

## Academic Advising Styles as Perceived by Undergraduate Students in The Hashemite University - Jordan

Aieman Ahmad Al-Omari<sup>1</sup>, Samer A. Khasawneh<sup>2</sup>

1. Associate Professor in Higher Education Administration, Faculty of Educational Sciences, Hashemite University, Zarqa, Jordan.
2. Professor in Human Resources Development, Faculty of Educational Sciences, Hashemite University, Zarqa, Jordan

Received: 2/1/2014

Modified: 1/6/2014

Accepted: 2/7/2014

### ABSTRACT

This study was designed to explore the academic advising styles that are currently perceived by undergraduate students in the Hashemite University. The Academic Advising Inventory was used in this study. The sample consisted of a total of 867 undergraduate students; 222 males and 645 females. A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) and t-tests were conducted to analyze differences in advising style when categorized by gender, classification, GPA, and major. The results revealed that the undergraduate students at the Hashemite University perceived their academic advising as prescriptive style. Female students had a perception for a developmental advising compared to males. Students in the GPA ranges (1.0-1.9) and (2.0-2.9) reported perceiving a prescriptive style of advising, while students in GPA range (3.0-4.0) reported perceiving a developmental style. Students by Classification (sophomore, junior, and senior) revealed that sophomore students reported receiving a developmental advising, whereas junior and senior students reported receiving a prescriptive academic advising. When students were categorized by Major (Scientific, and Humanities), the data revealed that no significant among students perception of their academic styles regarding to their major.

**Keywords:** Academic advising styles; Undergraduate students; Hashemite University; Jordan.

### INTRODUCTION

Academic advising is one of the best processes for promoting personal, social and the intellectual development of students. It is a systematic process, based on student-advisor relationships, to aid students in achieving academic goals, career goals, and personal goals. Also, Academic advisors can help students by providing them guidance and positive influences (Ender, Winston, & Miller, 1984). One of the most difficult challenges facing college faculty members is the ability to develop an understanding of how to meet student needs, while maintaining and

improving upon present standards of excellence (Scott, 1995).

Therefore, the quality of academic advising plays a critical role in students' satisfaction (Crockett, 1985; Ender, Winston, & Miller, 1984). The most important resources for students is having a role model, who can be a faculty member, an administrator, an academic advisor, or another individual the student looks up to and regularly interacts with (Davis, 1991; Herndon, 2001; Tan, 1995). In general, faculty, and administrators assume that the advising needs are similar for all students and do not vary in relation to specific student profiles (Herndon, 1993). It is

important that faculty advisors understand how these issues operate in order to develop effective interventions for these individuals (Schwitzer, Griffin, Ancis & Thomas, 1999).

Academic advising started through early institutions of higher education that modeled after British institutions such as Oxford and Cambridge in that the campuses were primarily residential and the curriculum was primarily training for the ministry (Thelin, 2004). In that administrators acted in place of parents, taking on full responsibility for the enrolled students. The faculty concerned with both the intellectual and moral development of the young men, often shared residence with the students and were therefore able to observe and regulate behavior both inside and outside of the classroom (Gillispie, 2003). Formal academic advising, as it is known today, was at this time unnecessary, as the classical curriculum offered limited choices in terms of coursework (Frost, 2000).

In the nineteenth century, the curriculum began to expand and the student body began to diversify through expanded access to higher education. Colleges and universities began to implement student affairs officers (Thelin, 2004, Tuttle, 2000). Thus, academic advising was adopted as a method to meet immediate and practical needs. Over time, the practice of advising became more sophisticated, as developmental psychology and higher education pedagogy replaced an earlier, more rudimentary understanding of advising practice as the prescription of course choices (Schulenberg & Lindhorst, 2008).

Today, students are responsible for their own choices and the role of the faculty advisor has primarily become assisting students with the transition from high school to college, program planning, course selection, and career development (Ender, Winston & Miller, 1984). With the increased use of technology at the university level, many students are communicating and registering for classes online. This technology has maximized educational potential through communication and information exchanges with an advisor; this process requires the involvement of both the student and the advisor.

The faculty advisor should wear many hats and continue to serve the student as a facilitator of communication, a coordinator of learning experiences

through course and career planning and academic progress review, and an agent of referral to other campus agencies as necessary (Gordon et al., 2000). Advisors work with students on everything from finding open classes, to career planning, to life issues and must do so within the context of numerous policies/procedures and curriculum requirements (Chase & Chase, 2007).

Academic advisors seek to help the students navigate their academic careers. They are concerned with the development of students and their success in becoming effective individuals in the society. Academic advising has been targeted as an effective means of increasing student satisfaction (Grites & Gordon, 2000; Gordon et al., 2000; Winston, 1996). Academic advising is a means of exploring careers and majors and then a method for selecting courses and arranging schedules. As partners in the process, students can learn to discover options, frame questions, gather information, and make decisions, which can increase their involvement in college and encourage them to persist to graduation (Gordon et al., 2000; Tinto, 1987).

Academic advising has the capabilities to link, promote and develop the academic and personal worlds of students in college as they persist towards their goals of graduation and employment. Academic advising impacts not only the lives of the students, but the institution as well (Gordon et al., 2000; Winston, 1996).

