

A Customer Service Approach to Advising: Theory and Application

Frank J. Spicuzza, *University of Tennessee, Knoxville*

The customer service marketing model provides an organizing strategy for advising in higher education. The university contributes resources for an advising process that addresses the needs and expectations of students as consumers and faculty as providers. The model's components are discussed within the context of an academic program. The author proposes careful consideration of the model in an effort to improve advising and increase retention rates.

"Treat 'em right. They'll be back, and they'll tell others." The business philosophy my dad used for the family-owned dry cleaning store in Cleveland, Ohio, is etched in my memory. While working with dad, I would often be informed that the secrets of a successful business involved being courteous, listening to the customer, telling the customer what you were able to do, doing it in a timely manner, and doing it right. Apparently this attitude was valid; the business prospered, and customers would travel past numerous dry cleaning stores, often cheaper in price, due to the service received. My dad would relay accounts of satisfied, loyal customers to the employees, who appreciated the accolades and the anticipated salary benefits associated with the feedback. There was a spirit of camaraderie among the owner, the customers, and the workers that came from customer satisfaction. Although dad was not aware of it at the time, he was adhering to the tenets of the customer service marketing model, a model that focuses on customer needs, expectations, and satisfaction.

According to this marketing model, customers—both current and potential—are the focal point and the reason for the organization's existence. Cooperating with customers and offering what they expect are emphasized rather than dictating what they receive (Wagenheim & Reurink, 1991). Implementation of the customer service model involves six key ingredients: (a) customer needs, (b) employee attitude, (c) administrative commitment, (d) training and resources, (e) recognition, and (f) evaluation (Congram & Friedman, 1991; Schneider, 1990). This model has obvious applications in the business sector. However, its principles are visible in higher education, as evidenced in a university

president's acceptance speech that focused on the needs and expectations of "our primary customers, the students," as the top priority (Davis, 1991, p. A3).

The Need

Colleges and universities are increasing their efforts to recruit, support, and retain quality students during a period of declining enrollment of traditional college students and increasing fiscal restraint. Students, the customers, have expectations regarding their educational experiences. If these expectations go unmet, withdrawal is a possible consequence. Many colleges and universities report that as many as half of the students who enter their institutions leave without a degree (Earl, 1988; Hartley, 1987; Patrick, Furlow, & Donovan, 1988), resulting in a staggering loss in human potential (Boyer, 1987) and significant economic costs for the institutions (Hartley, 1987).

There is a plethora of studies that identify student dissatisfaction with the advising process and with advisors who are uninterested and not approachable (e.g., Andrews, Andrews, Long, & Henton, 1987; Arnold, Mares, & Calkins, 1986; Beasley-Fielstein, 1986; DeBard, 1987; Koerin, 1991). The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching identifies advising as "one of the weakest links in the undergraduate experience" (Boyer, 1987, p. 51). Some institutions appear concerned about this frustration with advising. They stress the connection of quality advising with both education and retention. Nevertheless, although advising is sometimes recognized as a vital component of an institution's mission, the traditional faculty reward structure ignores it (Larsen & Brown, 1983). A recent study identifies publication in refereed journals as the key to higher pay for faculty (Jacobson, 1992). Because faculty members pursue those endeavors for which they will be most rewarded and held most accountable, students are likely to experience advising as a peripheral activity. Although no single formula for effective advising has been identified, the customer service model's focus on fulfilled expectations has

implications for the student's goals of academic and career success and the institution's goals of improved recruitment and retention.

The Model: From Business to Advising

Quality customer service is more than offering a smile, a handshake, and "have a nice day." It is an interaction between customer and provider in which the performance of the provider meets or exceeds the customer's expectations. The provider's attitude and performance shape customers' perceptions of service and their intention of continued patronage. In essence the customer purchases a service and an experience simultaneously, and this exchange has social as well as economic implications. Heskett (1986) affirms that the provider is "as much of the product in the consumer's mind as any other attribute of that service" (p. 94). The outcome of service is important, but as important in quality customer service is the process of service delivery. Both the product and process are significant in attracting and retaining customers.

