Getting What They Want: Aligning Student Expectations of Advising with Perceived Advisor Behaviors

Whitney Anderson
Justin S. Motto
Renee Bourdeaux
North Dakota State University

Maintaining effective undergraduate academic advising programs that meet the needs of students is an ongoing challenge for universities across the country. Using expectancy violations theory as a lens, this study argues that student satisfaction with advising is linked to alignment between student expectations of the advising process and perceived advisor behaviors. Advising approaches are classified as either prescriptive, in which the advisor assists students with course selection and other logistical details, or developmental, where the advisor takes a holistic approach in providing advice related to academic, career, and personal goals. Results indicate student satisfaction with advising increased when perceived advisor behaviors aligned with students' prescriptive or developmental expectations. Developmental advising, while favored in previous research, may not be appropriate for all students; instead, advisors should strive to meet students' expectations, whether prescriptive or developmental. Further, results suggest student expectations of advising are not being met at the university under study. Theoretical and practical implications are discussed.

Academic advising has consistently been rated a top predictor of college students' success and satisfaction during their undergraduate careers (Campbell & Nutt, 2008; Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS), 2011; Drake, 2011; Feghalil, Zbib, & Hallal, 2011; Harrison, 2009; Sayles & Shelton, 2005). In a national survey of over 225,000 undergraduates enrolled in 425 U.S. colleges and universities, academic advising was second only to quality of instruction in most important aspects of the college experience (Hale, Graham, & Johnson, 2009). Yet many colleges and universities struggle to develop and maintain effective advising services that promote student satisfaction and increase retention (Freeman, 2008; Hunter & White, 2004; Johnson & Morgan, 2005). This study examined undergraduate academic advising at a mid-sized Midwestern university ("State University" from here forward). At State University, 24% of first-year students and 35% of seniors rate the advising experience as either "fair"

or “poor” as opposed to “good” or “excellent” (National Survey of Student Engagement, 2011).

Multiple factors may influence students’ dissatisfaction with advising; however, current data at State University do not identify the expectations students may have of the advising process. Data identify *outcomes* of the process (e.g., poor ratings), but do not identify the individualized *expectations* students have of advising. Because advisors are unaware of students’ expectations, they may be inadvertently violating expectations, contributing to students’ poor ratings of the advising process. Without knowing the expectations of students, it is difficult for advisors to successfully meet student needs and build quality interactions to promote satisfaction and retention (Lotkowski, Robbins, & Noeth, 2004). Research on academic advising is plentiful and widely varied, addressing faculty members’ perceptions of advising (Allen & Smith, 2008; Harrison, 2009), students’ needs and desires for academic advising (Christian & Sprinkle, 2013; Smith & Allen, 2006), and, most frequently, the ways to improve academic advising (Freeman, 2008; Hunter & White, 2004; Johnson & Morgan, 2005; Sullivan-Vance, 2008). This study extends previous research by examining the expectations students have about advising, along with advisors’ ability to meet these expectations. We argue that the alignment between student expectations of the advising process and perceived advisor behaviors increases student satisfaction with the advising process. Expectancy violations theory (Burgoon, 1993) explains the relational impacts of going against expected or appropriate behaviors. When behaviors displayed by advisors violate what students expect, these violations can damage future interactions (Burgoon, 1993). As a result, it is critical that advisors become more aware of and address student expectations during advising.

This study examined the relationship among perceived advisor behaviors, student expectations, and student satisfaction with advising at State University. Further, this study investigated whether student expectations of advising were being met at State University. We begin with an explanation of expectancy violations theory (EVT), followed by a discussion about the link between advising and student satisfaction. We also summarize data gathered about the advising process at State University to provide context for the problem being addressed.

Expectancy Violations Theory

EVT (Burgoon, 1993) explores how individuals evaluate violations to expected behaviors (White, 2008). EVT has been used in a variety of interpersonal contexts to examine individuals’ reactions after being lied to (Rycyna, Champion,

& Kelly, 2009), relationships with friends (Cohen, 2010), and relationship quality following hurtful events (Bachman & Guerrero, 2006). Additionally, EVT has been used in educational settings to study traditional and nontraditional students' expectations of instructor clarity (Houser, 2006), expectations of nurturing from male and female professors (Meltzer & McNulty, 2011), and instructor nonverbal immediacy (Mottet, Parker-Raley, Cunningham, Beebe, & Raffeld, 2006). Although EVT has not been used as a theoretical framework in studies on the advisor/advisee relationship, advisor expectations of the advising process may differ considerably from students' expectations (Allen & Smith, 2008; Harrison, 2009; Nadler & Nadler, 1999).