There are two advising styles prescriptive advising and developmental advising that show how academic advisors can interact with their students. Prescriptive advising is primarily focused on formal academic matters and developmental advising reflects a concern for the student's total education. Prescriptive advising is defined as a program-focused activity in which the advisor dispenses information to the student and monitors progress. Developmental advising expands the role of the advisor to include a full range of resources such as life and career planning, decision-making skills, and mentoring through personal involvement with the student (Crookston, 1972; Winston & Sandor, 1984a).

Crookston (1972) first postulated a theory defining the student-advisor relationship as either prescriptive or developmental in approach, and this still largely

holds in the literature today. These two predominant models of academic advising are the chief theoretical underpinnings in the advising profession.

Prescriptive advising focuses on the requirements of academic performance and not on the holistic development of students. Prescriptive academic advising is a more traditional advising process, in which the advisor takes the responsibility for diagnosing the student's problems and prescribes solutions, functioning as an authority figure. Academic concerns such as course selection are the only or the primary focus of the process (Crookston, 1972; Grites & Gordon, 2000).

Prescriptive advising sees the advisor's role as primarily that of information giver. Advice given during prescriptive advising sessions concentrates on course registration, choice of major and academic rules and regulations (Crookston; 1972; Grites & Gordon, 2000). According to Crookston (1972) prescriptive advisor assumes that once advice is given, his responsibility is largely fulfilled; now it is up to the student to fulfil his responsibility to do what is prescribed. Prescriptive advising is a style of advising that is characterized by hierarchical relationship, one-directional flow of information and ideas, and the student as passive recipient (Lowenstein, 1999).

The prescriptive advising model reflects a methodology typical of traditional academic advisement programs. It places an emphasis on the superior knowledge and experience of the advisor and de-emphasizes the role of the student in the advising process. The advisor who uses the prescriptive style tends to focus on students' limitations instead of their potential. It assumes that all students are equally prepared for the work required of majors in a particular field and merely provides them with a list of courses needed to complete the program or degree. The burden of eliciting additional information falls on the student; the student's failure to elicit that information is often seen as evidence of the student's unreadiness for university-level work (Crookston; 1972; Lowenstein 1999).

Developmental advising is an intensive process where the student and the advisor have the same measure of equality and both take an active role in advisement activities (Crookston, 1972; Grites & Gordon, 2000). Frost & Brown-Wheeler (2003) notes

that developmental advising understands advising as a system of shared responsibility in which the primary goal is to help the student take responsibility for his or her decisions and actions.

Developmental advising promotes a collaborative, caring relationship between advisor and student, encouraging involvement and fostering development. It assumes that each student is unique, with a particular level of preparedness academically, socially, and emotionally (Crookston, 1972; Grites & Gordon, 2000; Winston & Sandor, 1984). The goal of developmental advising is to help students clarify interests, skills, attitudes, and values as they relate to the college experience and career goals. These goals will help develop life skills that will facilitate success; experience choice and develop autonomy; experience achievement; and develop purpose and direction (Crookston, 1972).

In developmental advising, the advisor and student have a high degree of interaction in order to define long-term as well as short-term academic goals. This style is characterized by (Lowenstein, 1999): dialogue, two-way flow of ideas and information, question-and-answer approach, and the student as active participant. The advising role becomes one of collaboration with the advisee, in this role the advisor must be able to diagnose and prescribe as well as be supportive, empathetic and involved (Crookston, 1972; Lowenstein, 1999).

Universities and academic advising offices are transforming their advising style from prescriptive to developmental to better serve the diverse needs of students, who increasingly comprise today's student population (Grites & Gordon, 2000). Several researchers (Crockett & Crawford, 1989; Herndon, 1993; Herndon, Kaiser & Creamer, 1996; Winston & Sandor 1984) have concluded that students want to retain their autonomy and decision making freedom with a strong support system from their advisor, thus indicating that they prefer developmental advising. Winston and Sandor (1984) reported that students preferred the developmental advising approach to the prescriptive advising approach.

### Literature Review

In a study conducted by Noel-Levitz (2006), which involved over 600,000 undergraduate students

representing 880 institutions across the United States, students reported that academic advising was a highly important component of the college experience. Students attending four-year, public institutions ranked academic advising as the most important factor, with quality instruction, campus safety, registration, and recruitment and financial aid completing the top five. This very same study also noted that approximately, 74% of students were satisfied with their academic advisor's knowledge, and approximately, 67% were satisfied with the level of concern their advisor had for their success as individuals.

Al-Mahameed & Arabiat (2005) study investigated the attitudes of Mu'tah students toward the academic counseling process and its relation to their academic adjustment. The results have indicated that students demonstrated negative attitudes toward the academic counseling, and there were no significant differences in these attitudes with respect to the variables of gender and college. In addition, the results revealed that there was a significant relationship between both students' attitudes toward the academic counseling and the academic adaptation.

The advising styles preferences related to gender, clarified through the result of study conducted by Crockett and Crawford (1989) that surveyed 201 students at the University of Arkansas at Little Rock, revealed that characteristics of students such as gender were significantly related to student preference for a developmental advising relationship; women had a significantly higher score than men for a preference of a developmental style of advising. Anderson (1985) reported that a strong support system could help students persevere in college. A good advisor can be correlated to better grades, higher persistence, and higher satisfaction with campus life (Cokley, 1999; Littleton, 2001; Schwitzer et al., 1999; Tan, 1995).