The key task is to know what will satisfy customers and to provide it in a way that shapes a positive attitude toward the provider. Schneider and Bowen (1985) substantiate that the customer's positive attitude is strongly related to the provider's relational skills as well as to competency in providing the core service. Today many suppliers can provide equivalent core services; for example, numerous companies can deliver a package overnight for about the same price. Customers are in a position to select the supplier they perceive in a positive way and who displays sensitivity to individual needs. When a company does not meet customer expectations, customers go elsewhere, and they inform others about their dissatisfaction. Businesses cannot compete by providing only products that competitors can duplicate. What distinguishes businesses is the quality of service, which Garfield (1992) specifies as the "primary determinant of success or failure in the 1990s" (p. 194).

The litany of unfulfilled expectations from customers and students is remarkably similar. Customers allude to unsatisfactory business transactions, and students complain of inconsistent, inattentive, and disrespectful advising service. In business, marketing theory focuses attention on the relational qualities of the service encounter. Parasuraman, Zeithaml, and Berry (1985; 1988) identify the elements of reliability,

assurance, and empathy as essential to customer service.

In response to criticism of advising, higher education can learn from the customer service model with its focus on building relationships and meeting expectations. Relationship is the glue of the advising process. Concern for a student's growth and development promotes a supportive environment (Habley, 1981), and this caring attitude has been identified as the "most potent retention force on campus" (Noel, 1985, p. 17). The focus on process as well as content is well documented in the literature on student-centered, developmental advising (Crockett, 1985; Habley, 1981; Tinto, 1988). Quality advising is associated with building rapport (DeBard, 1987) and interacting with students throughout their careers. Students want to be cared about as individuals (Beasley-Fielstein, 1986; Ford & Ford, 1989) as they seek information and counseling to better understand themselves and meet their academic and vocational needs.

Retention is a by-product of student satisfaction; the customer service model focuses on meeting student needs with responsive services and support. A consistent, user-friendly environment is promoted by caring, personal contacts with students. Attention to student diversity and understanding of student uniqueness require advisors to have (a) communication and problem-solving skills, (b) consciousness of the dimensions of individual difference, and (c) an understanding of available resources.

Commitment to students being served must go beyond committing the time and energy of advisors. Effective implementation of a customer service marketing approach requires a commitment from all levels of an organization. Our challenge is the creation of an academic environment where all parties—students, faculty, and administrators—are involved in a "win" scenario. Students receive personal contact and reliable service support; faculty gain recognition and rewards; the institution retains and attracts students. Development of such an environment requires the administration to articulate the importance and value of advising and to reinforce their rhetoric with actions.

Several studies indicate that many students prefer a developmental advising relationship based on trust, respect, mutual involvement, and interest to one based on passive receipt of advice (Creeden, 1990; Kelley & Lynch, 1991; Winston & Sandor, 1984). Following a customer

service model, the institution responds by providing resources and services for academic, vocational, and personal guidance. Workshops and training that emphasize the content and skills necessary for developmental advising are made available to faculty. In addition the institution furnishes the computer training and equipment to access student information in a timely manner and to streamline record keeping (Kramer, 1988).

Resources, training, and equipment are necessary ingredients, but the degree of faculty effort and time devoted to advising is linked to reinforcing personal and professional consequences. In business there is personal satisfaction in making a sale or providing service, but there are also organizational and professional rewards and incentives. In advising there is personal satisfaction in assisting student growth, but organizational and professional rewards at most institutions are meager or absent. Professional consequences are essential if advising reform is to progress beyond training to vigorous implementation.

A systematic appraisal of advising is necessary to determine whether student and institutional expectations are being met and to justify professional recognition. Srebnik (1988) identifies 25 advising assessment instruments that provide opportunities to survey students, advisors, and administrators. Unfortunately, few are being used; many institutions report no formal evaluation of advising programs or of individual advisors (Crockett & Levitz, 1983). Periodic evaluations are essential for reinforcing or changing policy, changing budgets, and providing merit recognition. This is especially true given present fiscal restraint and increased accountability.