People continually form expectancies, consciously and subconsciously; these expectancies are learned and derived from human interaction (Burgoon & Hale, 1988). Violations of these expectancies can be either positive (meeting or exceeding expectations) or negative (failing to meet or exceed expectations). When expectancy violations occur, individuals try to sort out the meaning of the behavior, shifting their focus to the behavior causing the violation (White, 2008). This shift represents a cognitive process, which occurs as individuals attempt to classify violations as positive or negative (White, 2008). In addition to cognitive arousal, violations are associated with physical arousal, as individual heart rates increase when violations occur (Le Poire & Burgoon, 1996).

When individuals navigate both the cognitive and physical response, they attempt to assess the violation. *Violation valence* refers to individuals' evaluation of a violation as positive or negative (Burgoon, 1993; White, 2008). When violations are positively valenced, they lead to more positive and fulfilling interactions; conversely, negatively valenced violations lead to poor interaction outcomes (Burgoon & Hale, 1988). In other words, positive violations exceed expectations, and negative violations decrease the appeal of the violator.

The alignment or misalignment between advisor behaviors and student expectations is closely linked to student satisfaction with advising. Prescriptive and developmental advising models (Crookston, 1972) explain traditional approaches to advising and the expectations students may bring to the advising process. In the prescriptive advising model, advisors have all the power and are primarily responsible for helping students with selecting and scheduling courses. Developmental advising takes a holistic approach to student needs, using advising as a teaching and mentorship tool to help students set and achieve academic and professional benchmarks (Crookston, 1972). When students' expectations are not met, this leads to dissatisfaction with advising (Nadler & Nadler, 1999).

Developmental advising has received consistent commendation from students (Bland, 2003; Campbell & Nutt, 2008; Hale et al., 2009; Tuttle, 2000), yet due to the need for time-intensive advisor training, most institutions do not employ the process (Sullivan-Vance, 2008). Some students may expect to use their advisor as a resource only for course scheduling (Hale et al., 2009) and may feel satisfied when their advisor uses prescriptive advising because it meets their expectations. Other students may wish to build a relationship with their advisor and use their advisor as a resource for academic, career, and personal matters (Bland, 2003), thus expecting a developmental approach. In both scenarios, student satisfaction with advising is ultimately based on the expectations they have of the advising process and whether advisor behaviors meet these expectations. At State University, the majority of students receive advising from either a faculty member or a staff member trained in advising. Due to a non-standardized approach, students may experience either prescriptive or developmental advising based on the advisor's background, training, and goals.

Although students may experience negatively valenced expectancy violations if their advisor enacts behaviors that disconfirm their prescriptive or developmental expectations, they may also experience positively valenced violations if their advisor exceeds their expectations. The original formulation of EVT focused solely on nonverbal behaviors and negatively valenced violations (Burgoon, 1978). As the theory has evolved, it has expanded its scope to include verbal violations that are positively valenced (Burgoon, 1993). The present study is interested in the interaction between expectations and behavior. Previous research has demonstrated beneficial aspects of both prescriptive and developmental advising (Hale et al., 2009), and negative consequences when student expectations and perceived advisor behaviors do not align (Nadler & Nadler, 1999). Therefore, whether student expectations are prescriptive or developmental, their satisfaction ultimately hinges on whether these expectations are met through perceived advisor behaviors. At State University, the interaction between perceived advisor behaviors (both prescriptive and developmental) and student expectations is unknown. Thus, the following hypotheses are posed:

> H_1: The interaction between perceived advisor prescriptive behaviors and student prescriptive expectations will be positively correlated to student satisfaction with academic advising at State University.
>
> H_2: The interaction between perceived advisor developmental behaviors and student developmental expectations will be positively correlated to student satisfaction with academic advising at State University.

Understanding Students Expectations of Advising at State University

The hypotheses test EVT in relation to student satisfaction with the advising process at State University. In addition, this study seeks to understand if student expectations of advising are being met at State University. State University is a land-grant institution in the upper Midwest with a student population of nearly 14,000. Improving student satisfaction with the advising process has emerged as an institutional goal. The advising process at State University varies across campus, with the majority of the university's eight colleges relying on faculty members to oversee undergraduate advising for students at all stages of their academic careers. Students are not required to meet with their advisors before signing up for courses each semester.

Advising dissatisfaction is evident in the data collected by State University, but the root of the problem is unknown. According to the 2011 National Survey of Student Engagement for State University, only 26% of first-year students and 23% of seniors rate the quality of academic advising as "excellent," with 50% of first-year students and 42% of seniors rating the quality of advising as "good." Additionally, ratings of advising as "poor" increased from 8% to 14% in random samples of first-year students and seniors, respectively.

These data indicate a decline in positive responses and a marked increase in negative responses as students approach graduation, but little data are available about advisor behaviors that may contribute to this trend. A 2005 focus group with students at the university broadly addressed negative advising experiences, indicating students were dissatisfied with three primary aspects of their interaction with their academic advisor: not having enough time to visit, not receiving proper direction, and not experiencing effective communication. These issues could also account for the link between advising and retention: 19.7% of first-year students and 21.9% of sophomores indicated academic advising as the primary reason for not returning to the university (2003-2009 ACT Nonreturning Student Survey). However, data from the 2005 focus group lack specificity and do not provide a detailed account of students' expectations of their advisors. This lack of information prevents advisors from changing behaviors or integrating new tactics to address the diverse needs of students. To discover whether student expectations of the advising process are being met, the following research question is posed:

> RQ: Do student expectations of the advising process correlate with perceptions of advisor behaviors at State University?

