

Informing, Apprising, Guiding, and Mentoring: Constructs Underlying Upperclassmen Expectations for Advising

Kathleen M. Propp, Western Michigan University

Steven C. Rhodes, Western Michigan University

We examined the mental constructs that guide students' expectations for advisor behavior. Through exploratory factor analysis, we identified four factors that underlie students' expectations. Interpretive analysis revealed underlying dimensions reflected by the factors of advisor role and enactment level. Specifically, the first dimension reflected that advisors may be expected to perform as academic and developmental advisor. The second dimension showed a refinement of factors such that each role could be enacted in a generalized or individualized manner. Based on the identified role and enactment level, four constructs were posited to guide students' expectations for advisors: informing, mentoring, guiding, and apprising. Findings suggest that students prefer that advisors display the informing, guiding, and apprising behaviors significantly more than mentoring behaviors.

KEY WORDS: advising approaches, advisor role, customer service, expectations of advising, perceptions of advising

Relative emphasis:* theory, research, practice

Since 1995, the private sector has responded to consumer demands for service by creating 24 × 7 × 365 product and customer service availability (Ford, 1998; 1999; Gutek, 1995; Timm, 2002). Today's college students grew up with fast food, computers, the Internet, and cell phones. They are accustomed to one-stop shopping, instant messaging, and lots of competition for their buying dollars. This culture has produced college students who are comparison shoppers with high expectations and short attention spans.

Researchers have argued that this trend has created a generation of "customers" (students) that has on-demand expectations for education (Leidner, 1993; Odland, 2002; Ritzer, 1993). Students want relatively fast service with few hassles and fair value for the tuition dollars that they are spending (Howe & Bellizzi, 2003; Upcraft & Stephens, 2000). Compared to earlier generations of students, these new student customers expect and demand more services from the universities they choose to

attend, and their demands include getting more from advising services.

Quality advising is linked to important educational outcomes, and thus, it has been a consistent concern of students, parents, university administrators, and faculty members. Boers (2001) argued that in the educational process, the only way that students' expectations can be met is for educators to know the exact nature of these expectations. As a consequence, to address student concerns better and meet their demands, advisors must know students' expectations for advisor behavior and how these expectations are formed and organized. In this study, we sought to expand and update the literature on student expectations for advising by exploring the mental constructs that guide student-customers' expectations for advisor behavior.

Students as Customers

The approach to students as customers has gained popularity as more and more postsecondary administrators conclude that the similarities between students and customers are more numerous than are the differences (Boria, 2004; Delucchi & Korgen, 2002; Martin & Bloom, 2003). Those embracing this view argue that both students and customers are purchasing a commodity, both expect to get measurable value from their purchases, and both expect service behind their purchases.

Some researchers feel that the raised expectations of current students can be traced to the present economic and social environment (Upcraft, Gardener, & Barefoot, 2005), and one way to respond to the contemporary forces of change is to perceive the student as a customer. While some view the student-customer metaphor as problematic (Boyer, 1987; Boyer Commission on Educating Undergraduates in the Research University, 1998; Upcraft & Stephens, 2000), others argue that it is appropriate, especially in the context of university services. Chaffee (1995, p. 19) argued that professionals in higher education should perceive the students as "the people you serve"; that is, people in organizations, like colleges and universities, should focus on the those they serve and not their own self-interests. While some may balk at the use

* See note on page 4.

of the customer label, advisors clearly need to know and meet student expectations.

From the student-as-customer perspective, college and university personnel have an obligation to meet students' expectations and to provide student customers with the best education possible, and timely support services constitute a critical component of the effort (McGillin, 2000; O'Malley, 1998). Furthermore, those with this perspective recognize that just like customers, students have choices; they are purchasing a very expensive commodity called an *education*, and if college and university stakeholders expect students to be repeat customers (return from one year to the next), everyone at the institution needs to be responsive to students' expectations (Cleary, 2001; Wright, 1996). Such a view has implications for today's advising models, such as that proposed by Gordon and Habley (2000).