A Bachelor's of Science in Social Work (B.S.S.W.) program at a large public university has taken the position that advising is the cornerstone for professional and personal growth and that a customer service approach increases student satisfaction and retention. A look at this advising system will help us better understand the application of a customer service model in higher education.

Customer Needs

Students enter the B.S.S.W. program from various pathways. Some, a small percentage, declare an interest in social work as freshmen; others transfer into the program from different

majors on campus, from community colleges, and from other four-year institutions. Freshmen who declare an immediate interest have initial contact with the program during freshman orientation. At this time the B.S.S.W. chair or a designee meets with interested students and their parents to discuss the profession, the curriculum, and the College of Social Work. Among the inquiries addressed are fields of practice, client groups, academic and field requirements, job possibilities, and salary levels. The following day these students meet again with a program representative to develop an academic plan for the coming year and to be assigned a permanent advisor. This is an additional opportunity to listen to student concerns, answer questions, and address program policies.

Most students enter the program as transfers. These students, in particular those switching from another major on campus, inquire throughout the academic year. A faculty member is assigned to meet with these students. At the scheduled meeting there is a discussion of the student's interest in the profession, a review of the curriculum, and an explanation of program policies. This conference allows the student to present an academic history and the advisor to identify possible course substitutions. A one-year academic plan is completed, and a permanent advisor is assigned.

The students in the B.S.S.W. program are not a homogenous group. They, like students enrolling in any discipline, are at different stages of life. They are experiencing various human needs and reacting to personal interests, motivations, and challenges with varying degrees of skill, knowledge, and self-confidence. They expect someone to be interested in them as individuals and want to be able to approach that person for assistance with their life, career, and academic plans (Fielstein, 1989). The B.S.S.W. program recognizes this expectation and places a high priority on knowing students as individuals.

Employee Attitude

Students are provided a permanent advisor. This decision follows the recommendations of the Study Group on the Conditions of Excellence in American Education (1984), which stress that advisors have regular contact with students and that one individual follow the student through her or his college career. Advise-

ment with the same faculty member provides opportunity not only for a timely response but also for a response tailored to the advisee.

Advisors make a conscious effort to demonstrate that students are important. This effort begins at registration. Undergraduates are not permitted to register for the subsequent term without having an advising conference. To assist the student, each advisor provides the program secretary with a schedule of available hours throughout the term. Advisees then request the schedule and sign up for advising slots. The process is well advertised and easy to follow. Advisors are accessible, which according to Fielstein (1989) is a top priority for students.

Students are required to meet with their advisors each academic term. By being accessible, listening to students, and showing concern, advisors foster an effective relationship. The B.S.S.W. faculty demonstrate by their words and actions a respect for students. In a keynote address presented at the annual conference of the National Academic Advising Association, Tinto (1988) notes that research clearly identifies faculty investment outside the classroom as a "strong predictor of student persistence."

Concern for students is further shown by the program's recognition of their diverse advising needs. For traditional freshmen the adjustment to college is emphasized. This group generally is concerned with separation, autonomy, interpersonal relationships, and academic skills and strategies. According to Wratcher (1991), "college freshmen generally have little preparation for all of the new responsibilities they encounter and they are hesitant to seek help when needed" (p. 171). Heeding this observation, the program makes a special effort to acquaint freshmen with available resources for academic and personal concerns. In addition advisors often act as brokers, linking students with needed services and monitoring their involvement.

For upperclassmen the issues are often different. Although freshmen and sophomores tend to focus on attainment and demonstration of intellectual competence, juniors and seniors often raise questions about employment, graduate school, and life goals. Each term, advising is geared to the student (e.g., topics might include daycare for a reentry student with a young child or assertiveness training for a freshman who has trouble expressing thoughts). Students are not shuffled off to various offices throughout the campus. If advisors cannot help directly, they

identify appropriate resources and assist in arranging appointments.

