Improving First-Year Students' Academic Self-Efficacy, Hope, Integration, and Performance: The Effects of an Academic Advising Intervention

Michele J. Hansen, Ph.D., Director of Assessment, University College
Cathy A. Buyarski, Ph.D., Assistant Dean and Director of Advising, University College

Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis

Abstract

This paper describes the effects of an academic advising intervention on students' academic hope, academic self-efficacy, campus social integration, and academic performance at a large, urban public university. Results suggest that advising had positive effects on students' perceptions of academic hope; academic self-efficacy in the domains of goal setting and career decision making; and campus social integration levels. Findings also indicated that students' levels of academic hope, time management self-efficacy, and degree completion self-efficacy predicted overall first-semester grade point averages even after controlling for academic preparation, student background variables, and pre-levels of efficacy and hope. Implications for advising practices are discussed.

INTRODUCTION

Many students attending urban institutions possess characteristics that place them at a greater risk for academic failure and attrition: not completing a rigorous high school college-preparatory curriculum, being first generation college students, attending classes part-time, living off campus, and significant off-campus work commitments. These students are often juggling work and family responsibilities along with school and may need support in terms of achieving their academic goals. Academic advising often provides students with the informational, personal, and academic support necessary for them to attain academic success.

The importance of advising as a factor in student academic success is recognized by students, faculty, and administrators. The quality of advising has been reported as an important component in students' successful transitions to college life (Steele and McDonald, 2000), academic and social integration (Fox, Zakely, Morris, and Jundt, 1993), adjustment and need satisfaction during the first year (Kramer and Spencer, 1989), decision-making processes in selecting the appropriate academic programs and careers (Creamer, 2000; McCalla-Wiggins, 2000), achievement of maximum potential (O'Banion, 1972), and academic success and retention (Gordon & Habley, 2000; Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991). Despite the widespread recognition of the importance of advising, there are relatively few comprehensive investigations of its effectiveness in the published literature (Banta, Hansen, Black & Jackson, 2003). Additionally, most of the studies focus on satisfaction with advising rather than assessment of student learning outcomes and academic success indicators. Cuseo (2004) asserts that:

> Evaluating the effectiveness of academic advisors and advisement programs sends a
> strong and explicit message to all members of the college community that advising
> is an important professional responsibility; conversely, failure to do so
> tacitly communicates the message that this student service is not highly valued
> by the institution (p.1).

Current Study

      This study focused on the effects of a specific, intrusive, academic advising intervention that took place as part of first-year seminar courses for first-year students. In particular, we were interested in how academic advising influenced levels of academic self-efficacy, hope, and campus social integration. Past research has suggested that *academic* self-efficacy beliefs or beliefs related to very specific academic behavior domains have stronger effects on academic outcomes compared to more generalized measures (Zajacova, Lynch and Espenshade, 2005; Lackaye, Margalik, Ziv, and Ziman, 2006). Thus, self-efficacy beliefs in the specific domains related to the goals of academic advising including time-management, degree completion, career decision making, and goal setting were explored.

      Self-efficacy refers to students' evaluation of their competence to successfully execute academic tasks necessary to reach desired outcomes (Zajacova, Lynch and Espenshade, 2005). According to Bandura (1997), a strong sense of efficacy enhances human accomplishment and personal well-being in many ways. Individuals with high confidence in their capabilities approach difficult tasks as challenges to be mastered rather than threats to be avoided. An optimistic sense of self-efficacy can enable individuals to preserve when faced with set-backs, frustrations, and inequities. Additionally, optimistic efficacy beliefs can affect the level of effort that one is willing to exert when challenges are faced (Bandura, 1994). Bandura suggests that persons' self-efficacy beliefs can be developed from four major sources: mastery experiences, vicarious experiences provided by social models, social persuasion, and relying on somatic or emotional states. Academic advising may be a mechanism in which students receive the support and verbal persuasion required to persist when faced with obstacles. Moreover, advising may also provide students with the opportunities to learn from social models and enact positive academic behavior necessary for academic success. Zajacova, Lynch and Espenshade (2005)

4

found that academic self-efficacy beliefs had a strong positive effect on grades and number of credit hours completed for freshmen immigrant, minority students.

Another area of interest was how advising influenced students' levels of academic hope. Hope is defined as "the process of thinking about one's goals, along with the motivation to move toward those goals (agency), and the ways to achieve those goals (pathways)" (Snyder, 1995, p. 355). Snyder, Shorey, Cheavens, Pulvers, Adams, and Wiklund (2002), found that hope scale scores of incoming freshmen predicted overall grade point averages even while controlling for scores on entrance examinations. Due to the fact that one of the major goals of academic advising is to facilitate the achievement of students' personal academic goals and help them achieve success even in the face of substantial obstacles (e.g., work and family commitments, academic under-preparation, inability to get into competitive degree-granting schools such as nursing and business), it seemed appropriate to add a measure of academic hope.

