of academic advising policy, and the roles of both advisors and students. Moreover, the researchers suggested that academic advising should be better appreciated by the faculty taking this responsibility; academic advisors should volunteer for this duty and get specific training; and the advising practices should be systematically evaluated by each institution.

Considering the limited number of studies and the importance of academic advising in higher education, the current study examined the views of students and advisors to understand the effectiveness of academic advising process in a large state university in Turkey. In this institution, academic advising started in the 1960s. Since then, the faculty members have been assigned as academic advisors to the undergraduate students. In the undergraduate rules and regulations document of this institution, the role of an academic advisor is defined as informing and guiding students about the course selection, approval of the course registration, and informing and guiding students about college adjustment, professional development, and career. As also understood from the role definition, academic advising could be regarded as prescriptive rather than developmental, as advisors mostly play the role of authority, and guide students while they are making their academic decisions. These academic advisors do not get any training before they are appointed as an academic advisor of a group of students.

Aim of the Study and Research Questions

The study aimed to examine the views of students and academic advisors in order to evaluate the effectiveness of an academic advising program in a state university in Ankara. The following were the research questions of the study:

- What are the academic advising activities that students and advisors engage in during a semester?
- What are the views of students and advisors on academic advising?
- Is there a significant difference between students' and advisors' satisfaction level about academic advising?
- Do gender, grade level, number of advising activity, the frequency of face-to-face appointments, advisor's communication with students, and advisors' knowledge about students significantly predict the level of student satisfaction with the academic advising?

Method

The study utilized both survey and correlational research design methods, since it aimed to gather views and opinions of participants about a specific topic and to examine the relationships between certain variables (Fraenkel, Wallen, & Hyun, 2015).

Sampling

The data were collected from undergraduate students and advisors in a large state university in Ankara. A total of 5000 students were selected via stratified random sampling by gender, faculty, and grade level from among 15000 undergraduate students. Students were invited by an e-mail to participate in the study and complete an online survey. Eight hundred and forty students (408 female; 428 male; 4 not specified) participated in the study with a return rate of 16.8%. With regard to the grade level, the data showed that participants were freshman (7.3%), sophomore (29.6%), junior (33.0%), and senior (28.8%) students. The detailed information on the characteristics of the students taking part in this study is given in Table 1.

To collect data from the advisors, a link to the online survey was e-mailed to 591 faculty members who were assigned as academic advisors at the time of the data collection. A total of 130 advisors (23.8% professors, 29.2% associate professors, 30.8% assistant professors, and 16.2% instructors) responded to the survey, with a return rate of 22%. The participants had the

Table 1. Information on the characteristics of the students.

		f	%
Gender	Female	408	48.5
	Male	428	51.0
	Total	836	99.5
Faculty	Architecture	17	2.0
	Arts and Sciences	198	23.5
	Economic and Administrative Sciences	94	11.2
	Education	88	10.5
	Engineering	382	45.4
	Total	779	92.6
Grade level	Freshman	61	7.3
	Sophomore	249	29.6
	Junior	277	33.0
	Senior	242	28.8
	Total	829	98.7
CGPA	Below 1.00	26	3.1
	1.00–1.79	52	6.2
	1.80–1.99	52	6.2
	2.00–2.49	273	32.5
	2.50–2.99	205	24.4
	3.00–3.49	159	18.9
	3.50–4.00	69	8.2
	Total	836	99.5

mean of 12.27 years of teaching experience and the mean of 10.5 years of advising experience. Table 2 presents more information on the profile of the academic advisors who participated in this study.

Data Collection Instruments

After reviewing several questionnaires in the literature (e.g., Allen & Smith, 2008a; Robbins & Zarges, 2011; Winston & Sandor, 1984) and considering the institution's policy statements on student advising, the Academic Advising Survey (AAS) with Advisor and Student Forms were developed by the researchers. The *AAS-Advisor* and *AAS-Student* forms included four sections (advising activities, views on the academic advising process, satisfaction from overall academic advising process, and demographic information). The first section in both the *AAS-Advisor* and *AAS-Student* forms included 27 advising activities (e.g. selecting courses, career goals, academic issues). The participants were asked whether or not they were engaged in the given activities throughout the advising period. Section two of the *AAS-Student Form* assessed academic advising experience on a 5-point Likert scale, and included 16 items to evaluate multiple aspects of advising-based relationship and communication with the advisor (e.g. "My advisor provides sufficient time for me during the advising sessions."), while section two of *the AAS-Advisor Form* included 10 items (e.g. "I provide sufficient time for my students during the advising sessions") on a 5-point Likert scale. The third section in both forms asked participants to evaluate their overall satisfaction of the academic advising program out of 10. In the final section of both forms, questions regarding demographic information and the academic advising program (e.g., the frequency of face-to-face advising appointments, duration of appointments) were asked. The detailed information on both forms is presented in Table 3.