Method

Design

This study investigated student expectations and perceived advisor behaviors in relation to satisfaction with academic advising. Additionally, this research explored whether a correlation exists between student expectations and perceived advisor behaviors. Survey methodology was utilized in a cross-sectional quantitative study.

Participants

Researchers obtained permission to recruit students from the Colleges of Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences (AHSS) and Science and Mathematics (SM) within State University. Because dissatisfaction with academic advising exists campus-wide, exploring advising within two of the university's eight colleges provides a starting point to better understand trends that may impact the larger institutional problem. In both AHSS and SM, dissatisfaction in advising increases as students approach graduation, similar to campus-wide trends.

Utilizing a convenience sample (Levin, Fox, & Forde, 2010), participants in AHSS and SM were recruited through solicitation emails sent to a total of 2,777 undergraduate students from both colleges. A total of 157 participants with varying degree programs, cultural backgrounds, years in school, and biological sex participated in an online survey. Information regarding advising was collected using a questionnaire that inquired about the manner in which participants received advising (e.g., from a faculty member, from the campus advising center, etc.), length of time for an advising session, number of advising sessions the participants had received during the current academic year, and academic major. Three participants were removed because they received advising outside the colleges under investigation. An additional nine participants were removed because they were advised by university-wide advising resources not provided by the colleges studied (e.g., the campus advising center). Finally, 30 participants were removed due to incomplete data sets. The removal of 42 participants resulted in 115 total participants (N = 115).

Participant demographics. Of the 115 participants, 75 were female, 36 were male, and four declined to respond. The age of the participants ranged from 18 to 64 years old (M = 24.81, SD = 7.948). Ninety-six participants were white/Caucasian, 2 participants were African American/Black, 2 were Latino/a, 1 was Asian American or Pacific Islander, 1 was biracial/multiracial, and

10 declined to respond. Please refer to Table 1 for a summary of participant demographics in comparison to State University's general student population.

Table 1

Participant Demographics

	University (*N*=13,533)	Study Reponses (*N*=115)
Gender		
Male	7, 467	36
Female	6,066	75
No Response	0	4
Race		
Non-residential Alien	1,274	NA
Black/African American	240	2
American Indian	119	NA
Asian/Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	190	1
Hispanic	116	2
White	10,848	96
2 or more races	85	1
No Response	661	10

Note: Items marked NA were not included in the survey

Measures

Perceived advisor behaviors enacted in advisor/advisee meetings. The statements included in this measure were adapted from the Academic Advising Inventory (AAI; Winston & Sandor, 2002). Participants' perceptions of advisor behaviors were measured with fourteen 7-point Likert-type statements, ranging from *strongly disagree* (1) to *strongly agree* (7). Seven of these statements described prescriptive behaviors enacted by the participant's advisor, while the other seven described developmental behaviors. For example, a prescriptive statement from the measure read, "My advisor tells me what would be the best schedule for me," and a developmental statement read, "My advisor talks with me about my interests and plans outside of academics." Testing of the measures showed acceptable reliabilities on the subscales. The prescriptive subscale resulted in a reliability of α = .87 (M = 3.33, SD = 1.35), and the developmental subscale resulted in α = .93 (M = 3.76, SD = 1.67).

Expectations of students. Expectations were measured with fourteen 7-point Likert-type statements which featured the same language as the statements in the measure for behaviors. For example, the statement that read, "My advisor tells me what would be the best schedule for me" in the measure about behaviors read, "I expect my advisor to tell me what would be the best schedule for me" in the measure for expectations. Statements measuring expectations were placed in a different order than those in the measure for behaviors and were separated by an open-ended question about students' positive or negative advising experience at the university. The subscales showed acceptable reliabilities. The prescriptive subscale resulted in $\alpha = .74$ ($M = 4.95$, $SD = 1.03$), and the developmental subscale resulted in $\alpha = .77$ ($M = 4.18$, $SD = 0.96$).

Satisfaction with advising. The statements included in this measure were adapted from a similar measure on educational experience satisfaction by Corts, Lounsbury, Saudargas, and Tatum (2000). Student satisfaction with advising was measured by four 7-point Likert-type statements ranging from *strongly dissatisfied* (1) to *strongly satisfied* (7). The advising scale resulted in $\alpha = .80$ ($M = 4.52$, $SD = 1.38$). Please see the Appendix for a copy of the measures. As data collection efforts were part of a larger study, not all results within the satisfaction measure are reported.