To focus on students' life goals and career options and to monitor academic and professional progress, the program has a dual progression policy. Students enter the program with an interest in social work, but they are not considered majors until they complete initial progression. Initial progression occurs prior to the student's junior year and must be attained prior to enrollment in any upper division social work classes. The criteria for initial progression include (a) successful completion of sophomore-level social work classes, (b) completion of 60 semester hours with a grade point average (GPA) of at least 2.0 on a 4.0 scale, and (c) submission of a well-written essay discussing the student's interest in and understanding of the profession. A faculty committee including the student's advisor reviews the application packet to determine initial progression status.

Full progression occurs prior to the senior year and is based on the recognition that social work has an intensive field component in which students demonstrate aptitude and ability to work with other people. Although review is ongoing during mandatory advising, full progression provides an additional opportunity for the advisor to consider a student's potential prior to enrollment in senior-level social work classes. The criteria for full progression are (a) successful completion of junior-level social work classes, (b) completion of 90 semester hours with a GPA of 2.0 or above, and (c) approval of a faculty committee that includes the student's advisor and junior field practice consultant. Throughout the progression process advisors interact with students in completing the necessary paperwork, but more importantly, they also explore the personal and vocational interests of their advisees. Students' expectations of good advising include discussion about life goals and career plans (Creeden, 1990).

If academic problems arise, the program has a more intrusive type of advising, called academic review. A student whose cumulative GPA falls below 2.0 or whose GPA for two successive terms is below 2.0 is placed on academic review for the subsequent semester. During any semester on academic review, a student must participate in advising that explores problems such as inadequate study skills, vague career goals, and excessive employment. Advisor and student investigate university and community

resources to help solve identified problems. Both parties develop a plan of action that clearly indicates (a) what is to be done, (b) by whom, and (c) within what time frame. The plan is signed by both student and advisor, and progress is closely monitored. If there is sufficient academic progress, the student continues in the program. If not, the student is released from the program and referred to the readmission office.

Administrative Commitment

The university administration is visibly supportive of the program's advising efforts. In a recently completed five-year plan, the university identifies "serving students better" as a major priority, reflecting what a recent cover story in *Time* refers to as the service orientation of the campus of the future (Elson, 1992). A pivotal component in addressing this priority is "more emphasis on career counseling and advising" (University of Tennessee & Tennessee Board of Regents, 1991, p. 1).

To champion the advising effort, the university has created an office of Coordinator of Advising and one of Reentry and Nontraditional Students. Both offices work with colleges to support advising that enhances student advancement. Specifically, the reentry office was created to assist students who have delayed or interrupted their education and to assist adult students. The Coordinator of Advising works with each college in the ongoing development of the advising system. The Coordinator provides advising workshops for faculty, chairs a committee of advising coordinators from each college, and coordinates a first-year studies class for at-risk students. These resources along with a computerized student information system substantiate the university's commitment to advising.

Training and Resources

Fundamental to customer service advising are not only commitment, availability, and continuity but also accurate information and ongoing professional development. A B.S.S.W. faculty member meets bimonthly as part of the University Advising Implementation Committee chaired by the Coordinator of Advising. The meetings provide information on curricular changes, orientation, registration, and university resources, as well as opportunities to discuss advising throughout the university. Materials and

information from this committee are shared with B.S.S.W. faculty at curriculum and faculty meetings.

An outgrowth of the implementation committee is the monthly Advisor Forum, committed to support academic advising and the professional growth of advisors. The forum's constituency includes faculty, administrators, academic advisors, counselors, and graduate students who are concerned with the diverse advising needs of students. The monthly meetings are opportunities for the exchange of ideas about advising and its role and importance within the university. For example, a recent meeting involved a discussion led by the Dean of Students regarding the advising needs of freshmen and services available to them.

Each advisor is trained on the computerized student information system. Academic history and admission information are easily retrieved, allowing advisors to respond to questions quickly with up-to-date information. Kramer, Peterson, and Spencer (1984) report clerical tasks are reduced and the quality and accuracy of advising are enhanced by the use of computers. Computer technology provides additional time for advisors "to concentrate on more important issues such as student development, retention, and academic planning" (Kramer, 1990, p. 5).