It is noteworthy that in some cases hope has been treated as a dispositional or stabile construct (Snyder, Shorley, Cheavens, Pulvers, Adams, and Wiklund, 2002). However, Synder and colleagues also posit that teachers may have a role in affecting students' hope as "they encourage students in the pursuit of classroom goals (p. 824)." It is possible that advisors play an important role in positively impacting the hope levels of the students they advise. This study investigated students' hope levels over one semester.

According to Fox, Zakely, Morris, and Jundt (1993) "central to successful academic integration is successful advising: time and appropriate information to make informed choices about courses and major selection, as well as competent staff assistance" (p.50). These authors also contend that interventions such as academic advising may help students cope with the social and personal changes they experience as they transition to college life. Academic integration is defined as the development of a strong affiliation with the college academic environment both in the classroom and outside of class and it often involves interactions with faculty, academic staff,

and peers in an academic nature (Nora, 1993). On the other hand, social integration involves the development of a strong affiliation with the college social environment both in the classroom and outside of class. It involves interactions with faculty, academic staff, and peers in a social nature.

The focus of this study was to assess the impacts of advising on students' academic hope, efficacy levels, campus social integration, and academic performance levels. The following research questions guided this study:

1. Did students' self-efficacy levels in the domains of goal setting, time-management, timely degree completion, and career decision making improve by participating in an advising intervention?

2. Did students' levels of academic hope improve by participating?

3. Did students' perceptions of campus integration improve by participating?

4. Do academic hope, self-efficacy levels, and campus integration significantly predict levels of academic performance?

METHOD

Research Setting and Design

The research took place at a large public, urban institution of higher education facing challenges in supporting retention and the collegiate success of first-year students. The academic advising intervention was a component of first-year seminar courses. Advisors were integral members of seminar instructional teams and interacted with students with the following major goals in mind: 1) students will accept responsibility for their college success, set goals, and commit to an academic plan/major, 2) students will apply academic success strategies (e.g., demonstrate knowledge of time management strategies and know effective strategies for studying), 3) students will know how to cope, adjust to college life, and continue to pursue goals

despite obstacles, and 4) students will be familiar with appropriate campus services and become more integrated and engaged at the university.

Specifically, academic advisors were active members of a four person instructional team for each section of the first-year seminar. Other team members included a faculty member, librarian and student mentor. Students were told that the advisor in the first-year seminar was their assigned advisor for the semester. Advisors typically presented class sessions on time management, academic planning, goal setting, and study skills. In addition, every student was required to meet individually with their advisor at least once during the academic term. By attending each weekly class meeting, the advisor was able to visit with students informally and provide "quick" and on-going advising in regard to any issues students brought up (e.g. expressing having difficulty in a math course). Advisors also made weekly announcements about upcoming academic deadlines such as course withdrawal and registration dates.

The research design was a pre-post design with no control group. First-year students enrolled in first-year seminars were asked to voluntarily complete a pre-and post questionnaire. First-year students were asked to complete the questionnaires during class time. The questionnaires were designed to assess the advising components of first-year seminar courses and not other aspects of the course (students were asked to complete separate questionnaires that were designed to assess *course* learning outcomes). First-year students were asked to complete the questionnaires during class time. The pre-questionnaire was administered during the second class period of the semester and the post-survey was administered during the last class period of the term.

Participants

A total of 740 students completed the pre-survey. The sample was comprised of 24% males and 75% females. Of students responding to the pre-test, 61% were White/Caucasian,

11% African American, 2% Asian American, and 2% Latino/a. Ninety-four percent of the respondents were full-time students, whereas the other 6% held part-time status at IUPUI. Forty-one percent of the respondents were admitted conditionally and the other 59% were regular admits. Respondents to the pre-test survey had a mean age of 19 years (SD=2.59), with a mean high school percentile of 62 (SD=19.60). The fall semester grade point average was 2.57 (N=579; SD=1.08). There were 154 missing values because the some respondents failed to include their student identification number and responses could not be linked to institutional data.

A total of 494 students completed the post-survey. The sample was comprised of 20% males and 53% females. Of students responding to the post-test, 59% were White/Caucasian, 8% African American, 1% Asian American, and 1% Latino/a. Ninety-three percent of the respondents were full-time students, whereas the other 7% held part-time status at IUPUI. Thirty-three percent of the respondents were admitted conditionally and the other 67% were regular admits. Respondents to the post-test survey had a mean age of 19 years (SD=3.37), with a mean high school percentile of 63 (SD=19.93). The fall semester grade point average was 2.85 (N=358; SD=.844). There were 136 missing values because the some respondents failed to include their student identification number and responses could not be linked to institutional data.