Procedure

Before beginning data collection, researchers first gained approval from the university's Institutional Review Board (HS13164). Researchers contacted the deans from the two colleges under investigation to request access to the email listserv for all students with a declared major within AHSS and SM. The recruitment email described the purpose of the study and provided a link to the survey for students who chose to participate. It took participants approximately 20-25 minutes to complete the measures.

Results

Behaviors and Expectations

The two hypotheses explored the relationships among perceived behaviors, expectations, and satisfaction; specifically, hypothesis one posited that the interaction between perceived advisor prescriptive behaviors and student prescriptive expectations was positively correlated to student satisfaction with academic advising, while hypothesis two posited that the interaction between perceived advisor developmental behaviors and student developmental

expectations was positively correlated to student satisfaction with academic advising. The results of the analyses are reported in the following.

Prescriptive. To test the relationship among perceived advisor prescriptive behaviors, student prescriptive expectations, and student satisfaction with academic advising, a difference score was created. The difference score was the difference between perceived advisor prescriptive behaviors and student prescriptive expectations (i.e., behaviors minus expectations). A Pearson's correlation analysis was performed with the prescriptive difference score and student satisfaction with academic advising. A Pearson's correlation analysis was performed because it measures the strength of linear dependence between two variables; *r* values close to zero indicate a weak or non-existent relationship, while higher values indicate stronger relationships between the variables. The results indicate there was a positive correlation between the prescriptive difference score and student satisfaction with academic advising, $r(115) = .598$, $p < .01$. These results indicate that as prescriptive expectations are met and even exceeded by perceived prescriptive advisor behaviors, student satisfaction with academic advising increases. Hypothesis one was supported.

Developmental. The relationship among perceived advisor developmental behaviors, student developmental expectations, and student satisfaction with academic advising required a second difference score. The difference score was the difference between perceived advisor developmental behaviors and student developmental expectations (i.e., behaviors minus expectations). A Pearson's correlation analysis revealed support for the second hypothesis predicting the positive relationship between the developmental difference score and student satisfaction with academic advising. The results indicate there was a positive correlation between the developmental difference score and student satisfaction with academic advising, $r(115) = .618$, $p < .01$. These results suggest that as developmental expectations are met by perceived developmental behaviors in advisors, student satisfaction with academic advising increases.

Student Expectations and Perceived Advisor Behaviors

The research question asked if student expectations of the advising process correlated with perceived advisor behaviors. The results indicate there is no correlation between prescriptive expectations and behaviors, $r(115) = .03$, $p = .69$. The results also indicate that there is no relationship between developmental expectations and behaviors, $r(115) = .01$, $p = .95$. The data suggest that expectations are not related to perceptions of behaviors, and the lack of correlation between both prescriptive and developmental expectations and

behaviors indicates advisors are not perceived as meeting student expectations. Not all correlations were reported; to see all correlations, please refer to Table 2.

Table 2

Correlation Matrix

	Developmental Behaviors	Prescriptive Behaviors	Developmental Expectations	Prescriptive Expectations
Developmental Behaviors	--	.745**	.006	-.266**
Prescriptive Behaviors	.745**	--	.000	.037
Developmental Expectations	.006	.000	--	.591**
Prescriptive Expectations	-.266**	.037	.591**	--

*** Shows correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed).*

Discussion

Strong academic advising programs are the hallmark of student retention and satisfaction (CAS, 2011; Drake, 2011; Hale et al., 2009; Winston & Sandor, 2002), but State University and universities around the country often struggle to build and sustain effective undergraduate student advising. Lack of alignment between student expectations of advising and perceived behaviors enacted by advisors is one explanation for student dissatisfaction with advising (Nadler & Nadler, 1999). This study investigated the interaction among student expectations, perceptions of advisor behavior, and satisfaction with the advising process. Importantly, results indicated universities should carefully tailor advising to meet student needs rather than defaulting to a developmental approach. While research has heavily supported developmental advising (Bland, 2003; Campbell & Nutt, 2008; Hale et al., 2009; Tuttle, 2000), the results of this study indicate meeting student expectations, whether developmental or prescriptive, contributes to student satisfaction. The findings offer both practical and theoretical contributions by providing steps for universities desiring to improve their advising programs and by extending previous research on EVT.

Student Expectations, Advisor Behaviors, and Student Satisfaction

When an advisor's approach aligned with student expectations, whether prescriptive or developmental, student satisfaction with advisement increased. Meeting student expectations is key in achieving satisfaction with the advising process. Although previous research on prescriptive and developmental advising styles has discussed the benefits of both approaches, developmental advising has been lauded as the best approach for universities striving for a student-centered advising system that empowers students (Bland, 2003; Campbell & Nutt, 2008; Nadler & Nadler, 1999; Tuttle, 2000). Developmental advisors link students to extracurricular opportunities within the university, inform them of internships and job opportunities off-campus, assist students in planning their coursework, and provide insight on personal issues (Bland, 2003; Freeman, 2008). All these benefits cultivate a connection between students and the university (Bland, 2003), and foster student satisfaction with advising (Hale et al., 2009).