Exploratory factor analyses were conducted for the second section of the survey by using the student and academic advisor data. Before running the factor analysis for the student data, factorability was tested by using correlation coefficients, communality values, Bartlett's test of sphericity, and the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy. All of the items were correlated with one other item at least .3, and all communalities were above .3. In addition, Bartlett's test was significant, ($\chi^2(120)=8881.0$, $p<.01$), indicating that the correlation matrix was different from the identity matrix. Finally, KMO value of .95 suggested that the data were factorable. Sixteen items (of Section II) were subjected to the factor analysis using principal axis factoring and direct oblimin rotation. The analysis yielded two factors, explaining 65.71% of the total variance. The first factor, labeled "advisor's communication with students," included 11 items with loadings ranging from .53 to .93. The second factor, labeled "advisor's knowledge about students," consisted of five items, with factor loadings from .45 to .93. Internal consistency was estimated through Cronbach's alpha. The alpha levels (.93 and .84) of both factors and the whole scale (.95) were deemed acceptable (Table 4).

Table 2. Information on the characteristics of the advisors.

		f	%
Faculty	Architecture	12	9.2
	Arts and Sciences	37	28.5
	Economic and Administrative Sciences	11	8.5
	Education	14	10.8
	Engineering	52	40.0
	Vocational High School	1	0.8
	Total	127	97.7
Title	Professor	31	23.8
	Associate Professor	38	29.2
	Assistant Professor	40	30.8
	Instructor	21	16.2
	Total	130	100
Average number of delivered courses in an academic year	2 courses	9	6.9
	3 courses	14	10.8
	4 courses	67	51.5
	5 courses	20	15.4
	6 courses	14	10.8
	Other	6	4.7
	Total	130	100

Table 3. Sections of the Academic Advising Survey-Student Form and Advisor Form.

Sections of the survey	Number of items in AAS-Student Form	Number of items in AAS-Advisor Form
Section 1: Advising activities	27 items for marking the issue/topics that students spend time with their advisor	27 items for marking the issue/topics that the faculty spend time with their advisees
Section 2: Experience on academic advising	16 items with 5-point Likert scale to get views on academic advisor and advising process	10 items with 5-point Likert scale to get views on advising process
Section 3: Satisfaction from academic advising	1 item for assessing their satisfaction level out of 10	1 item for assessing their satisfaction level out of 10
Section 4: Demographic information	11 items on both students' background and academic advising process	10 items on faculty members' background and academic advising process

Table 4. Factor loadings of the AAS Student Form.

	Factor 1: Communication with students	Factor 2: Knowledge about students
Item 3 - maintains an open line of communication.	**.93**	-.14
Item 4 - is a good listener.	**.91**	-.08
Item 2 - provides a caring, open atmosphere.	**.91**	-.09
Item 5 - responds to my requests in timely fashion (e.g. e-mail, phone calls).	**.81**	-.03
Item 15 - provides sufficient time for me during advising sessions.	**.79**	.07
Item 1 - is available when I need assistance.	**.67**	.19
Item 6 - is on time for advising appointments with me.	**.66**	.10
Item 14 - is easy to get in touch with when I need.	**.64**	.16
Item 9 - is knowledgeable about my major.	**.60**	-.01
Item 12 - knowledgeable about what courses I need.	**.60**	.10
Item 10 - is flexible in arranging meeting times with me.	**.53**	.19
Item 7 - is familiar with my academic background.	-.07	**.93**
Item 8 - is concerned about my success.	.03	**.84**
Item 13 - knows me well enough to write a letter of recommendation for me.	.05	**.76**
Item 11 - knows my name.	.08	**.70**
Item 16 - considers my personal abilities, talents, and interests when advising me about courses or programs of study.	.32	**.45**
Eigenvalue	9.04	1.47
Total variance explained	56.51%	9.20%
Cronbach's alpha	.93	.84