Recognition

The Advisor Forum acts as an advocate for academic advising within the university. The forum is addressing the need to develop a university-wide reward structure and will discuss this issue with the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs.

In support of advising, the College of Social Work provides release time of one course per term for a faculty member to facilitate mandatory and academic review advising as well as to direct transfer advising. In addition, a faculty member's advising load is considered when assigning committee responsibilities and making promotion, tenure, and salary decisions. To judge faculty effort toward advising, the college employs program and university evaluations.

Evaluation

Evaluation of advising was addressed in a recent survey of B.S.S.W. graduates (*B.S.S.W. Program Survey*, 1991). Of 96 mailed surveys, 58 (60%) were returned. Graduates from

1987-1991 are laudatory of academic and career advising in the program, with 81% indicating satisfaction and only a small minority (5%) indicating dissatisfaction. All of the alumni indicate that their advisors met with them at least once or twice per term, and a sizeable percentage of the sample (43%) indicate meeting with their advisors three or more times per term.

Tables 1, 2, and 3 exhibit graduates' perceptions of advising before and after adoption of the customer service model. The 1991 survey reflects graduates' perceptions of advising following adoption of the customer service model in 1987. An earlier survey (*B.S.S.W. Program Survey*, 1986) indicates that graduates from 1983-1986 have a slightly different opinion of advising. Although perceiving advising in a positive manner, this sample ($N = 42$) is not as enthusiastic. These alumni appreciate faculty accessibility but not to the same degree as later graduates. A lower percentage of the earlier graduates report seeing their advisors as accessible and meeting with them three or more times per term.

A comparison of the surveys' results pertaining to satisfaction with advising indicates no significant difference. However, there is a significant change of perception regarding accessibility and advisor contact. The results are not surprising. The B.S.S.W. program had a good advising record prior to adopting the customer service model. The change was introduced to enrich advising by increasing accessibility and taking a more developmental stance.

These results should be interpreted with caution. The university switched from a quarter to a semester system in 1988. The longer term could affect accessibility and provide additional opportunities for meeting.

Studies conducted by the university confirm the results of the program's 1991 survey. *Student Ratings of Experiences with Advisors and Professors at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville*, prepared by Bensey and Phillippi (1990) for the Center for Assessment Research and Development, and the *Undergraduate Alumni Survey* (1990), designed and implemented by the Center for Assessment Research and Development, provide descriptive information and charts disclosing that the B.S.S.W. program is higher than the university average in the following categories: (a) talked with advisor more than five times per year, (b) sought advisor's help more than five times per year, (c) obtained career advice from

TABLE 1
Satisfaction With Advising

	1986		1991		χ^2
	Survey $N = 42$		Survey $N = 58$		
Perception	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	
Satisfied	30	71	47	81	
Neutral	9	22	8	14	
Dissatisfied	3	7	3	5	1.25*

*no significance

TABLE 2
Accessibility of Advisor

	1986		1991		χ^2
	Survey $N = 42$		Survey $N = 58$		
Perception	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	
Inaccessible	3	7	0	0	
Accessible	11	26	24	41	
Very accessible	28	67	34	59	5.99*

* $p < .05$

TABLE 3
Contact with Advisor

	1986		1991		χ^2
	Survey $N = 42$		Survey $N = 58$		
Contacts Per Term	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	
One or two	36	86	33	57	
Three or four	4	9	17	29	
More than four	2	5	8	14	11.13*

* $p < .01$

faculty, (d) received feedback from professors, (e) availability of advisor, and (f) willingness of advisor to help.

There is further evidence of student approval of the program's advising services in a student satisfaction survey designed and conducted by Lyons and Scroggins (1991) and mailed by the Office of Institutional Research to a representative sample of undergraduates enrolled in the various colleges throughout the university. Several items refer specifically to advising services

in the major department. The report compares college to university-wide student ratings on a 4-point Likert scale. Table 4 compares perceptions of availability of the advisor, willingness of the advisor to help, and quality of curricular and career advising. Chi-square tests indicate a significant differences between the two groups for each variable ($p > .001$), and these appear to validate the customer service model of advising.