Students are not universally satisfied with developmental advising (Mottarella, Fritzsche, & Cerabino, 2004; Smith, 2002). Some evidence exists that freshman prefer more prescriptive approaches while older students prefer developmental approaches (Smith, 2002).

Al-Karni (1991) study about faculty and students' perceptions of the role and problems of advising at the college of education in King Saud University. Results

revealed that faculty and students rated the role of advising according to its importance and clarified its problems. A significant difference was found between the demographic variables of the faculty and the advising role, exempt nationality (Saudi and non-Saudi). A significant difference was found between some students' demographic variables and the role of advising.

An academic advisor who can be a faculty member, an administrator or another individual, is an important resource available to students in the transition from high school to college whom the student looks up to and regularly interacts with (Herndon, 2001; Littleton, 2001; Sedlacek, 1987; Schwitzer et al., 1999; Tan, 1995).

Faculty members as advisors are important components of this advising equation. It is important to remember that faculty members only receive one chance to make a first impression. The initial contact is extremely important with undergraduate students. A successful initial contact with a faculty member can reduce the stress on the student. The Student initiative is a necessary step in establishing working relationships with faculty. This is an obstacle for many students to overcome.

Limited research has been done to assess the relationship between student characteristics and special advising needs among students in Jordanian universities. This study was designed to explore the advising styles - on the prescriptive-developmental advising issue - that are currently perceived by undergraduate students in the Hashemite University. This study specifically examined the comparisons between gender, classification, grade point average (GPA), and major.

### **Statement of Problem**

How is the issue of academic advising to be addressed? How can quality academic advising be assured? The only way to meet the expectations of students is the educators knowledge of the exact nature of the expectations. The same can be said for academic advising expectations. In order for academic advisors, faculty or others, to meet expectations of their advisees, they must first know advisees' expectations and seek to understand how the expectations are formed.

So, the problem that faces this research is that there are no studies that have examined the current incidence of advising styles for students in the Hashemite University in Jordan. However, we do not have evidence of undergraduate students' perceptions of academic advising styles in the Hashemite University. Therefore, this study was designed to explore the advising styles - on the prescriptive-developmental advising issue - that are currently perceived by undergraduate students in the Hashemite University.

### Purpose and Questions of Study

The purpose of this study is to examine the incidences of academic advising for undergraduate students in the Hashemite University. Specifically, the researchers will examine the current perceptions for prescriptive or developmental advising.

This study addressed the following research questions:

- (1) What type of academic advising students are currently perceived?
- (2) During this academic year, how many times have you been involved in advisor-advisee activities taking place during academic advising sessions?
- (3) To what extent are students satisfied with academic advising?
- (4) To what extent the differences between the kinds of academic advising students are currently perceived based on their gender, classification, GPA, and major?

### Definition of Terms

The following definitions identify the main concepts that are used in this research:

**Academic advising** refers to an interactive process in which the adviser helps the student set and achieve academic goals, acquire relevant information and services, and make responsible decisions consistent with interests, goals, abilities, and degree requirements (Ender et al., 1984; Winston & Sandor, 1984).

**Developmental advising** refers to an advising model in which students seek out academic information from their advisor and gradually develop self reliance in the use of degree requirements, resources and information, so they can make better decisions about their majors, minors and potential

careers. The advisor and the advisee collaborate with one another and the student sees the advisor as a resource of equality (Crookston, 1972; Winston & Sandor, 1984).

**Prescriptive Advising** refers to an advising model that intends to provide as much information up front. Prescriptive advising focuses only on the requirements of academic performance (e.g. course registration and academic requirements) and not on the development of the student. The advisor has an authoritative relationship with the advisee (Crookston, 1972; Winston & Sandor, 1984).

## METHODOLOGY

### Methodology of study

This study was a quantitative study conducted through utilizing the Academic Advising Inventory (AAI) research instrument that has been shown to assess undergraduate students' perception of the academic styles in Hashemite University- Jordan.

### Population and sample of the study

The target population for the study included all undergraduate students, enrolled in one of the university elective courses, as part of their degree program in the Hashemite University during the first semester of academic year 2009/2010. A total number of 1203 registered students representing a variety of academic majors. A sample of 893 students was chosen randomly, but only 867 students were satisfactorily completed the survey and used in this study, with response rate of 97%. The final sample, therefore, included 645 female (74%), and 222 male (26%). Regarding to classification, the senior students 396 (46%), juniors consisted of 268 (31%), sophomores made up 203 (23%) of the study. With regard to GPA, there were 228 students with 3 to 4 GPA, 531 students with 2 to 2.9 GPA, and 108 students with 1.0-1.9 GPA. As for discipline, there were 543 scientific and 324 humanities disciplines. Students were told that participation was voluntary, and were assured that their responses anonymous.

### Instrumentation

Crookston (1972) presented two advising styles—prescriptive advising, which is primarily focused on formal academic matters, and developmental advising,

which reflects a concern for the student's total education. Efforts to evaluate what happens in academic advising led to the development of the Academic Advising Inventory (AAI) by Winston and Sandor (1984). The AAI addressed the research questions and identified the current perceptions of academic advising students in this study. The AAI was also availed in measuring the comparison between gender, classification, GPA, and major.