For the advisor data, factorability was also tested by using correlation coefficients, communality values, Bartlett's test of sphericity, and the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy. All of the items were correlated with one other item at least .3 and all communalities were above .3. In addition, Bartlett's test was significant, ($\chi^2(45)=444.08$, $p<.01$), indicating that the correlation matrix was different from the identity matrix. Finally, KMO value of .85 suggested that the data were factorable. The items were subjected to the factor analysis using principal axis factoring and direct oblimin rotation. The analysis yielded two factors, explaining 49.66% of the total variance. The first factor, labeled "knowledge about students," included five items with loadings ranging from .40 to .87. The second factor, labeled "communication with students," consisted of five items, with factor loadings from .43 to .68. Internal consistency was estimated through Cronbach's alpha. The alpha levels (.83 and .69) of both factors and the total scale (.86) were both acceptable (Table 5).

Table 5. Factor loadings of the AAS Academic Advisor Form.

	Factor 1: Knowledge about students	Factor 2: Communication with students
Item 2 - I am familiar with my students' academic background.	**.87**	-.05
Item 3 - I am concerned with my students' success.	**.81**	-.05
Item 1 - I know my students' name.	**.79**	-.07
Item 7 - I know my students well enough to write a letter of recommendation for them.	**.72**	-.06
Item 9 - I consider my students' personal abilities, talents, and interests when advising them about courses/programs.	**.40**	.32
Item 5 - I respond to my students' requests in timely fashion (e.g. e-mail, phone calls, etc.).	**-.08**	.68
Item 4 - I provide my students with a sincere and caring atmosphere.	-.12	**.63**
Item 8 - I provide sufficient time for my students during advising sessions.	.27	**.57**
Item 6 - I try different ways (e-mail, phone call, etc.) to get in touch with my students when needed.	.17	**.54**
Item 10 - My students are on time for advising appointments with me.	.19	**.44**
Eigenvalue	4.48	1.47
Total variance explained	40.17%	9.49%
Cronbach's alpha	.83	.69

Data Analysis

The survey data from students and advisors were firstly summarized through descriptive statistics. In addition, independent samples t-test was used to compare the satisfaction level of students and advisors from the academic advising. Hierarchical regression analysis was performed only on the student data to predict overall student satisfaction of academic advising by the number of advising activities, the frequency of face-to-face advising appointments, and advisor characteristics after controlling for gender and grade level. The outcome variable was overall student satisfaction with the academic advising, which was measured in *the Academic Advising Student Survey* using one question asking about their satisfaction out of 10. The predictor variables were gender, grade level, number of advising activity, the frequency of face-to-face appointment, communication with students, and knowledge about students. Two variables categorical in nature ("grade level" and "frequency of face-to-face advising appointments") were dummy coded using "senior" and "never" as the reference category, respectively. Analyses were conducted by using SPSS 24.

Results

Advising Activities

The students and advisors were asked to report on the frequency of face-to-face advising appointments in an academic semester on a 4-point scale with the following anchors: "Never," "1–2 times," "3–4 times," and "5 or more." The findings are presented in Table 6. The majority of both students and advisors reported that they met one or two times in a semester. Participants were also asked about the duration of those meetings. More than half of the both group said "less than 15 minutes."

When the participants were given the list of the academic advising activities and asked to select the activities they were engaged in with their advisors/ students, the top three activities appeared the same: course registration and approval (99% of the students, 93.1% of the advisors), course content (79.9% of the students, 50% of the advisors), and course selection (60.8% of the students, 82.3% of the advisors). On the other hand, there were activities on which the responses of advisors and students differed. For instance, while the advisors claimed that they talked about graduate education (50% of the advisors) and career (48.5% of the advisors), less than 12% of the advisees reported these activities.

The Views of the Students and Advisors on Academic Advising Process

The participants were asked about their views on the advising program mainly considering their communication with advisors/students. The results showed that the ratings of the advisors were also higher than those of the students. More specifically, on a 5-point Likert scale, the students' ratings ranged between 2.23 and 3.96 in relation to their advisors and different aspects of advising, as seen in Table 7.