For example, the Education Advising Center within the College of Education and Human Development at the University of Louisville reframed its view of students, acknowledging that just as they are customers of retail establishments, restaurants, or banks, students are also customers of educational institutions. According to arguments put forth in Dorsey (2003), this paradigm shift allowed Center staff to make modifications in some of their advising strategies, thereby improving their services to both their internal customers (staff and faculty) and their external customers (prospective students, current students, and the general public).

Similarly, with student-customers in mind, the staff at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology formed a discovery team to address the question of how information technology can be used to support the student advising experience. Although it fully recognized that information technologies comprise only one component in improving the advising experience for students, the team found that implementing technology to enhance advising systems is one way to respond to current students' expectations (Straggas, Caso, Enterline, & Martin, 2000).

While planners of each of these initiatives took into account student-customer expectations in some manner, their foci were on providing additional services such as extended hours, drop-in advising, Web-based advising, and so forth. They did not focus on students' expectations for advisor behavior and the types of communication in which they preferred to engage with advisors. Although the characteristics of students may have changed over time, with current students bringing a vast array of concerns and needs to their advisors, the basic purpose of advising con-

tinues to be to assist students (Upcraft et al., 2005). As Petress (1996, p. 92) explained:

Students' academic performance is inexorably tied to how the rest of their lives are progressing. Students' teacher, peer, family, romantic, and employment relationships; their physical, mental, and emotional, and spiritual health; their out-of-class activity, financial well being; test anxiety; and post graduation anxieties are all germane to the advisor's role.

With the advisors role being more complex than in the past, knowing student expectations becomes even more important.

Student Expectations for Advising Behavior

Past studies on expectations for advising behavior reflect a general lack of consensus on the definitions of advising and the appropriate roles for advisors (Alvarado, 1988; Guinn & Mitchell, 1986; Kelley & Lynch, 1991; Winston & Sandor, 1984). Research on students' expectation of advisors has often yielded contradictory results. For example, Pascarella (1980) argued that many students desire technical competencies of an advisor over the advisor's personal qualities as a counselor. However, Winston and Sandor (1984) later found that students prefer an advisor who emphasizes building a personal relationship with advisees.

Despite the inconsistencies in student preferences, past research has made clear two broad roles that an advisor may be expected to play: personal mentor and academic counselor. Some studies have reported that students want an advisor who is personally acquainted with them, a characteristic Fielstein (1989) described as the students' preference for a developmental advising relationship. Others have reported that advisors should be expected to provide information on campus resources or university rules and regulations (McAnulty, O'Connor, & Sklare, 1987). This prescriptive advising approach results in a traditional relationship between students and advisors where the advisor engages in narrowly focused interactions that emphasize academic matters over interpersonal concerns (Fielstein, 1989).

Because research has elucidated different advisor roles that may be performed, the question is now focused on the type of advising behavior that is most effective. According to Ogletree (1999), evaluation of advisor performance and effectiveness depends on the expectations students bring to the situation. Therefore, students' expectations of advisors must be considered during an evaluation of the

advisor's role and performance (Saving & Keim, 1998). The inclusion of student expectations in evaluation is especially important because contemporary students are demanding to be heard as customers.

Mental Constructs Underlying Students' Expectations for Advising

The concept of schemata, mental constructs that organize and guide the intake and processing of information, may be used as a tool to understand better advisor effectiveness based on student expectations. It can offer insight into how these expectations are formed and organized. Cognitive process theories suggest that mental constructs help individuals reduce a complex environment into a manageable set of meaningful categories. Cohen (1981) and Higgins, Rholes, and Jones (1977) suggested that these categories help people focus on and attend to specific parts of the environment. In other words, humans tend to see what their schemata tell them to expect. Taylor and Crocker (1981) argued that personal schemata drive one's impressions to fit his or her expectations. For example, Nye (1988) suggested that people rely on schemata when judging the effectiveness of leaders, and that this effectiveness rating is often based on the extent to which the individual leader matches the mental construct of the ideal leader rather than on an impartially based impression of performance. As in the leadership selection process, when evaluating the effectiveness of an advisor, students may base their ratings on a mental construct or constructs (the advisor prototypes) and not solely on an advisor's actual performance (Crockett & Levitz, 1984; Grites, 1984; Ogletree, 1999).