The AAI is an instrument that measures the level of prescriptive or developmental advising perceived by students and student satisfaction with advising. The AAI was found to have a high construct validity and reliability. Reliability and validity of test items are based on studies published in the test manual for the AAI by Winston and Sandor (1984). It appears that the AAI is relatively homogeneous and stable enough for use with a diverse group of students. The questions were derived from an eight-member panel of advising experts nationally. The alpha coefficient for the Developmental-Prescriptive Advising scale was found to be .78, as measured using Cronbach's alpha. These results were derived from data gathered from over 600 largely traditional postsecondary students at five geographically diverse colleges and universities (Winston & Sandor, 1984).

**Part I, the Developmental-Prescriptive Advising (DPA)**, this part consists of 14 pairs of statements (items 1-14), used to measure the nature of the advising relationship that the student currently perceives they are experiencing with their academic advisor. Paired statements are shown of examples of topics and concerns addressed when the advisor-advisee is engaged. Each pair represents a continuum between the two contrasting student-advisor behavior styles and attitudes perceived by students as prescriptive or developmental (Winston & Sander, 1984a). Subjects were asked to choose one of the two statements that most accurately describe the academic advising they have received throughout this year on an eight-point continuum. Low scores (14 to 56) indicate that *prescriptive* advising is prevalent; while high scores (57 to 112) indicate *developmental* advising is evident between the student/advisor relationship.

**Part II, Advisor-Advisee Activity Scales**, five subscales have been named and described as follows with the item numbers enumerated:

*Personal Development and Interpersonal Relationships (PDIR)*. This subscale is composed of 12 items: 18, 20, 32, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 43, 44. Activities associated with this scale include: (1) interpersonal exchanges that serve as foundations for a friendly personal relationship, (2) discussing student's college experiences –both classroom-related and extracurricular activities, (3) addressing personal issues, such as academic or personal problems and values, and (4) discussing both short-term and long-range plans for the future.

*Exploring Institutional Policies (EIP)*. This subscale is composed of 5 items: 24, 25, 27, 28, 33. Activities associated with this scale include providing general information about the college, explanation of academic rules and regulations (e.g., transfer credit and academic probation) and identifying campus resources and programs, such as cooperative education or study abroad programs or referral to financial aid office.

*Registration and Class Scheduling (RCS)*. This subscale is composed of 4 items: 16, 17, 22, 23. Activities falling within this scale include signing registration forms, selecting courses and planning class schedules for the next term, and adjusting classes after registration.

*Teaching Personal Skills (TPS)*. This subscale is composed of 3 items: 15, 30, 42. The activities associated with this scale are discussing college policies, study skills and tips, and time management techniques.

*Academic Majors and Courses (AMC)*. This subscale is composed of 6 items: 19, 21, 26, 29, 31, 41. The activities included in this scale include discussing possible academic majors, the courses and other requirements associated with different majors, the administrative process of "declaring a major," and possible career alternatives.

**Part III, Satisfaction with Advising**, is composed of five items (45-49) that relate to various aspects of students' satisfaction with the advising they have received during the current academic year, namely (a) *overall satisfaction*, (b) *accuracy of information provided*, (c) *adequacy of notice about important deadlines*, (d) *availability of advising when desires*, and (e) *amount of time available during advising sessions*. Students respond to each item using a four-

place Likert-type scale, choosing either strongly disagree, disagree, agree, or strongly agree.

To ensure equivalence of meaning of the items, and constructs between the Arabic and English items of the Academic Advising Inventory (AAI), a translation process was used to include forward and backward translation. The goal of the translation process was to produce Arabic items of the AAI that were equivalent in meaning to the original English items.

The researchers in this study tested the reliability of the Arabic version of the AAI with a sample of 46 undergraduate students different than that of the study but withdrawn from the same population. Chronbach coefficient alpha estimates of reliability coefficients of .88. Twelve specialists in the field of education assessed the validity of the questionnaire.

#### Data Collection and Analysis

Out of 893 students, there were a total of 867 (97%) replies. Data was analyzed using SPSS for Windows. Descriptive statistics were used to identify advising style perceived by participants. One-way ANOVA was also used to test differences whether advising were different between classification (freshmen, sophomore, junior, and senior), and GPA (1.0-1.9, 2.0-2.9, and 3.0-4.0). Tukey's post hoc multiple comparison tests were used to test which categories of classifications and GPA differed from each other. All *t*-test were significant at  $p < .05$  to test the differences between gender (male and female) students, and to test the differences between major

(scientific and humanities) students.

#### Results of Study

##### (1) What type of academic advising students are currently perceiving?

Undergraduate students participating in this survey scored a mean of (53.04) with Standard Deviation (16.32) when asked what type of advising they perceived; that they were currently experiencing, indicating that the Hashemite University faculty is providing a prescriptive type of academic advising style to the majority of undergraduate students. *According to Winston & Sandor (1984) Prescriptive advising is a score between 14 - 56. Developmental advising is a score between 57 - 112.*

##### (2) What is the difference between the kinds of academic advising students are currently perceiving based on gender, classification, GPA, and major?