Evidence of the program's advising quality is reinforced by a site visit report prepared by the Commission on Accreditation of the Council on Social Work Education. As part of the reaccreditation process, a team from the commission reviews a self-study document and meets with students, faculty, field instructors, and administrators to determine whether accreditation standards are being met. One of the standards is advisement. The team's report indicates the B.S.S.W. advisement system is well established and effectively implemented. The report specifies that "students expressed great satisfaction and appreciation for the commitment shown by the faculty to advisement and stated that in-depth, high quality, and personalized advisement was available to them" (Commission on Accreditation, 1992, p. 13).

Surveys of graduates and presently enrolled students provide little evidence that a customer service model of advising is influencing retention. Unfortunately the College of Social Work did not monitor student retention before 1987. This gap prevents a pre- and post-model comparison of the program's rates. It is, however, possible to compare the program's rates since the model's inception with the university's one- and two-year retention rates (see Table 5).

Some significant differences, using the chi-square test, are present. Two-year retention of Fall 1988 B.S.S.W. entrants is moderately better than the university's rate for that period ($\chi^2 = 3.63, p < .10$). There are similar results when comparing the two-year retention rates of Fall 1989 entrants ($\chi^2 = 3.26, p < .10$). It is interesting to note that no statistically significant difference is found in one-year retention rates from 1987-1990. The results may address the B.S.S.W. program's commitment to high quality advising throughout a student's tenure. Students reveal a need for more contact with advisors after the freshman year, but in fact the opposite may be occurring. In a recent article in *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, a student claims that "much of the quality academic advis-

TABLE 4
Students' Perception of the Quality of Advising in Their Major

Variable	Perception	University-wide Response* ($n = 285$)		B.S.S.W. Response ($n = 51$)		χ^2
		n	%	n	%	
Availability	Excellent	57	20	31	61	35.37**
	Good	121	42	16	31	
	Fair	59	21	2	4	
	Poor	48	17	2	4	
Advisor's willingness to help	Excellent	88	31	35	69	40.86**
	Good	123	43	15	29	
	Fair	54	19	0	0	
	Poor	20	7	1	2	
Quality of curricular advising	Excellent	37	13	27	53	48.27**
	Good	145	51	20	39	
	Fair	74	26	3	6	
	Poor	29	10	1	2	
Quality of career advising	Excellent	23	8	19	37	41.62**
	Good	120	42	24	47	
	Fair	102	36	4	8	
	Poor	40	14	4	8	

*Does not include the B.S.S.W. response

** $p < .001$

TABLE 5
One- and Two-Year Retention Rates

Term	B.S.S.W. Program					University				
	Initial Enrollment	One-Year Retention		Two-Year Retention		Initial Enrollment	One-Year Retention		Two-Year Retention	
		<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%		<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Fall 1987	24	20	83	18	75	3683	2894	79	2355	64
Fall 1988	26	24	92	22	85	3708	2924	79	2484	67
Fall 1989	25	22	88	21	84	3296	2609	79	2208	67
Fall 1990	30	26	87	—	—	3336	2640	79	—	—

ing and the personal contacts seem to come early on, and then fizzle" (Dodge, 1992, p. A42).

A word of caution is in order in comparing B.S.S.W. program retention with overall university retention. As mentioned earlier, many students transfer into the B.S.S.W. program after the freshman year. Also, students entering the program are focused and declare an interest in the major. These students may not be as drop-out prone. The certainty about what to study, and for many of these students, some earlier adjustment to higher education could also influence the program's retention rate.

Nevertheless, retention is dependent upon satisfied students. The customer service model appears to be producing this result. Currently enrolled B.S.S.W. students and recent graduates enthusiastically endorse the advising process. B.S.S.W. students perceive advising in the major more favorably than do students throughout the university. The two-year retention rate of the program since 1988 is moderately higher than the university's rate.