To gain a better understanding of how to meet student consumers' needs, advisors must understand the schemata or mental constructs that drive students' expectations. Previous research suggests that two general roles, those of academic and of developmental advisor, represent potential schemata for students' expectations of advisors. However, are expectations of advising guided only by perceptions of these two roles? Or do other mental constructs guide students' expectations? With these concerns in mind, we addressed the following research question:

RQ1: What are the mental constructs that guide students' expectations for advisor behavior?

While our primary purpose of undertaking this study was to explore the mental constructs that guide student customers' expectations for advisor

behavior, to understand more fully these expectations, we next sought to determine if students prefer some of the identified mental constructs more than others. Furthermore, to continue to refine our understanding of the expectations of student customers and to determine the target market for different types of advisor behaviors, variations in preferences as related to demographic variables also were examined. Thus, the following two additional research questions were addressed:

RQ2: What are students' preferences for expected advisor behavior?

RQ3: Do demographic differences, such as gender, class standing, or age, affect students' expectations for advisor behavior?

Method

Respondents

Students were recruited for this study from undergraduate communication courses at a large midwestern university. Students were offered extra credit for their participation in the study. Students who chose not to participate were given an alternative extra-credit assignment. Approximately 175 students were offered the opportunity to participate, and 93 upper level undergraduates completed the questionnaire. Each respondent filled out a questionnaire designed to measure her or his perceptions of advisors' roles and responsibilities. The questionnaire took approximately 10 to 15 minutes to complete.

Of the 93 respondents, the majority of the sample was female (61.3%). The youngest respondent was 19 and the oldest was 48 years old; the average age of the sample was 22 years. The sample was primarily European American (73.9%), but was somewhat diverse with respondents who indicated they were African American (17.4%), Asian American (5.4%), Hispanic (2.2%), and Native American (1.1%). Students were in their junior (50.5%) or senior (49.5%) year, and all were communication minors or precommunication majors.

Instrument

Guinn and Mitchell's (1986) Advising Role and Responsibility Inventory (ARRI) was adapted for use in this study. The original instrument included 52 questions, but only 38 questions were used in the present study. Questions were removed that a) did not address responsibilities of advisors for majors (i.e., they were directed toward general education advisors), b) addressed administrative procedures

not used at the university from which the sample was drawn, and c) were outside of the purview of the advisor-advisee relationship.

The original ARRI asked students, faculty members, and administrators to indicate whether each item was the responsibility of an advisor, a responsibility shared with others, or not the responsibility of an advisor. To obtain interval data that could be used to perform an exploratory factor analysis, the responses were changed to a 7-point Likert-type scale, with 7 indicating that the respondent strongly agreed that an advisor should display the behavior and 1 indicating that the respondent strongly disagreed that an advisor should display the behavior. Some items were reverse coded to minimize response set. Basic demographic questions were included at the beginning of the questionnaire.

Results and Discussion

An exploratory factor analysis was performed to address RQ1: What are the mental constructs that guide students' expectations for advisor behavior? The underlying factor structure reflects the mental constructs that students use to organize their expectations for advisors' behaviors. SPSS statistical software was used to perform a principle components analysis (PCA) of the 38 items drawn from the ARRI. Because this was an exploratory factor analysis, the number of components to be retained was determined by an examination of the Scree plot, in combination with minimum factor loadings, the amount of additional variance accounted for by the inclusion of the next component, and eigenvalues greater than one. Both varimax and oblique rotations were performed. Similar results were found for both rotations. While the standard bar of acceptability for factor loadings is .4 or greater, a higher standard was used in this study, and only items with component loadings $>.6$ were retained. Furthermore, all items with cross loadings of $<.3$ on a second factor were retained.

The initial PCA of the ARRI included 38 items. We reduced 38 items to 13 based on component loadings, cross loadings, and impact of items on alpha reliabilities. The rotation for the remaining 13 items converged in six iterations. Four distinct factors emerged from the exploratory factor analysis, represented by 13 items from the original scale; each factor was supported by 3 or 4 items.

The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure was used to determine that the sample size was adequate (.745). Results of the factor analysis, items retained, and their respective factor loadings are presented in Table 1. The four factors were all internally con-

sistent with acceptable alpha reliability values: Factor 1 = .83; Factor 2 = .86; Factor 3 = .72; and Factor 4 = .72. Factor loadings on the retained items ranged from .601 to .925, while cross loadings were all less than .26.