On the other hand, the ratings of advisors ranged from 3.44 to 4.44 when they were asked about their views about the different aspects of communication with students during the advising process as seen in Table 8.

Table 6. Advising activities during the semester.

	Student (*n*=840)	Faculty (*n*=130)
Frequency of face-to-face appointments		
Never	14.6%	7.7%
1–2 times	65.8%	66.2%
3–4 times	13.1%	14.6%
5 or more	5.8%	9.2%
Missing data	0.7%	2.3%
Duration of face-to-face appointments		
Less than 15 minutes	87.3%	63.1%
15–30 minutes	8.9%	27.7%
31–60 minutes	1.0%	4.6%
More than one hour	-	3.1%
Missing data	2.8%	1.5%

Table 7. Students' views on the advising process.

	M	*SD*
is knowledgeable about my major	3.96	1.17
maintains an open line of communication	3.67	1.28
is on time for advising appointments with me	3.62	1.11
knowledgeable about what courses I need	3.62	1.26
is a good listener	3.62	1.18
responds to my requests in timely fashion (e.g. e-mail, phone calls)	3.55	1.19
provides sufficient time for me during advising sessions	3.54	1.16
provides a caring, open atmosphere	3.51	1.29
is easy to get in touch with when I need	3.26	1.23
is flexible in arranging meeting times with me	3.10	1.11
is available when I need assistance	3.08	1.31
knows my name	2.82	1.54
is familiar with my academic background	2.60	1.32
considers my personal abilities, talents, and interests when advising about courses or programs of study	2.60	1.28
is concerned about my success	2.51	1.31
knows me well enough to write a letter of recommendation	2.23	1.25

Satisfaction from Academic Advising Program

In the study, both advisors and students were asked about their overall satisfaction with the academic advising program. The participants rated their satisfaction level out of 10 and the findings showed that the advisors' ratings (M=5.40, SD=2.06) were slightly higher than the student's ratings (M=4.82, SD=2.30). To see whether this difference was significant or not, independent samples t-test was used. The t-test result showed that advisors are significantly more satisfied with academic advising than the students, with $t(748)$=-2.37, p<.05.

Predictors of Student Satisfaction with Academic Advising

Moreover, hierarchical regression analysis was performed using the student data to predict student satisfaction about the advising. As the outcome variable, the responses of the students on the question asking about their satisfaction level out of 10 were used. After controlling for gender and grade level, the number of advising activities and the frequency of face-to-face advising appointments were entered as predictors. The advisors' communication with students and knowledge about students were entered in the third step of the analysis. Before the regression analysis, basic assumptions (i.e., linearity, homoscedasticity, normality, and independence of residuals) were checked. In addition, to test multicollinearity, VIF values and correlations between the predictors were also examined. The correlations among the variables were checked through Pearson's r values and they are all shown in Table 9. The VIF coefficients ranged from 1.00 to 2.53 (below 4), indicating no multicollinearity in the data (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007).

Table 8. Advisors' views on the advising process.

	M	*SD*
Providing students with a sincere and caring atmosphere	4.44	0.62
Responding to students' requests in timely fashion (e.g. e-mail, phone calls, etc.)	4.44	0.71
Trying different ways (e-mail, phone call, etc.) to get in touch with students	4.30	0.94
Providing sufficient time for students during advising sessions	4.28	0.80
Students' being on time for advising appointments	3.76	0.83
Being concerned students' success	3.70	1.04
Considering students' personal abilities, talents, and interests while advising them about courses/programs	3.68	1.11
Knowing students' name	3.63	0.88
Knowing students well enough to write a letter of recommendation for them	3.46	1.06
Being familiar with students' academic background	3.44	0.96

The regression analysis (Table 10) indicated that the overall model was significant, explaining a total of 41.9% of the variance.

After controlling for gender and grade level, both number of advising activity and the frequency of face-to-face appointments significantly contributed to student satisfaction (ΔR^2=.23, $\Delta F(4, 629)$=47.68, p<.05). More specifically, as the number of advising activities increased, the student satisfaction tended to

Table 9. Correlations among the variables used in the hierarchical regression analysis.