While developmental advising yields a wide variety of benefits for universities, privileging the developmental approach overlooks the diverse needs of today's students. The results of this study indicate that students who receive prescriptive advising can also experience satisfaction with the advising process, as long as they maintain prescriptive expectations for their advisor. The benefits of prescriptive advising have been largely ignored, even though a prescriptive advisor can provide great benefit to students by ensuring timely graduation through proper course selection (Hale et al., 2009). Some students may perceive their advisors solely as a resource for providing advice on courses, equating an advisor with a high school guidance counselor (Smith, 2002), and are most likely to seek out their advisor for logistical questions (Broadbridge, 1996). Ultimately, some students may desire a prescriptive approach because it alleviates anxiety about missing deadlines or making poor choices about classes that could affect the trajectory of their college career (Smith, 2002).

A valuable contribution from this study is the importance of alignment between student expectations of advising and perceived advisor behaviors. It is not productive to view developmental advising as the only approach to achieving a successful advising program; instead, universities should be more concerned with the interaction between expectations and behaviors. Advisors should be equipped to provide either developmental or prescriptive advising based on student needs. The lack of a standardized advising approach adds complexity to the responsibility of advisors, but also reflects the type of students currently populating college campuses. Millennials, or those students born between 1980 and 2000, are both confident and sheltered, as well as entitled and high achieving

(Howe & Strauss, 2003). Further, they may expect role models and leaders to help them make decisions in their lives, while still desiring personal challenge and independence (Jonas-Dwyer & Pospisil, 2004). These opposing and complex characteristics of millennials result in changing expectations of the advising process and the higher education experience as a whole (Mangold, 2007). It means some millennials could enter college expecting an advisor to take control by assisting in course selection and scheduling (i.e., a prescriptive approach), as this tangibly helps students achieve their goals. Millennials are also accustomed to being very busy, so they may prefer a fast and efficient advisor meeting that solely focuses on course logistics. Conversely, other millennials may expect a fulfilling relationship with their advisor that goes far beyond course scheduling (i.e., a developmental approach), expecting advisors to be accessible, encouraging, and personally invested in students' success.

Although this study found that students were more satisfied with the advising process when their expectations were met, results also revealed that at State University, advisors are *not* perceived as meeting expectations. This again reinforces the finding that advisors must build on students' expectations to effectively serve them, as the hypotheses indicated a strong relationship between expectations and satisfaction. Advisors may overestimate the positive impact of their advising (Nadler & Nadler, 1999; Saving & Keim, 1998), so understanding student expectations is essential to achieving a stronger and more effective advising program.

Practical Implications

On a practical level, communication is important for successful advisor/student relationships. Advisors should consider discussing expectations of the advising process with their students early in the advisor/student relationship. This discussion could be enhanced by providing students with an assessment much like the one used in this study (Winston & Sandor, 2002). After students complete the Academic Advising Inventory, advisors have the choice to either adapt their advising style to fit the needs of the student or transfer the student to a different, more compatible advisor. Additionally, if student expectations of the advising process appear unreasonable, the student can be educated about the true purpose of advising to temper these expectations.

Another micro-level change exists in training academic advisors on the importance of not only understanding the expectations of their students, but on how these expectations may evolve as the relationship between the advisor and student develops. Bland (2003) notes that advisor training is a key factor for

achieving effective academic advising. Advisors need to be able to ascertain the evolving behavioral expectations of their students, because as the advising relationship matures, expectations may change. If the advisor does not adapt to the changing expectations of students, this may cause students to negatively evaluate the advising process. Advising, if administered effectively, provides institutions with a powerful educational tool to connect students with opportunities to engage and further their learning outcomes (Campbell & Nutt, 2008). If students negatively evaluate advising, they may discontinue using their advisors, which is detrimental to their learning outcomes. Additionally, if students simply stop seeking advisement and do not tell anyone that their expectations were not met, universities will have no way of knowing that changes need to be made to their advising process to better meet the needs of students.

An ongoing professional development effort to train advisors ensures advisors continually meet student expectations even when students switch majors or advisors throughout their academic career. The majority of students at State University receive their academic advising from a faculty member, even before they have declared their majors. Students develop a relationship with their first advisor, and consequently develop behavioral expectations for the advising relationship. After declaring a major, State University students typically would then be assigned an advisor in the department of their area of concentration. If the first advisor and the new advisor shared information about student expectations, this would allow advisors to spend less time learning about advisee expectations and more time providing credible advice to students regarding their major departmental academic requirements. This suggestion could help reverse trends of advising dissatisfaction at State University and other institutions using the same model.