Factor 1 consisted of four items that measured whether an advisor should be responsible for telling an advisee about deadlines and degree, major, or general education requirements. This factor accounted for 32.06% of the variance in student expectations for advisor behavior. Factor 2 consisted of three items that accounted for an additional 16.86% of the variance. Factor 2 items dealt with levels of advisor responsibilities for developing an advisee's decision-making skills and self-understanding, as well as appropriateness of counseling an advisee about personal concerns. Factor 3 consisted of three items that focused on whether an advisor should make course and load recommendations to an advisee. This factor accounted for an additional 12.39% of the variance. Factor 4 consisted of three items that included whether an advisor should provide pertinent registration details, tell an advisee about specific instructors, and review requirements for graduation with an advisee. The final factor accounted for an additional 10.13% of the variance in student expectations for advisor behavior. The four-factor solution explained 71.44% of the total variance.

Analysis and interpretation of the four factors with their corresponding items revealed that the factors reflected two underlying dimensions that appear to guide students' expectations for advisor behaviors. The first dimension incorporates behaviors that define the general role of the advisor. The second dimension is based on the level of enactment at which these roles are to be played.

The first dimension interpreted from the factors supports past research and suggests that students may expect an advisor to play two roles: academic or developmental advisor. An academic advisor's role is to represent the university and to inform the student about the requirements and deadlines of the institution for which he or she works. As a representative of the university, the academic advisor is to enforce the rules of the university in an impartial manner. A developmental advisor's role is to be a mentor and to advise students in ways that extend beyond the confines of the university and the here-and-now concerns of student life. As a consequence, the developmental advisor is future oriented, incorporating career and personal advice as well as help in the student's growth as a person. In addition, a large part of the developmental advisor's role

Table 1 Results of factor analysis

Item	Factor Loadings			
	1	2	3	4
27. An advisor should evaluate transcripts in relation to degree requirements.	.918*	-.036	.025	.235
24. An advisor should assist advisee with awareness of deadlines that affect him/her.	.843*	.063	-.061	-.081
25. An advisor should explain existence of certain general education or major requirements.	.771*	-.007	.011	-.139
28. An advisor should recommend course substitutions or other degree requirements.	.601*	-.041	.087	-.254
37. An advisor should assist advisee in self-understanding and self-acceptance.	.094	.925*	-.005	-.034
38. An advisor should counsel advisee about personal concerns.	-.038	.916*	-.071	.084
36. An advisor should assist advisee in development of decision-making skills.	.021	.740*	.233	-.170
3. An advisor should recommend elective courses that might be beneficial.	-.049	-.184	.875*	-.102
2. An advisor should help evaluate academic load in relation to other factors.	.020	.150	.840*	.178
9. An advisor should guide advisee with pre-communication major to courses that may help decide area of interest.	.110	.131	.635*	-.094
15. An advisor should provide pertinent registration details.	.049	.032	-.041	-.843*
17. An advisor should review with each advisee the requirements for graduation.	-.019	-.111	.238	-.793*
16. An advisor should recommend specific instructors.	.059	.130	-.113	-.723*

Note. *Factor loadings of $>.6$; no cross loadings $>.26$.

includes taking a holistic approach to students' concerns and needs: focusing not only on students' schoolwork, but also on other parts of their lives. The role of developmental advisor is similar to the developmental relationship between advisor and student posited by Crookston (1972).

The second dimension interpreted from the factors suggests that students expect varying levels of behavioral enactment with respect to their expected advising role. This dimension represents the level of specificity of advice for which advisors are perceived to be responsible: generalized or individualized. Advisors may be perceived as responsible to understand and advise categories of students (generalized), or they may be perceived as responsible to understand the needs of a particular student (individualized).

The type of role (academic vs. developmental) and the level of enactment (generalized vs. individualized) underlie the four factors identified, with each factor representing a unique blend of student expectations of an advisor when these two dimensions are combined. As a result, four mental schemata or constructs appear to guide the expecta-

tations of students for advisor behavior, and these constructs correspond to the four factors and corresponding items found in the statistical analyses. See Figure 1.