#### Gender

Females scored a group mean of (56.85) while males scored a group mean of (41.95) showing that females reported receiving developmental advising while males reported receiving a prescriptive style. Regarding the significant differences between the kind of advising students are currently perceiving based on gender, *t*-test reveals that there were significant differences at the (0.05) level in received advising style ( $p = 0.00$ ), males receiving a prescriptive style, females scored significantly for developmental advising.

**Table 1. t-test, Mean, and SD between the style of academic advising that male and female students perceived**

Gender	No.	Mean	SD	t	df	p
Male	222	41.95	10.30	12.778	865	.00*
Female	645	56.85	116.27			

#### Classification

The largest group of participants were the senior class 396 (46%), juniors consisted of 268 (31%) of the participants, sophomores made up 203 (23%) of the study.

One-Way analysis was used to analyze whether

undergraduate students differed from the type of advising received when looking at ones classification in the university. Results show in Tables 2 that there is a difference between classification in received academic advising, sophomore students reported receiving developmental advising, while juniors and

seniors reported receiving prescriptive advising. Tukey post hoc analysis was used to analyze the

difference among the classification of students as shown in Table 6.

**Table 2. One-Way ANOVA for the academic advising received based on students classifications**

Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	Sig.
Between Groups	2670.223	2	1335.112	5.060	0.007*
Within Groups	227989.521	864	263.877		
Total	230659.744	866			

The results in Table 3 indicate that sophomore students (M = 56.21) differ significantly from junior students (M = 52.04) and senior students (M=52.08).

That means sophomore students are receiving developmental advising than junior and senior students who received prescriptive advising.

**Table 3. Tukey HSD Post hoc analysis for students' classifications**

(I) classification	(J) classification	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Sophomore	junior	4.17078*	1.51146	.016
	senior	4.12596*	1.40223	.009
Junior	sophomore	-4.17078*	1.51146	.016
	senior	-.04481	1.28490	.999
Senior	sophomore	-4.12596*	1.40223	.009
	junior	.04481	1.28490	.999

\*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

**Table 4. Means and SD of Advising Received regarding to students Classification**

Classification	N	Mean	SD
Sophomore	203	56.21	16.31
Junior	268	52.04	15.94
Senior	396	52.08	16.40

**Grade Point Average**

Students were categorized by 1, 2, and 3, where 1= GPA between 1.0-1.9, 2 = GPA between 2.0-2.9, and 3 = GPA between 3.0-4.0.

Results show in Table 7 that undergraduate students in the GPA categories of 1.0- 1.9 and 2.0-2.9 reported receiving prescriptive advising, while the 3.0-4.0 category of undergraduate students reported receiving developmental advising (57.76).

One-Way analysis was used to analyze whether undergraduate students differed from the type of advising received when looking at ones GPA in the

university. Results show in Tables 5 that there is a statistical difference between students GPA in received advising. Tukey post hoc analysis was used to analyze the difference among the GPA's of students as shown in Table 6.

The results indicate that students with GPA (3-4) (M = 57.76) differ significantly from students with GPA (1-1.9) (M = 50.38) and students with GPA (2-2.9) (M = 51.54). That means students with GPA (3-4) are receiving developmental advising, and students with GPA (1-1.9) and students with GPA (2-2.9) received prescriptive advising.

**Table 5. One-Way ANOVA for the academic advising received based on students GPA**

Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	Sig.
Between Groups	7027.341	2	3513.671	13.575	0.000*
Within Groups	223632.403	864	258.834		
Total	230659.744	866			

**Table 6. Tukey HSD Post hoc analysis for students GPA's**

(I) gpa	(J) gpa	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
1 to 1.9	2 to 2.9	-1.15913	1.69825	.774
	3 to 4	-7.37427*	1.87932	.000
2 to 2.9	1 to 1.9	1.15913	1.69825	.774
	3 to 4	-6.21514*	1.27385	.000
3 to 4	1 to 1.9	7.37427*	1.87932	.000
	2 to 2.9	6.21514*	1.27385	.000

\*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

**Table 7. Academic Advising Received and GPA Mean Comparison**

GPA	N	Mean	SD
1.0-1.9	108	50.38	14.15
2.0-2.9	531	51.54	15.25
3.0-4.0	228	57.76	18.63

**Major**

t-test indicated no significant main effect of major. Results revealed that all majors (Scientific and Humanities) reported receiving a prescriptive style of

academic advising. Scientific students scored a group mean of (53.37) while Humanities students scored a group mean of (52.48).

**Table 8. t-test, Mean, and SD between the style of academic advising that Scientific and Humanities students perceived related to Major**

Major	N	Mean	SD	t	df	p
Scientific	543	53.37	16.16	.776	865	.438
Humanities	324	52.48	16.59			

(3) **During this academic year, how many times have you been involved in advisor-advisee activities taking place during advising sessions?**

Results in Table 9 revealed that students on average (10.29) times involved in "Personal development and interpersonal relationships" activity during advising sessions. On average (9.66) times

students involved in “*Academic majors and courses*” activity during advising sessions. On average (7.68) times students involved in “*Registration and class scheduling*” activity. On average (5.66) times students

involved in “*Exploring institutional policies*” activity, while on average (2.82) times students involved in “*Teaching personal skills*” activity.