Theoretical Implications

In addition to having practical application for undergraduate academic advising programs, this research also extends EVT. EVT has not been previously applied to an academic advising context. The findings of this study demonstrate that students' perceptions of how much advisor behaviors meet their expectations have an impact on satisfaction with the advising experience. The link between expectancy violations and satisfaction is a new relationship that has not previously been studied. Negatively valenced violations have been found to harm future interactions (Burgoon & Hale, 1988); however, the relationship among perceived behaviors, violations of expectations on a dyadic level, and satisfaction with the advising experience is novel.

Further, this study illuminates the importance of behavioral perceptions of the advisor by the student, demonstrating that behaviors enacted by the advisor may impact whether students utilize and are satisfied with advising services at universities. The results further confirm EVT by indicating the importance of students' perceptions, as violations are based on perception. Based on the results, if an advisor continually enacts behaviors contrary to what the student expects, satisfaction with advising will continually receive poor ratings. However, if an advisor enacts an expected behavior, either prescriptive or developmental, and it meets the expectations of the student, the student will perceive the interaction as a positive violation leading to satisfaction. The results illustrate that advisors need to meet or exceed student expectations to cultivate satisfied students. Therefore, universities must work to establish a clear system for evaluating individual student expectations to achieve satisfaction with their advising services. Undergraduate student advising represents an extension of EVT and a call for more research investigating the link between expectancy violations and overall advising satisfaction.

Limitations and Directions for Future Research

While this research provides important contributions to universities desiring to improve their academic advising programs, it is not without limitations. For example, the sex and course standing distribution among participants was uneven. More than twice as many females participated in comparison to males, and the majority of the sample consisted of third- and fourth-year students. Upperclass students have had an opportunity to cultivate a relationship with their advisor, and therefore have a different perspective than underclass students.

Future research should broaden the scope of the present study by including a greater number of colleges within State University or studying trends across multiple universities. This study included only two colleges at a single university, limiting the generalizability of the findings. A fruitful next step to this study is the examination of faculty perceptions of the advising process. This study solely measured student participants' perceptions of academic advisors' behaviors. With data from both advisees and advisors, congruence and incongruence between the expectations and behaviors of both parties could be studied. One final direction for future research would be to explore the types of advisor behaviors students from various generational groups prefer.

Creating a successful and sustainable undergraduate academic advising program takes a great deal of hard work, dedication, and maintenance, but a strong program will pay dividends in satisfied and loyal students (Campbell & Nutt,

2008). This research underscores the importance of understanding students' expectations of the advising process and of taking steps to align these expectations with advisor behaviors. As colleges and universities continue to strive for the "right equation" of services that yield student satisfaction and retention, improving academic advising should be a key goal.

Author Notes

Whitney Anderson is a Ph.D. student in the Department of Communications at North Dakota State University.

Justin S. Motto is a Ph.D. student in the Department of Communications at North Dakota State University.

Renee Bourdeaux is a Ph.D. student in the Department of Communications at North Dakota State University.

Acknowledgements: The authors wish to thank Drs. Amy O'Connor and Ann Burnett for their invaluable support and guidance over the course of this research project. Additionally, the authors thank Dr. Nan Yu for her assistance in data analysis.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Whitney Anderson at whitney.a.anderson@my.ndsu.edu

References

2003-2009 ACT Nonreturning Student Survey. Data collected from [university name removed to protect anonymity].

Allen, J. M., & Smith, C. L. (2008). Faculty and student perspectives on advising: Implications for student dissatisfaction. *Journal of College Student Development, 49*, 609-624. doi: 10.1353/csd.0.0042

Bachman, G., & Guerrero, L. K. (2006). Relational quality and communicative responses following hurtful events in dating relationships: An expectancy violations analysis. *Journal of Social & Personal Relationships, 23*, 943-963. doi:10.1177/0265407506070476

Bland, S. (2003). Advising adults: Telling or coaching? *Adult Learning, 14*, 6-9.

Broadbridge, A. (1996). Academic advising—traditional or developmental approaches? Student perspectives. *British Journal of Guidance & Counseling*, *24*, 97–112. doi: 10.1080/03069889600760091

Burgoon, J. K. (1978). A communication model of personal space violation: Explication and an initial test. *Human Communication Research, 4*, 129-142. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2958.1978.tb00603.x

Burgoon, J. K. (1993). Interpersonal expectations, expectancy violations, and emotional communication. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 12*, 30-48. doi: 10.1177/0261927X93121003

Burgoon, J. K., & Hale, J. L. (1988). Nonverbal expectancy violations: Model elaboration and application to immediacy behaviors. *Communication Monographs, 55,* 58-79. doi: 10.1080/03637758809376158

Campbell, S. M., & Nutt, C. L. (2008). Academic advising in the new global century: Supporting student engagement and learning outcomes achievement. *AAC&U Peer Review,*10(1), 4-7.