The four items in Factor 1 create an informing construct of advising. This construct is based on the role of academic advisor performed at the generalized level of enactment. All four items focus on an advisor's role to inform the student of various academic requirements and deadlines. This advice is designed to keep a student abreast of her or his steps to graduation, but it does not move an advisor beyond serving as a university representative. These items are generalized to the extent that most students would find essentially the same advice to be useful, and the items suggest that the advisor makes no attempt to adapt to a particular student's individualized needs.

The three items in Factor 2 represent a mentoring construct that summarizes the role of developmental advisor when advisement is individualized to meet the needs of a specific student. The three items include assisting the advisee in self-understanding/self-acceptance and development of deci-

Figure 1 Advisor behavioral constructs based on role and enactment dimensions

		Role	
		Academic Advisor	Developmental Advisor
Level of Enactment	Generalized	Informing	Guiding
	Individualized	Apprising	Mentoring

sion-making skills as well as counseling the advisee about personal concerns. In contrast, the mentoring construct, in which advisors move beyond a focus on current academic needs to a future orientation to address the student's personal needs and growth, clearly represents the role of developmental advisor. The items in this construct also reflect an individualized approach to the student, revealing a holistic concern that is customized to meet the needs of a particular student.

The three items in Factor 3 form the guiding construct of advisor behavior that blends the role of developmental advisor with a generalized level of enactment. These items focus on providing guidance about academic load in relation to other factors and beneficial elective courses as well as recommendations for courses that may help a student decide on an area of interest. While the types of advice incorporated in this construct are aimed at more short-term goals than in the mentoring construct, the guiding construct also represents the role of a developmental advisor in that advice is given that helps a student to prepare for future decisions and reflects a consideration of potential outside influences on the student's life (e.g., factors affecting academic load). However, when contrasted with the role of developmental advisor as performed in the mentoring construct, the level of enactment is clearly more broad and open-ended and designed to meet the generalized needs of students. The advisor does not need to know the student at an individual level to provide general guidance of the type given in these items.

The three items in Factor 4 create the appraising construct of advisor behavior, which is the role of academic advisor when performed at the individualized level of enactment. The items include academic advising behaviors such as appraising a student of pertinent registration details or the requirements she or he needs to fulfill for graduation as well as

recommendations for specific instructors. The specificity with which the advisor is to provide information on organizational rules and requirements ties together the items of the appraising construct. While the role suggested by the items is clearly that of academic advisor, this factor is distinct from the informing construct because the advice is customized to the individual advisee in each of the items. Rather than giving general information about requirements, the advisor must have individualized knowledge, such as the student's academic record, so he or she can determine the pertinent information that must be provided, such as the required courses needed for graduation. Also, to recommend effectively the specific instructors (rather than courses), the advisor must know something about a student's academic style and needs.

Having identified the constructs used to organize students' expectations for advising behavior, we focused RQ2 on student preferences for these expected behaviors. In order of preference, students rated the four constructs:

1. guiding ($M = 6.04$; $SD = 0.87$),
2. informing ($M = 5.92$; $SD = 0.97$),
3. appraising ($M = 5.88$; $SD = 1.05$), and
4. mentoring ($M = 3.96$; $SD = 1.52$).

Paired sample t tests were performed to determine if the mean preferences reported by students were statistically significant from one another. No significant differences were found between guiding, informing, and appraising. However, mentoring was rated from 1.92 to 2.08 points lower than the other three constructs, reflecting significant differences between it and guiding ($t = 12.87$, $p = .000$), informing ($t = 11.23$, $p = .000$), and appraising ($t = 11.25$, $p = .000$).

These findings suggest that the upper level undergraduates comprising this sample expected advisors to play the role of academic advisor at the general-

ized (informing) and individualized level (apprising). However, while developmental advice was expected and desired at the generalized level of enactment (guiding), it was expected significantly less at the individualized level of enactment (mentoring).