**Table 9. The times have students been involved in advisor-advisee activities taking place during advising sessions**

Scales	Mean	SD
Personal development and interpersonal relationships	10.29	4.10
Exploring institutional policies	5.66	1.69
Registration and class scheduling	7.68	2.14
Teaching personal skills	2.82	1.02
Academic majors and courses	9.66	1.69

**(4) To what extent do students satisfied with academic advising?**

Undergraduate students were asked to indicate their satisfaction towards academic advising in the Hashemite University. The AAI used a four-place Likert-type scale, choosing either strongly disagree, disagree, agree, or strongly agree.

When students were asked to respond to the statement “*I am satisfied in general with the academic advising I have received,*” 11.4% of participants “strongly disagree.” Another 66.8% report that they “disagree,” revealing that approximately 78% of the students are not satisfied with academic advising.

The second question asked students to respond to the following statement: “*I have received accurate information about courses programs, and requirements through academic advising.*” About 10% of the students reported that they do not receive accurate information. Close to 90% of the students “agree” or “strongly agree” that they are receiving accurate information.

When students were asked to respond to the statement “*Sufficient prior notice has been provided about deadlines related to institutional policies and procedures,*” 5% of participants “strongly disagree.” Another 20% report that they “disagree,” Close to 75% of the students “agree” or “strongly agree” that they are receiving accurate information.

The forth question asked students to respond to the following statement: “*Advising had been available when I needed it.*” About 25% of the students reported that Advising did not available when they needed it.

Close to 75% of the students “agree” or “strongly agree” that they are receiving advising when they needed it.

When students were asked to respond to the statement “*Sufficient time has been available during advising sessions,*” 3.9% of participants “strongly disagree.” Another 19.1% report that they “disagree,” Close to 77% of the students “agree” or “strongly agree” that they have sufficient time during advising sessions.

**DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

Results of this study revealed that the undergraduate students at the Hashemite University perceived their academic advising as “prescriptive advising”. The prescriptive advisor only focuses on the requirements of academic performance and not on the holistic development of students. Prescriptive advising is more of a traditional advising process that has been considered outdated, and it would be a major limitation for students (Grites & Gordon, 2000; Crockett & Crawford, 1989; Herndon, 1993; Herndon et al., 1996). Results of this study did not agree with the findings of Crockett and Crawford (1989), Herndon (1993), Herndon et al. (1996) and Winston and Sandor (1984) in the fact that all students prefer a developmental style of advising over prescriptive. A developmental advisor assumes that each student is unique; with a particular level of preparedness academically, socially and emotionally (Crookston, 1972; Ender et al., 1984; Grites & Gordon, 2000; Winston & Sandor, 1984).

The result of this study consists with Crockett and Crawford (1989) and Herndon, Kaiser, and Creamer (1996) with the fact that gender are significantly related to student perceptives for a developmental advisor. In this study, female students had a significantly stronger perception for a developmental advisor compared to males. The females may have a stronger perceptives for developmental advising because they may be looking for an advisor with incorporate a high degree of interaction between the advisor and the advisee, productive and effective means of communication. Female students would like their faculty academic advisor to clarify interests, skills, attitudes, and values as they relate to the college experience and future goals, and bi-directional flow of information and ideas.

When students were categorized by GPA, the data significantly revealed that students in the GPA range of (1.0-1.9) and (2.0-2.9) categories reported receiving a prescriptive style of advising. On the contrary, students in the GPA range of (3.0-4.0) category reported receiving a developmental style of advising. It may be that students with low GPAs feel isolated, and frustrated; these negative feelings may lead to their barriers with their perceptions of their academic advisor. It could also be the academic advisor has a negative perception towards the students with the low GPA, and actually present a prescriptive style of advising. When a prescriptive style of advising is prevalent, students may perceive academic support services to be inaccessible (Schwitzer et al., 1999; Scott, 1995; Sedlacek, 1987). Therefore, it is vital for faculty advisors to understand that they have the opportunity to be a valuable resource available to all students.

When students were categorized by Classification (sophomore, junior, and senior), the results of study revealed that sophomore students reported receiving a developmental advising, whereas junior and senior students reported receiving a prescriptive academic advising. When students were categorized by Major (Scientific, and Humanities), the data revealed that no significant among students perception of their academic styles regarding to their major.

## Recommendations

Based on the results of this study, several recommendations for faculty advisors and students in the Hashemite University are indicated. It is important for academic advisors in the University to understand the needs of individuals. This study has shown that the majority of undergraduate students perceive that they are receiving a prescriptive style of academic advising. Faculty member must understand that the quality of the advising relationship is important to the students' sense of belonging. Faculty members need to also be aware of the adjustment stress that students go through in college.

Develop workshops for faculty members and staffs in the university as well as student orientation sessions to help prepare students. These professional development workshops will be able to assist academic advisors to become more knowledgeable so they can assist undergraduate students with a more developmental advising approach. The faculty advisors will gain an understanding of the challenges that undergraduate students face at the university. Advising training should include all positive aspects of the developmental approach to advisement, as it is clearly what students want from the university.

Further qualitative research can be conducted to find out: Why males feel that they are receiving a prescriptive style of advising. Why students with low GPAs perceive that they are receiving a prescriptive style of advising. A follow-up quantitative study can be conducted at other universities. A longitudinal study can be conducted to find any trends or changes in the advising style students are receiving over time in the university.