	Student satisfaction	Gender	Freshman *vs.* senior	Sophomore *vs.* senior	Junior *vs.* senior	Number of advising activity	Never *vs.* 1–2 times	Never *vs.* 3–4 times	Never *vs.* 5 or more times	Communication with students	Knowledge about students
Student satisfaction	1.00										
Gender	-.06	1,00									
Freshman *vs.* senior	-.03	-.05	1,00								
Sophomore *vs.* senior	.09	.03	-.18	1.00							
Junior *vs.* senior	-.01	-.03	-.21	-.46	1.00						
Number of advising activity	.44	.04	-.02	-.12	.03	1.00					
Never *vs.* 1–2 times	-.11	-.05	-.02	.05	.01	-.26	1.00				
Never *vs.* 3–4 times	.19	.04	.01	-.02	-.00	.26	-.52	1.00			
Never *vs.* 5 or more times	.22	.01	-.00	-.07	-.02	.38	-.35	-.10	1.00		
Communication with students	.63	.01	-.06	.02	-.01	.49	-.12	.21	.27	1.00	
Knowledge about students	.52	-.01	-.08	-.10	-.02	.59	-.18	.25	.35	.70	1.00

Table 10. Summary of the regression analysis.

	b	*SEb*	*μ*	*t*	*sr*	R^2	ΔR^2	ΔF
Model 1						.01	.01	2.13
Gender	-.30	.18	-.06	-1.62	-.06			
Grade level								
Freshman *vs.* senior	.16	.38	.02	0.42	.02			
Sophomore *vs.* senior	.57	.24	.11	2.38*	.09			
Junior *vs.* senior	.22	.23	.05	0.97	.04			
Model 2						.24	.23	47.68**
Number of advising activity	.34	.04	.39	9.88**	.34			
Freq. of face-to-face appointments								
Never *vs.* 1–2 times	.55	.23	.11	2.43*	.08			
Never *vs.* 3–4 times	1.18	.31	.17	3.77**	.13			
Never *vs.* 5 or more times	1.37	.42	.14	3.30**	.11			
Model 3						.42	.18	94.93**
Communication with students	.99	.11	.41	9.33**	.28			
Knowledge about students	.29	.10	.14	2.96**	.09			

*p<.05, **p<.01

increase as well (uniquely contributing 11.76%). Furthermore, there was a significant relationship between the frequency of face-to-face appointments and student satisfaction. The inclusion of the advisor's communication with students and his/her level of knowledge about the students in the third step accounted for an additional 17.6% variance ($\Delta F(2, 627)=94.93$, $p<.05$). Both predictors were positively related to student satisfaction. In other words, when students gave higher ratings to the advisor's communication with students and his/her level of knowledge about students, their overall satisfaction with the advising increased.

Discussion & Conclusion

Compared to the past, college life has become more challenging, and it requires students to be more independent and persistent in their studies and to spend more time on preparation for the classes and assignments. However, the help provided to students during their college life has been found to have less direction, guidance, and structure (Abernathy & Engelland, 2001). As stated by Goomas (2012), students also frequently report their dissatisfaction with the academic advising. The previous research on academic advising focused on students' and advisors' attitudes and perceptions regarding advising. However, there is a limited amount of research focusing on the comparison between advisors and students regarding their viewpoints and satisfaction (Abernathy & Engelland, 2001). In the present study, the students were found to be less satisfied with the academic advising program than their advisors, which is not surprising, considering the context of such a large state university where advisors have a high number of students to help. Similarly, another finding in this study was the low level of rating of the academic advising by both advisors (5.40) and students (4.82). This might indicate the need for improvement in the current academic advising procedures. At the institution, where the study was conducted, the approach towards academic advising seems to be prescriptive. As stated in the literature, the faculty generally perceive this approach more convenient and suitable (Crookston, 2009). Other reasons for not using developmental approach could be the advisor-student ratio, insufficient time for advising, lack of training, lack of commitment, and lack of institutional support (Pardee, 1994). Nevertheless, the relevant literature also emphasizes the effectiveness of the developmental model over prescriptive academic advising (Barbuto et al., 2011; Crookston, 2009; Grites, 2013). Instead of changing the complete advising system, some components of the developmental model should be added to the institutions' advising system such as taking into account the individual needs of students, encouraging students to make their own academic decisions, asking them about their social life, and organizing group meetings to discuss their academic goals or other issues. Braun and Zolfagharian (2016) suggested that educators should try to account for student differences while providing student services. In this way, the satisfaction of both students and advisors with the advising practices might be increased.