The differences in the expectations for the four constructs identified in this study may be explained by characteristics of this particular sample. While the sample consisted of juniors and seniors, it was drawn from two sophomore-level lecture classes that must be completed before a student can apply to a specialized major in the School of Communication. Students at this point in their education may not have been focusing on careers and other personal issues addressed by the mentoring construct. In addition, the sample was drawn from a large school, with over 1,500 majors and minors, serviced by one general advisor. Consequently, students might have felt that individualized mentoring was unrealistic because the contact they might expect with the advisor is limited; instead, they might seek this type of advice from professors.

To address RQ3, we computed analyses of variance (ANOVAs) to determine whether demographic variables influence the expectations for advisor behavior. Three fixed main effects were used in the analyses: gender (male, female), race (Caucasian, African American), and year in school (junior, senior). Race was limited to the two groups with sufficient sample sizes. Interaction effects between the demographic variables were also included in the analyses. The dependent variables for the analyses were the four advising constructs. We used a general linear model for balanced designs to compute the ANOVAs. No significant main effects or interaction effects were found for any of the four advising constructs, and the full models accounted for very little variance (informing $R^2 = .05$; mentoring $R^2 = .01$; guiding $R^2 = .06$; apprising $R^2 = .01$). These findings suggest that the respondents' expectations for advisor behavior were very similar and did not vary based on basic demographic variables. These findings were not surprising because the sample was relatively homogeneous.

Conclusions

Our primary purpose of conducting this study was to determine the schemata or mental constructs that guide students' expectations for advisor behavior. We undertook the study to understand better how to serve student customers' advising needs. Statistical analyses identified four distinct factors composed of 13 behavioral items. Interpretive analysis revealed two underlying dimensions reflected

by the four factors: the role of the advisor and the level of enactment at which a given role should be performed. First, two roles were identified that advisors may be expected to perform: academic advisor and developmental advisor. Second, the level of enactment at which these two roles may be performed refined the factors into a generalized or individualized manner of advising delivery. Thus, based on the advisor's role and level of enactment, four distinct constructs of advising expectations were identified: informing, mentoring, guiding, and apprising.

The two general roles uncovered by the factor analysis lend support to earlier research that suggests students' expectations for advisors are varied (Crookston, 1972). Some students believe that an advisor's role is to instruct advisees about university rules, registration details, and other pertinent university information. This is the traditional role of an academic advisor. Moreover, research has also supported that some students expect that an advisor should develop a personalized relationship with advisees (Crookston, 1972; Fielstein, 1987; Grites, 1979; Hawkins, 1991). In this personalized role, an advisor becomes more of a counselor who can assist the advisee in career choices, development of life skills, and achievement of personal goals.

While the finding of the academic and developmental roles of an advisor was not surprising, interpretation of the factor analysis results revealed that students' expectations for the advisors were expected at differing levels of specificity. Past research has not accounted for the potential generalization or individualization of advisors' behavior in this way. Rather, the role of a traditional academic advisor typically has been posited as a generalized relationship (i.e., an informing construct), while the role of developmental advisor predictably has been posited as individualized (i.e., a mentoring construct). The findings of this study suggest that these roles each may be played at the opposite level of enactment, thus creating two new constructs of advising: the apprising and guiding constructs. The apprising construct is based on an advisor's customized advice to meet the needs of the individual student while focusing on purely academic matters. Under the guiding construct, an advisor may provide general advice on career and personal issues to an advisee but is not necessarily required to understand the advisee in a close and personal manner. These findings suggest that student customers are making distinctions in the ways they organize their expectations for advising behavior; these distinctions had not been explored before

this study. Because students' expectations influence their reactions to and evaluations of advising, stakeholders need to understand those expectations and their cognitive organization.

After identifying the constructs that guide students' expectations, we began to explore student preferences for these expected behaviors. For this particular sample of juniors and seniors, students desired advisors to enact the constructs of guiding, informing, and apprising significantly more than the construct of mentoring. These are important findings, because two of the three constructs that these students preferred have not been addressed directly in previous literature. This study provides initial support that upper level undergraduates desire academic advising that is both general and individualized. They also desire personal advising that is generalized, but they had significantly less desire for individualized personal advice. Because of the time pressures many academic advisors face while trying to provide quality customer service, understanding that student customers do not necessarily desire a personal mentoring relationship is important.