Conclusion

The components of the customer service model of advising are evident in the B.S.S.W. program. However, some integral parts, in particular rewards and assessments, need further development to experience the full impact of this advising process. Currently, rewards include course and/or committee assignment reductions and rather loosely made pronouncements of the importance of advising in tenure, promotion, and salary decisions. Assessments of the program do not consider dropouts, nor are

individual advisors evaluated. The program needs to add formal evaluations of individual advisors and exit surveys of students who drop out of the program. This additional information is needed to determine internal consistency and accountability and to justify enhanced individual recognition. The exit survey is important to monitor dropouts, their reasons for withdrawal, and the role of advising in influencing this decision. With this data a more definitive evaluation of the model will be possible.

What is clear at this time is that the B.S.S.W. program is developing a reputation among its students, its alumni, and the university community for caring about students. Students express satisfaction with advising that emphasizes individual needs and is accessible, timely, and accurate. They are satisfied customers, and satisfied customers are the best recruiters.

With a customer service approach to advising, everyone benefits—the university, the program, the faculty, and the students. Students and alumni indicate that their expectations for academic and career advising have been met, and they tell others about their positive experiences. The university and the academic program benefit from these endorsements in terms of academic reputation, future admissions, reduced attrition, and financial support. Faculty, who devote their effort and time to quality advising, experience rewards. During a period of declining enrollments and high attrition, this model deserves a close inspection. In the short time that this model has been operating in the B.S.S.W. program, I've seen my dad's wisdom borne out—wisdom that appears as successful in meeting customers' expectations of a small dry cleaning business as in meeting students' expectations of advising in higher education.