The current study also explored the factors influencing the satisfaction of students with academic advising. The causal inferences cannot be drawn considering the nature of the study, but still the findings of regression analysis indicat-

ed that as students spent more time with their advisors, their satisfaction increased. However, the majority of advisors and students also reported that they met one or two times in a semester and spent less than 15 minutes for the meetings. In addition, as explored in the study, the advising activities mostly involved the ones related to registration and course selection. As stated by Mattei, Dodson, Guerin, Goldsmith, and Mazur (2014), although, ideally, advisors and students are to meet regularly, this is not the case in reality. They found that students often met their advisors two times in a year for procedural issues and spent 15 to 30 minutes in each meeting. The main reasons for not seeing the advisee more often might be the lack of time, workload, and the high number of advisees. There could be different solutions for this problem, such as using group meetings, having assistants/colleagues to help during the advising process, and using online tools for meetings. Demir and Ok (2001) suggested that computer-assisted advising had certain advantages in terms of time spent during the process, easiness of sending and obtaining information, and cost reduction. Similarly, Mattei and others (2014) suggested that using software tools could help institutions improve the advisee-advisor relationship and increase the frequency of meetings. However, they also signified the importance of face-to-face advising and pointed out that face-to-face meetings could not be replaced with any software.

Another salient predictor of the student satisfaction from the advising program was the quality of communication with the advisor. As students regarded their advisors more approachable, their satisfaction increased. This finding is also consistent with Allen and Smith's study (2008b) in which students expressed dissatisfaction with their advisors and reported that the advisors were not motivated for advising, as they were in their other roles in the academic life.

In higher education institutions, the faculty from various positions and background provide academic advising to students. Thus, the background, position, and the current workload of the faculty might also be considered before assigning them as advisors. The ones appointed as advisors could be provided a specific training, or at least some guiding documents on the process, as also suggested by Demir and Ok (2001). Moreover, institutions could do their best to increase collaboration between the student affairs and faculty members to provide academic advising services to students to help them succeed in college (Goomas, 2012). As concluded by Abernathy and Engelland (2001), advisors are generally the first point of contact to help students understand academic expectations and encourage them to take responsibility in decisions they make. It is believed that the advisors could advise in a more developmental and effective way when the institutions provide essential training and support on academic advising. Training on academic advising for the faculty can also be conducted. Since each higher education institution has unique needs and characteristics, before designing such trainings the needs, concerns, and suggestions of the faculty and students on academic advising should also be taken into account.

To sum up, the findings of this study might contribute to the existing literature on academic advising and provide up-to-date data for both academic advisors and administrators in higher education institutions. Effective academic advising activities make a variety of contributions to the effectiveness and efficiency of higher education institutions, and are crucial in supporting college student development and success. This study was conducted in a state university with academic advising system that has existed for over 60 years. Therefore, our findings can not be generalized to other college students enrolled in other state universities or private universities in Turkey, which have different systems regarding academic advising. In the current study, two parallel online surveys were used to collect data. In the future, studies utilizing qualitative research could be carried out to identify the in-depth views of students and advisors regarding their advising experiences.

References

Abernathy, T., & Engelland, B. (2001). The effects of frequency, recency, and academic prowess as moderators of service quality evaluations for collegiate academic advising. *Marketing Management Journal*, *11*(2), 97–107.

Allen, J. M., & Smith, C. L. (2008a). Importance of, responsibility for, and satisfaction with academic advising: A faculty perspective. *Journal of College Student Development*, *49*(5), 397–411.

Allen, J. M., & Smith, C. L. (2008b). Faculty and student perspectives on advising: Implications for student dissatisfaction. *Journal of College Student Development*, *49*(6), 609–624.

Allen, J. M., Smith, C. L., & Muehleck, J. K. (2014). Pre-and post-transfer academic advising: What students say are the similarities and differences. *Journal of College Student Development*, *55*(4), 353–367.

Barbuto Jr, J. E., Story, J. S., Fritz, S. M., & Schinstock, J. L. (2011). Full range advising: Transforming the advisor-advisee experience. *Journal of College Student Development*, *52*(6), 656–670.

Braun, J., & Zolfagharian, M. (2016). Student participation in academic advising: Propensity, behavior, attribution and satisfaction. *Research in Higher Education*, *57*(8), 968–989.