Findings also show that preferences for these constructs are not affected by demographic differences. However, these findings should be viewed with caution because the sample size was relatively small and homogeneous. Future research on students' expectations about advisor behavior should include exploration on the construct(s) students prefer and the circumstances in which these preferences are held. Because the sample used for this study was comprised of only juniors and seniors, future researchers should determine if preferences for the constructs are different for underclassmen.

With a larger and more diverse sample, researchers can determine if preferences may vary by demographic differences such as gender of the student, gender of the advisor, age, major, credit hours, type/size of school, race, and so forth. Preferences might differ based on personality and communication traits such as learning style, locus of control, and communication apprehension. Information on the factors that account for student expectations of advising can then be used to guide the choice of roles and responsibilities for an advisor in a particular situation, better equipping them to meet that student customer's needs.

Future studies should also continue to refine the measurement of the four constructs identified in this study. The development of additional behaviors that differentiate each construct, so that each construct is measured by at least 5 items, would ben-

efit a continued effort to expand the scale of student expectations for advisors. Improving the inter-item reliability for each factor is also advised. Furthermore, having identified the four primary constructs through an exploratory factor analysis, future researchers should use confirmatory factor analyses to verify the validity of the factors and new items added to the scale.

References

- Alvarado, I. (1988). Student and faculty expectations of the faculty advisor functions and characteristics of the advisor/advisee relationship. (Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1987). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 48, 7-A.
- Boers, D. (2001). What teachers need from students. *The Education Digest*, 67(8), 22–26.
- Boria, S. (2004). Students as “customers.” *On the Horizon*, 12(4), 158–62.
- Boyer Commission on Educating Undergraduates in the Research University. (1998). *Reinventing undergraduate education: A blueprint for America's research universities*. New York: State University of New York.
- Boyer, E. L. (1987). *College: The undergraduate experience in America*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Chaffee, E. E. (1995). Listening to the people we serve. In W. Tierney (Ed.), *The responsive university restructuring for high performance* (pp. 13–37). Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Cleary, T. (2001). Indicators of quality. *Planning for Higher Education*, 29(3), 19–28.
- Cohen, C. E. (1981). Person categories and social perception: Testing some boundaries of the processing effects of prior knowledge. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 40(3), 441–52.
- Crockett, D. S., & Levitz, R. (1984). Current advising practices in colleges and universities. In R. Winston (Ed.), *Developmental academic advising*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Crookston, B. B. (1972). A developmental view of academic advising. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 13(1), 12–17.
- Delucchi, M., & Korgen, K. (2002). “We’re the customer—we pay the tuition”: Student consumerism among undergraduate sociology majors. *Teaching Sociology*, 30(1), 100–107.
- Dorsey, R. L. (2003, May). *Improving advising through a customer service initiative at the University of Louisville's College of Education*