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

Cohen, E. L. (2010). Expectancy violations in relationships with friends and media figures. *Communication Research Reports, 27*, 97-111. doi:10.1080/08824091003737836

Corts, D. P., Lounsbury, J. W., Saudargas, J. W., & Tatum, R. A. (2000). Assessing undergraduate satisfaction with an academic department: A method and case study. *College Student Journal, 34*, 399-408.

Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS). (2011). The role of academic advising programs. Retrieved August 20, 2013 from http://www.cas.edu/ getpdf.cfm?PDF=E864D2C4-D655-8F74-2E647CDECD29B7D0

Crookston, B. B. (1972). A developmental view of academic advising as teaching. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 13,* 12-17. doi: 10.12930/0271-9517-29.1.78

Drake, J. K. (2011). The role of academic advising in student retention and persistence. *About Campus, 16,* 8-12. doi:10.1002/abc.20062

Feghalil, T., Zbib, I., & Hallal, S. (2011). A web-based decision support tool for academic advising. *Educational Technology & Society, 14*, 82-94.

Freeman, L. C. (2008). Establishing effective advising practices to influence student learning and success. *Peer Review, 10,* 12-14.

Hale, M. D., Graham, D. L., & Johnson, D. M. (2009). Are students more satisfied with academic advising when there is congruence between current and preferred advising styles? *College Student Journal, 43*, 313-324.

Harrison, E. (2009). Faculty perceptions of academic advising: "I don't get no respect." *Nursing Education Research, 30*, 229-233.

Houser, M. L. (2006). Expectancy violations of instructor communication as predictors of motivation and learning: A comparison of traditional and nontraditional students. *Communication Quarterly, 54,* 331-349. doi: 10.1080/01463370600878248

Howe, N., & Strauss, W. (2003). *Millennials go to college.* Washington, D.C.: American Association of Collegiate Registrars.

Hunter, M. S., & White, E. R. (2004). Could fixing academic advising fix higher education? *About Campus, 9*, 20-25.

Johnson, E. L., & Morgan, B. L. (2005). Advice on advising: Improving a comprehensive university's program. *Teaching of Psychology, 32*, 15-18. doi: 10.1207/s15328023top3201_3

Jonas-Dwyer, D., & Pospisil, R. (2004). The millennial effect: Implications for academic development. *Proceedings of the 2004 annual international conference of the Higher Education Research and Development Society of Australasia (HERDSA),* Sarawak, Malaysia. Retrieved August 28, 2013, from http://www.herdsa.org.au/conference2004/ Contributions/ RPapers/P050-jt.pdf

Le Poire, B. A., & Burgoon, J. K. (1996). Usefulness of differentiating arousal responses within communication theories: Orienting response. *Communication Monographs, 63*, 208-230. doi: 10.1080/03637759609376390

Levin, J., Fox, J. A., & Forde, D. R. (2010). *Elementary statistics in social research.* Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Lotkowski, V. A., Robbins, S. B., & Noeth, R. J. (2004). The role of academic and nonacademic factors in improving college retention. Retrieved from *www.act.org/research/policymakers/pdf/college_retention.pdf*

Mangold, K. (2007). Educating a new generation: Teaching baby boomer faculty about millennial students. *Nurse Educator, 32,* 21-23. doi: 10.1097/00006223-200701000-00007

Meltzer, A. L., & McNulty, J. K. (2011). Contrast effects of stereotypes: "Nurturing" male professors are evaluated more positively than "nurturing" female professors. *Journal of Men's Studies, 19,* 57-64. doi: 10.3149/jms.1901.57

Mottet, T. P., Parker-Raley, J., Cunningham, C., Beebe, S. A., & Raffeld, P. C. (2006). Testing the neutralizing effect of instructor immediacy on student course workload expectancy violations and tolerance for instructor unavailability. *Communication Education, 55,* 147-166. doi:10.1080/03634520600565886

Nadler, L. B., & Nadler, M. (1999). Faculty and student expectations/perceptions of the adviser-advisee relationship. *Journal of the Association for Communication Administration, 28,* 47-59.

National Survey on Student Engagement (2011). Data collected from [university name removed to protect anonymity].

Rycyna, C. C., Champion, C. D., & Kelly, A. E. (2009). First impressions after various types of deception: Less favorable following expectancy violation. *Basic & Applied Social Psychology, 31,* 40-48. doi:10.1080/01973530802659851

Saving, K., & Keim, M. C. (1998). Student and advisor perceptions of academic advising in two Midwestern colleges of business. *College Student Journal, 32*, 511–21.

Sayles, S., & Shelton, D. (2005). Student success strategies. *The Association of Black Nursing Faculty Journal*, *16*(5), 98-101.

Smith, J. S. (2002). First-year student perceptions of academic advisement: A qualitative study and reality check. *NACADA Journal, 22*, 39-49. doi: 10.12930/0271-9517-22.2.39

Smith, C. L., & Allen, J. M. (2006). Essential functions of academic advising: What students want and get. *NACADA Journal, 26*, 56. doi: 10.12930/0271-9517-26.1.5

Sullivan-Vance, K. (2008). Reenvisioning and revitalizing academic advising at Western Oregon University. *AAC&U Peer Review*, *10*(1), 15-17.