Champlin-Scharff, S. (2010). Advising with understanding: Considering hermeneutic theory in academic advising. *NACADA Journal*, *30*(1), 59–65.

Christian, T. Y., & Sprinkle, J. E. (2013). College student perceptions and ideals of advising: An exploratory analysis. *College Student Journal*, *47*(2), 271–291.

Cook, S. (2009). Important events in the development of academic advising in the United States. *NACADA Journal*, *29*(2), 18–40.

Crookston, B. B. (2009). A developmental view of academic advising as teaching. *NACADA Journal*, *29*(1), 78–82.

Demir, A., & Ok, A. (2001). Improving academic advising: A case study. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, *20*, 57–64.

Ellis, K. C. (2014). Academic advising experiences of first-year undecided students: A qualitative study. *NACADA Journal*, *34*(2), 42–50.

Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. H. (2015). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (9th ed.). New York, NY: MacGraw Hill Education.

Goomas, D. T. (2012). Closing the gap: Merging student affairs, advising and registration. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, *36*, 59–61.

Grites, T. J. (2013). Developmental academic advising: A 40-year context. *NACADA Journal*, *33*(1), 5–15.

Güçlü, N., Sezgin, F., Kılınç, A., Ç., & Kavgacı, H. (2011) Lisansüstü öğrencilerinin iyi bir tez danışmanından beklentilerine ilişkin nitel bir çalışma. *5. Lisansüstü Eğitim Sempozyumu*, 7–8 Ekim 2011, Gazi Üniversitesi, Ankara; Program Kitapçığı ve Bildiri Özetleri, s. 93.

Hatch, D. K., & Garcia, C. E. (2017). Academic advising and the persistence intentions of community college students in their first weeks in college. *Review of Higher Education*, *40*(3), 353–390.

Köser, B. (2010). Üniversitelerde akademik danışmanlık hizmetinin önemi ve Türkiye'de bulunan devlet ve vakıf üniversitelerinde akademik danışmanlık hizmetinin değerlendirilmesi. Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Beykent Üniversitesi. İstanbul.

Köser, B., & Mercanlıoğlu, Ç. (2010). Akademik danışmanlık hizmetinin önemi ve Türkiye'deki üniversitelerde akademik danışmanlık hizmetinin değerlendirilmesi. *Sosyal ve Beşeri Bilimler Dergisi*, *2*(2), 27–26.

Mattei, N., Dodson, T., Guerin, J. T., Goldsmith, J., & Mazur, J. M. (2014, April). Lessons learned from development of a software tool to support academic advising. In *American Society for Engineering Education (ASEE Zone 1)*, *2014 Zone 1 Conference of the IEEE*, pp. 1–8.

Pardee, C. F. (1994). We profess developmental advising, but do we practice it? *NACADA Journal*, *14*(2), 59–61.

Robbins, R. (2012). Everything you always wanted know about academic advising (well, almost). *Journal of College Student Psychotherapy*, *26*, 216–226.

Robbins, R., & Zarges, K. M. (2011). *Assessment of academic advising: A summary of the process*. Accessed through <http://www.nacada.ksu.edu/Resources/Clearinghouse/View-Articles/Assessment-of-academic-advising.aspx> on January 27th, 2018.

Shelton, E. N. (2003). Faculty support and student retention. *Journal of Nursing Education*, *42*(2), 68–75.

Strayhorn, T. L. (2015). Reframing academic advising for student success: From advisor to cultural navigator. *The Journal of the National Academic Advising Association*, *35*(1), 56–63.

Tabachnick, B., & Fidell, L. (2007). *Using multivariate statistics* (5th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon/Pearson Education.

Teasley, M., & Buchanan, E. (2013). Are Missouri State students satisfied with academic advising? *Work by Missouri State University Undergraduate Students*, 81.

Tonbul, Y. (2014). A comparative study of selection, training and advisory practices for doctoral education. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research (EJER)*, 55, 263–282.

Winston, R. B., & Sandor, J. A. (1984). *The academic advising inventory*. Athens, GA: Student Development Associates.

Young-Jones, A. D., Burt, T. D., Dixon, S., & Hawthorne, M. J. (2013). Academic advising: Does it really impact student success? *Quality Assurance in Education*, *21*(1), 7–19.