- and Human Development. Paper presented at the annual Committee on Institutional Cooperation Academic Advising Conference, Bloomington, IN.
- Fielstein, L. L. (1987). Student preferences for personal contact in a student-faculty advising relationship. *NACADA Journal*, 7(2), 34–40.
- Fielstein, L. L. (1989). Student priorities for academic advising: Do they want a personal relationship? *NACADA Journal*, 9(1), 33–38.
- Ford, W. S. Z. (1998). *Communicating with customers: Service approaches, ethics, and impact*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.
- Ford, W. S. Z. (1999). Communication and customer service. In M. E. Roloff (Vol. Ed.), *Communication Yearbook 22* (pp. 341–75). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Gordon, V., & Habley, W. R. (Eds.). (2000). *Academic advising: A comprehensive handbook*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Grites, T. J. (1979). *Academic advising: Getting us through the eighties* (AAHE-ERIC/Higher Education Report No. 7). Washington, DC: American Association of Higher Education.
- Grites, T. J. (1984). Noteworthy academic advising programs. In R. B. Winston (Ed.), *Developmental academic advising: Addressing students' educational, career, and personal needs* (pp. 469–537). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Guinn, D., & Mitchell, R. (1986). Academic advising: And different expectations. *NACADA Journal*, 6(1), 99–105.
- Gutek, B. A. (1995). *The dynamics of service: Reflections on the changing nature of customer/provider interactions*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Hawkins, K. (1991). Preliminary development of a measure of faculty/advisor communication apprehension. *Communication Research Reports*, 8(1–2), 127–32.
- Higgins, E. T., Rholes, W. S., & Jones, C. R. (1977). Category accessibility and impression formation. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 13(2), 141–54.
- Howe, L., & Bellizzi, F. (2003, April). *High impact customer service*. Paper presented at the annual conference of the National Association of Graduate Admissions Professionals, New Orleans, LA.
- Kelley, K. N., & Lynch, M. J. (1991). Factors students use when evaluating advisors. *NACADA Journal*, 11(1), 26–33.
- Kramer, G. (Ed.). (2000). *The “e” factor in delivering advising and student services*. (Monograph No. 7). Manhattan, KS: National Academic Advising Association.
- Leidner, R. (1993). *Fast food, fast talk: Service work and the routinization of everyday life*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Martin, N. A., & Bloom, J. L. (2003). *Career aspirations and expeditions: Advancing your career in higher education administration*. Champaign, IL: Stipes Publishing.
- McAnulty, B. H., O'Connor, C. A., & Sklare, L. (1987). Analysis of student faculty opinion of academic advising services. *NACADA Journal*, 7(1), 49–61.
- McGillin, V. A. (2000). Current issues in advising research. In V. N. Gordon & W. R. Habley (Eds.), *Academic advising: A comprehensive handbook* (pp. 365–80). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Nye, J. L. (1988). *Leader prototypes: Evaluation on schema or performance?* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Communication Association, New Orleans, LA.
- Odland, M. (2002, March). Meeting demands of the customer in the 21st century. *Spectrum*, pp. 18–20. (Available from the National Communication Association, 1765 N Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036)
- Ogletree, S. M. (1999). Improving career advising: Responding to alumni surveys. *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, 2(1), 42–47.
- O'Malley, S. (1998). Student services with a smile. *Community College Journal*, 68(1), 8–12.
- Pascarella, E. (1980). Student-faculty informal contact and college outcomes. *Review of Educational Research*, 50(4), 545–95.
- Petress, K. C. (1996). The multiple roles of an undergraduate's academic advisor. *Education*, 117(1), 91–92.
- Ritzer, G. (1993). *The McDonaldization of society: An investigation into the changing character of contemporary social life*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge.
- Saving, K. A., & Keim, M. C. (1998). Student and advisor perceptions of academic advising in two midwestern colleges of business. *College Student Journal*, 32(4), 511–21.
- Straggas, J., Caso, R., Enterline, M., & Martin, M. (2000). *Advising at MIT Discovery*. Project report presented to the Faculty Senate at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Retrieved January 13, 2006, from <http://web.mit.edu/is/discovery/advising/>
- Taylor, S. E., & Crocker, J. (1981). Schematic bases of social information processing. In E. T. Higgins, C. P. Herman, & M. P. Zanna (Eds.),

- Social cognition: The Ottawa symposium* (Vol. 1). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Timm, P. R. (2002). *50 powerful ideas you can use to keep your customers* (3rd ed.). Franklin Lakes, NJ: Career Press.
- Upcraft, M. L., & Stephens, P. S. (2000). Academic advising and today's changing student. In V. N. Gordon & W. R. Habley (Eds.), *Academic advising: A comprehensive handbook* (pp. 73–83). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Upcraft, M. L., Gardner, J. N., & Barefoot, B. O. (2005). *Challenging and supporting the first-year student*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Winston, R. B., & Sandor, J. A. (1984). Developmental academic advising: What do students want? *NACADA Journal*, 4(1), 5–13.

Wright, R. E. (1996, June). Quality factors in higher education: The students' viewpoint. *College Student Journal*, 30, 269–72.

Authors' Note

Kathleen M. Propp (PhD, University of Iowa) is an associate professor and Director of Undergraduate Studies in the School of Communication at Western Michigan University. Interested readers can reach Dr. Propp at kathy.propp@wmich.edu.

Steven C. Rhodes (PhD, Pennsylvania State University) is the Director of the School of Communication at Western Michigan University. Interested readers can reach Dr. Rhodes at steve.rhodes@wmich.edu.