References

- Andrews, M., Andrews, D., Long, E., & Henton, J. (1987). Student characteristics as predictors of perceived academic needs. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 28(1), 60-65.
- Arnold, L., Mares, R., & Calkins, E. V. (1986). Exit interviews reveal why students leave a BA-MD degree program prematurely. *College and University*, 62(1), 34-47.
- Beasley-Fielstein, L. (1986). Student perception of the developmental advisor-advisee relationship. *NACADA Journal*, 6(2), 107-117.
- Bensey, M., & Phillippi, R. H. (1990). *Student ratings of experiences with advisors and professors at The University of Tennessee*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Center for Assessment Research and Development.
- Boyer, E. L. (1987). *College: The undergraduate experience in America*. New York: Harper & Row.
- B.S.S.W. program survey. (1986). Unpublished report, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, College of Social Work.
- B.S.S.W. program survey. (1991). Unpublished report, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, College of Social Work.
- Congram, C. A., & Friedman, M. L. (1991). The quality-leadership connection in service business. In C. Congram (Ed.), *Handbook of marketing for the service industries* (pp. 3-19). New York: American Management Association.
- Creeden, J. E. (1990). Components of good advising: Differences in faculty and student perceptions. *NACADA Journal*, 10(2), 30-36.
- Commission on Accreditation. (1992). *Site visit report*. Unpublished report available from Council on Social Work Education, Alexandria, VA.
- Crockett, D. (1985). Academic advising. In L. Noel, R. Levitz, D. Saluri, & Associates (Eds.), *Increasing student retention* (pp. 244-263). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Crockett, D., & Levitz, R. (1983). *A national survey of academic advising: Final report*. Iowa City: American College Testing Program.
- Davis, M. (1991, June 28). Students top priority for new UT boss. *Knoxville News Sentinel*, p. A3.
- DeBard, R. (1987). Counseling students in academic difficulty. *College and University*, 63(1), 57-63.
- Dodge, S. (1992, April 15). Colleges are trying ways to enhance academic advising. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, pp. A41-42.
- Earl, W. R. (1988). Intrusive advising of freshmen in academic difficulty. *NACADA Journal*, 8(2), 27-33.
- Elson, J. (1992, April 13). Campus of the future. *Time*, pp. 54-58.
- Fielstein, L. L. (1989). Student priorities for academic advising: Do they want a personal relationship? *NACADA Journal*, 9(1), 33-38.
- Ford, J., & Ford, S. S. (1989). A caring attitude and academic advising. *NACADA Journal*, 9(2), 43-48.
- Garfield, C. (1992). *Second to none: How smart companies put people first*. Homewood, IL: Business One Irwin.
- Habley, W. R. (1981). Academic advisement: The critical link in student retention. *NASPA Journal*, 18(4), 45-50.
- Hartley, M. P. (1987). H.E.L.P. for students: One university's action approach to increasing student retention. *College and University*, 63(1), 80-94.
- Heskett, J. L. (1986). *Managing in the service economy*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Jacobson, J. S. (1992, April 15). Professors who teach more are paid less—study finds. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, p. A17.
- Kelley, K. N., & Lynch, M. J. (1991). Factors students use when evaluating advisors. *NACADA Journal*, 11(1), 26-33.
- Koerin, B. B. (1991). Improving academic advising: Strategies for change. *NASPA Journal*, 28(4), 323-327.
- Kramer, G. L. (1988). Enhancing the role of academic advising on the college campus. *NACADA Journal*, 8(1), 3-6.
- Kramer, G. L. (1990). The compleat advisor. *NACADA Journal*, 10(1), 5-7.
- Kramer, G. L., Peterson, E. D., & Spencer, R. W. (1984). Using computers in academic advising. In R. B. Winston, Jr., T. K. Miller, S. C. Ender, T. J. Grites, & Associates (Eds.), *Developmental academic advising* (pp. 226-249). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Larsen, M. D., & Brown, B. (1983). Rewards for academic advising: An evaluation. *NACADA Journal*, 3(2), 53-60.
- Lyons, W., & Scroggins, D. (1991). *Student satisfaction survey for the College of Social Work*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Office of Institutional Research.
- Noel, L. (1985). Increasing student retention: New challenges & potential. In L. Noel, R. Levitz, D. Saluri, & Associates (Eds.), *Increasing student retention* (pp. 1-27). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A., & Berry, L. L. (1985). A conceptual model of service quality and its implications for future research. *Journal of Marketing*, 49(Fall), 41-50.
- Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A., & Berry, L. L. (1988). SERVQUAL: A multiple-item scale for measuring consumer perceptions of service quality. *Journal of Retailing*, 64(Spring), 12-40.
- Patrick, J., Furlow, J. W., & Donovan, S. (1988). Using a comprehensive academic intervention program in the retention of high risk students. *NACADA Journal*, 8(1), 29-36.
- Schneider, B. (1990). Alternative strategies for creating service-oriented organizations. In D. Bowen, R. Chase, T. Cummings, & Associates (Eds.), *Service management effectiveness: Balancing strategy, organization and human resources, operations, and marketing* (pp. 126-151). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Schneider, B., & Bowen, D. E. (1985). Employee and customer perceptions of service in banks: Replica-

- tion and extension. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 70, 323-333.
- Srebnik, D. S. (1988). Academic advising evaluation: A review of assessment instruments. *NACADA Journal*, 8(1), 52-62.
- Study Group on the Conditions of Excellence in American Education. (1984, October 24). Involvement in learning: Realizing the potential of American higher education. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, pp. 35-49.
- Tinto, V. (1988). *Educational principles of effective student retention*. Keynote address at the annual conference of the National Academic Advising Association, Miami, FL.
- Undergraduate alumni survey*. (1990). Unpublished report, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Center for Assessment Research and Development.
- University of Tennessee & Tennessee Board of Regents. (1991). *Intents and purposes: UT's five year plan*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Office of University Relations.
- Wagenheim, G. D., & Reurink, J. H. (1991). Customer service in public administration. *Public Administration Review*, 51(3), 263-269.
- Winston, R. B., Jr., & Sandor, J. A. (1984). Developmental academic advising: What do students want? *NACADA Journal*, 4(1), 5-13.
- Wratcher, M. A. (1991). Freshman academic adjustment at a competitive university. *College Student Journal*, 25(2), 170-177.
- Frank J. Spicuzza is Associate Professor of Social Work and chairperson of the B.S.S.W. program. Address correspondence concerning this article to him at UTK College of Social Work, Henson Hall, Knoxville, TN 37996-3333.*