Tuttle, K. N. (2000). Academic advising. *New Directions for Higher Education, 111*, 15-24. doi: 10.1002/he.11102

White, C. H. (2008). Expectancy violations theory and interaction adaptation theory. In L.A. Baxter & D.O. Braithwaite (Ed.), *Engaging theories in interpersonal communication: Multiple perspectives* (pp. 189-202). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Winston, R. B., & Sandor, J. A. (2002). Evaluating academic advising: Manual for the academic advising inventory. Retrieved from *www.nacada.ksu.edu/clearinghouse/links/AAI-Inventory-Master.pdf*

Appendix: Measures

Prescriptive/Developmental Actions Assessment Scale

Instructions: When answering the following questions, please think about the advisor with whom you regularly interact. Please rate the following statements based on your experience with that advisor.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree			Neutral			Strongly Agree

1. My advisor directs me to appropriate on-campus courses and programs. (P)
2. My advisor tells me what would be the best schedule for me. (P)
3. My advisor and I talk about extracurricular opportunities in conjunction with advising. (D)
4. My advisor shows an interest in my activities outside of class. (D)
5. My advisor and I collaborate in identifying realistic academic goals based on what I know about myself, as well as about my test scores and grades. (D)
6. My advisor registers me for my classes. (P)
7. When I'm faced with difficult decisions my advisor tells me my alternatives and we work together to decide which one is the best choice. (D)
8. My advisor helps connect me to campus resources when I have problems in and out of the classroom. (D)
9. My advisor gives me tips on managing my time better and on studying more effectively when I need them. (D)
10. My advisor tells me exactly what to prepare/bring for each advising session.(P)
11. My advisor suggests what major and/or minor I should pursue. (P)
12. My advisor uses test scores and grades to let him/her know what courses are most appropriate for me to take. (P)
13. My advisor talks with me about my interests and plans outside of academics.(D)
14. My advisor keeps me informed of my academic progress by examining my files and grades. (P)

(P) Prescriptive subscale; (D) Developmental subscale

Student Expectations of Academic Advisors

Instructions: Think about the following statements; rate the statements according to the following scale.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree			Neutral			Strongly Agree

1. I do not expect my advisor to show an interest in my activities outside of class.(D) *
2. I expect my advisor and me to talk about extracurricular opportunities in conjunction with advising. (D)
3. I expect my advisor to assist me in identifying realistic academic goals based on what I know about myself, as well as about my test scores and grades. (D)
4. I expect my advisor to direct me to appropriate on-campus courses and programs. (P)
5. I do not expect my advisor to tell me exactly what to prepare/bring for each advising session. (P) *
6. I expect my advisor to give me tips on managing my time better and on studying more effectively when I need them. (D)
7. I expect my advisor to help connect me to campus resources when I have problems in and out of the classroom. (D)
8. I expect my advisor to keep me informed of my academic progress by examining my files and grades only. (P)
9. I expect my advisor to register me for my classes. (P)
10. I expect my advisor to suggest what major and/or minor I should pursue. (P)
11. I expect my advisor to talk with me about my interests and plans outside of academics. (D)
12. 12. I expect my advisor to tell me what would be the best schedule for me. (P)
13. I expect my advisor to use test scores and grades to let him/her know what courses are most appropriate for me to take. (P)
14. When I'm faced with difficult decisions I expect my advisor to tell me my alternatives and we work together to decide which one is the best choice. (D)

* Denotes a reverse coded item; (P) Prescriptive subscale; (D) Developmental subscale

Student Satisfaction of Educational Experience

Instructions: Please think about the following statements; rate your satisfaction with the statements according to the following scale.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Dissatisfied			Neutral			Strongly Satisfied

1. The availability of courses for completing my major. (C)
2. The class size of required courses for my major. (S)
3. The availability of elective courses required for my major. (C)
4. The general quality of faculty instruction for required courses in my major. (I)
5. Faculty's knowledge about requirements to graduate. (A)
6. The overall class size of courses in my major. (S)
7. The general quality of faculty instruction for elective courses in my major. (I)
8. The quality of faculty advising about selecting courses. (A)
9. The quality of instruction that meets my educational needs. (I)
10. The availability of courses that help me prepare for future employment. (C)
11. Faculty's interest in my success as a student. (A)
12. The class size of electives for my major. (S)
13. The student to instructor ratio in the classroom. (S)
14. The availability of courses that help me prepare for graduate school. (C)
15. The quality of instruction in relation to course expectations. (I)
16. The availability of faculty for advising. (A)

(C) Course availability subscale
(I) Course instruction subscale
(S) Class size subscale
(A) Faculty advising subscale