This study could be duplicated, at the graduate level instead of the undergraduate level, to see if the graduate students are also receiving a prescriptive style of advising. A follow-up quantitative and qualitative study should be conducted for the faculty advisors in the university to determine their self perception of their role as an advisor (prescriptive or developmental).





23. Planning a class schedule for the next term	A	B	C	D	E	F
24. Discussing transfer credit and policies	A	B	C	D	E	F
25. Discussing advanced placement or exempting courses	A	B	C	D	E	F
26. Discussing career alternatives	A	B	C	D	E	F
27. Discussing probation and dismissal policies	A	B	C	D	E	F
28. Discussing financial aid	A	B	C	D	E	F
29. Identifying other campus offices that can provide assistance	A	B	C	D	E	F
30. Discussing study skills or study tips	A	B	C	D	E	F
31. Discussing degree or major/academic concentration requirements	A	B	C	D	E	F
32. Discussing personal concerns or problems	A	B	C	D	E	F
33. Discussing studies abroad or other special academic programs	A	B	C	D	E	F
34. Discussing internship or cooperative education opportunities	A	B	C	D	E	F
35. Talking about or setting personal goals	A	B	C	D	E	F
36. Evaluating academic progress	A	B	C	D	E	F
37. Getting to know each other	A	B	C	D	E	F
38. Discussing extracurricular activities	A	B	C	D	E	F
39. Discussing job placement opportunities	A	B	C	D	E	F
40. Discussing the purposes of a college education	A	B	C	D	E	F
41. Declaring or changing a major/academic concentration	A	B	C	D	E	F
42. Discussing time management	A	B	C	D	E	F
43. Talking about experiences in different classes	A	B	C	D	E	F
44. Talking about what you are doing besides taking classes	A	B	C	D	E	F

**PART III**

Considering the academic advising you have participated in at this college this year, respond to the following five statements on the answer sheet using the code below.

**A = Strongly Disagree, B = Disagree, C = Agree, D = Strongly Agree**

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
45. I am satisfied in general with the academic advising I have received.				
46. I have received accurate information about courses, programs, and requirements through academic advising.				
47. Sufficient prior notice has been provided about deadlines related to institutional policies and procedures.				
48. Advising has been available when I needed it.				
49. Sufficient time has been available during advising sessions.				

**References**

Al-Karni, A.S. (1991). Faculty and students' perceptions of the role and problems of advising at the college of education - King Saud University. *The Journal of King Saud University*. 3 (2), 402-668.

Al-Mahameed, S., & Arabiat, A. (2005). Mu'tah students' attitudes toward the academic counseling and its relation to their adjustment. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Sciences*. 6 (4), 152-169.

Anderson, E. C. (1985). Forces influencing student persistence and achievement. In L. Noel, R. Levitz, D. Saluri, & Associates, *Increasing student retention: Effective programs and practices for reducing the*

- dropout rate* (p. 44-61). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Chase, J. D. & Chase, M. (2007). Building Bridges: Creating Effective Communication in Advising. Retrieved from NACADA Clearinghouse of Academic Advising Resources Web site <http://www.nacada.ksu.edu/tabid/3318/articleType/ArticleView/articleId/83/article.aspx>
- Cokley, K. (1999). Reconceptualizing the impact of college racial composition on African American students' racial identity. *Journal of College Student Development*. 40, 235-245.
- Crockett, D. S. (1985). Academic advising. In L. Noel, R. Levitz, D. Saluri, & Associates (Eds.) *Increasing student retention: Effective programs and practices for reducing the dropout rate* (pp. 244-263). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Crockett, J. B., & Crawford, R. L. (1989). The relationship between Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) scale scores and advising style of preference of college freshman. *Journal of College Student Development*. 30, 154-161.
- Crookston, B.B. (1972). A developmental view of academic advisement as teaching. *Journal of College Student Personnel*. 13, 12-17.
- Davis, R. B. (1991). Social support networks and undergraduate student academic success-related outcomes: A comparison of Black students on Black and White Campuses. In W. R. Allen, E. G. Epps, & N.A. Haniff (Eds.), *College of Black and White* (pp. 143-157). Albany; State University of New York Press.
- Ender, S. C., Winston, Jr., R. B., & Miller, T. K. (1984). Academic advising as student development. In R. B. Wintson, Jr., S. C. Ender, & T. K. Miller (Eds.), *New directions for student services: No. 17. Developmental approaches to academic advising*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Frost, S.H. & Brown-Wheeler, K.E. (2003). Evaluation and Examination: Philosophical and Cultural Foundations for Faculty Advising. In Kramer, G.L. (Ed.) *Faculty Advising Examined*. Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Co.
- Frost, S. H. (2000). Historical and philosophical foundations for academic advising. In V. N. Gordon, & W. R. Habley (Eds.), *Academic advising: A comprehensive handbook* (pp. 3-17). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Gillispie, B. (2003). History of academic advising. Retrieved May 22, 2014 from *NACADA Clearinghouse of Academic Advising Resources*. Web site:<http://www.nacada.ksu.edu/Clearinghouse/AdvisingIssues/History.htm>
- Gordon, V.N., Habley, W.R. & Associates (2000). *Academic advising: A comprehensive handbook*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass Higher and Adult Education Series.
- Grites, T., Gordon, V. (2000). Developmental academic advising revisited. *NACADA Journal*. 20 (1) 12-15.
- Herndon, J. B. (1993). Advising styles preferred by African American students enrolled in a two-year commuter college. Ph.D. diss., Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.
- Herndon, J. B., Kaiser, J. & Creamer, D. (1996). Student preferences for advising style in community college environments. *Journal of College Student Development*. 37, 637-648.
- Herndon, M. K. (2001). The role of family in the success of African American college students. Ph.D. diss., Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.
- Littleton, R. A. (2001). African American student persistence at small colleges in Appalachia: A qualitative study. Paper Presented at Association for the Study of Higher Education (ASHE). Annual Conference in Richmond, Virginia. November 15-18, 2001.
- Lowenstein, M. (1999, November 22). An alternative to the Developmental Theory of Advising. *The Mentor*. Retrieved December 28, 2009 from <http://www.psu.edu/dus/mentor/991122ml.htm>
- Mottarella, K. E., Fritzsche, B. A., & Cerabino, K. C. (2004). What do students want in advising? *NACADA Journal*. 24 (1&2), 48-61.
- Noel-Levitz Inc. (2006). 2006 national research report: Academic advising highly important to students. Iowa City, IA: Noel-Levitz, Inc.
- Sedlacek, W. E. (1987). Black students on White campuses: 20 years of research. *Journal of College Student Personnel*. 28, 484-495.
- Schulenberg, J. K., & Lindhorst, M. J. (2008). Advising is advising: Toward defining the practice and scholarship of academic advising. *NACADA Journal*. 28, 43-53.
- Schwitzer, A. M., Griffin, O. T., Ancis, J. R., & Thomas, C. R. (1999). Social adjustment experiences of African-American college students. *Journal of Counseling and Development*. 77, 189-197.
- Scott, D. W. (1995). Conditions related to the academic performance of African American students at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. Ph.D. diss.,

- Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.
- Smith, J. S. (2002). First-year student perceptions of academic advisement: A qualitative study and reality check. *NACADA Journal*. 22 (2), 39-49.
- Tan, D. L. (1995). Perceived importance of role models and its relationships with minority students' satisfaction and academic performance. *NACADA Journal*. 15, 48-51.
- Thelin, J. R. (2004). *History of American higher education*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Tuttle, K. N. (2000). Academic advising. *New Directions for Higher Education*. 111, 15-24.
- Tinto, V. (1987). *Leaving college: Rethinking the causes and cures of student attrition*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Winston, R. B., Jr. (1996). Counseling and advising. In S. R. Komives, D. B. Woodard, Jr., and Associates (Eds.), *Student services: A handbook for the Professions*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Winston, R.B., Jr. & Sandor, J.A. (1984). *Academic Advising Inventory*. Athens, GA: Student Development Associates, Inc.

## أساليب الإرشاد الأكاديمي كما يدركها طلبة مرحلة البكالوريوس في الجامعة الهاشمية – الأردن

أيمن أحمد العمري<sup>1</sup>، وسامر عبدالكريم خصاونة<sup>2</sup>

1. أستاذ مشارك في إدارة التعليم العالي، كلية العلوم التربوية، الجامعة الهاشمية، الزرقاء، الأردن؛  
2. أستاذ تنمية الموارد البشرية، كلية العلوم التربوية، الجامعة الهاشمية، الزرقاء، الأردن.

### الملخص

استهدفت هذه الدراسة استكشاف أساليب الإرشاد الأكاديمي كما يدركها طلبة مرحلة البكالوريوس في الجامعة الهاشمية، وذلك من خلال استخدام مقياس الإرشاد الأكاديمي. تألفت عينة الدراسة من مجموع 867 طالباً منهم 222 ذكور و645 إناث. وتم استخدام تحليل التباين الأحادي واختبار "ت" لتحليل الفروقات في أسلوب تقديم الإرشاد الأكاديمي حسب الجنس، ومستوى السنة الدراسية، والمعدل التراكمي، والتخصص. وبينت نتائج الدراسة أن نمط الإرشاد التوجيهي هو السائد بين طلبة الجامعة الهاشمية، في حين أن نمط الإرشاد التطويري هو السائد بين الطالبات. ونمط الإرشاد الأكاديمي التوجيهي هو السائد بين الطلاب ذوي المعدلات التراكمية (1-1,9) و(2 - 2,9)، في حين كان النمط التطويري هو السائد بين الطلبة ذوي المعدلات التراكمية (3 - 4). وحسب التصنيف (مستجدين، وطلاب السنة الثانية وطلبة السنة الرابعة) بينت أن الأسلوب التطويري هو السائد بين طلبة السنة الثانية، في حين أن النمط التوجيهي في الإرشاد الأكاديمي هو السائد بين الطلبة المستجدين وطلبة السنة الرابعة. وبينت نتائج الدراسة عدم وجود فروق ذات دلالة إحصائية في استجابات الطلبة تعود لمتغير التخصص (الكليات العلمية، والكليات الإنسانية).

**الكلمات المفتاحية:** أساليب الإرشاد الأكاديمي، طلبة المرحلة الجامعية الأولى، الجامعة الهاشمية، الأردن.