There were 294 respondents that were included in all the pre-post analyses. Due to the fact that we had to rely on students' self-reported identification numbers, many respondents were dropped from the pre-post dataset (paired samples t-tests were conducted thus requiring student identification numbers on the pre-and post-surveys to correspond with one another). Similar to the pre-test sample, 24% were males (N=65), and 76% females (N=243). There were a total of 20 missing responses. The pre-post sample was as diverse as the pre-test sample, with 75% of the sample being White/Caucasian, 12% African American, 2% Asian American, and 2%

8

Hispanic/Latino. Thirty-two percent of the respondents were admitted conditionally and the other 68% were regular admits. The pre-post test sample was also comparable to the pre-sample in terms of being comprised of students with full-time status: 94% (N=258) of the respondents had full-time status, while only 6% (N=16) were part-time students. Respondents to the pre-post survey had a mean age of 19 years (SD=3.10), with a mean high school percentile of 64 (SD=19.47). The fall semester grade point average was 2.86 (N=274; SD=.840). Please note that the differences between the samples must be taken into consideration when interpreting the results. It seems that the students who responded to both surveys were more academically prepared and performed better academically than students who completed the pre-test instrument only.

RESULTS

Principal Components Analyses: Six Factors Emerge

A Principal Components Analysis with Varimax rotation was conducted on the pre-post sample survey in order to break the 25 items into common factors. After suppressing factor loadings of less than 0.30, five factors emerged (see Table 1 below for factors and factor loadings). Please note that "factors" were formed based on a combination of factor loadings, scale reliabilities, and face validity (the items were designed to assess advising learning outcomes in first-year seminar courses). Factor 1 contained 6 items, including "I can think of many ways to reach my current academic goals" and "At the present time, I am energetically pursuing my academic goals" This factor, labeled "Academic Hope" demonstrated high levels of internal reliability, with the subscale having a Cronbach's alpha of .853. The items employed in this current study were adapted in part from Snyder, Sympson, Ybasco, Borders, Babyak, and Higgins (1996). The second factor was comprised of five items, including "I have a good understanding of my academic goals" and "I have learned to accept responsibility for achieving

9

my academic goals." This factor was labeled "Academic Goal Self-Efficacy" and demonstrated high levels of internal consistency, with a Cronbach's alpha of .814. Factor 3 contained 4 items including "I have a good understanding of how to decide on a major or future career," "I know which courses fulfill requirements for my major," and "I am able to identify links between my chosen major and possible careers" and was given the label "Career Decision Making Self-Efficacy." This factor also demonstrated high levels of internal consistency, with a Cronbach's alpha of .811. Factor 4, labeled "Time Management Self-Efficacy" contained three items: "I can maintain a balance between school and my personal life," "I can maintain a balance between school and work demands" and "I understand the amount of time I need to devote to studying" This factor also had an acceptable degree of internal consistency; the subscale had an alpha level of .707. A fifth factor was created due to the *face validity* of the items and the intended measurement goal. Factor 5 contained two items, including "I feel confident that I will be able to complete my degree," and "I feel confident that I will complete my degree in a timely manner." This factor, labeled "Degree Completion Self-Efficacy" demonstrated an acceptable level of internal reliability, with the subscale having a Cronbach's alpha of .831. The final factor was labeled "Campus Integration" and included four items: "I know about campus resources to help me succeed academically," "I have a good understanding of ways to become engaged at IUPUI (co-curricular and campus life activities)," "I feel a sense of belonging at IUPUI" and "The advisor/advisee relationship is important to a student's overall academic experience." This four-item factor had an acceptable internal consistency, with a Cronbach's alpha of .566. Although, some of the "scales" contain relatively few items and do not have extremely high reliabilities, this method of combining items was preferred over using single items when employing inferential statistical procedures such as regressions and paired samples t-tests.

Insert Table 1 about here

Descriptive Statistics

Displayed in Tables 2 and 3 are the descriptive statistics rank ordered by mean rating for each of the samples. Results suggest that students felt confident about their ability to accept responsibility for achieving my academic goals, complete their degrees, and had a good understanding of academic goals and amount of time needed to devote to studying at pre and post-testing. However, students seemed to lack a sense of belonging at IUPUI and a feeling of confidence about managing stress at post test.

Insert Table 2 about here

Insert Table 3 about here

Students were asked to report approximately how often they met with an adviser outside of class time and what type of advising they received during the post-test administration. Tables 4 and 5 display the frequencies.

Insert Table 4 about here

11

Insert Table 5 about here

Understanding What Students Are Gaining from First-Year Seminar Advising Interventions

A series of paired samples t-tests were employed in order to investigate what gains students made after a semester of receiving various academic advising interventions in first-year seminar courses. Results imply that students made significant gains in the following areas: academic hope ($t(277)=2.42$, $p<.05$), goal setting self-efficacy ($t(275)=5.92$, $p<.0001$), career decision making self-efficacy ($t(252)=9.08$, $p<.0001$), and campus integration ($t(277)=5.27$, $p<.0001$). The value of Cohen's d and the effect-size correlation were calculated using the means and standard deviations of pre-post test results. The original standard deviations were used to compute the effect size rather than the paired t-test value or the within subject's F value. Results suggest that the effect sizes were in the small to medium range. The effect size for the pre-post change in academic hope was relatively small (Cohen's d = .15) while change in career decision making self-efficacy was large (Cohen's d=.65) (Lipsey, 1990; Lipsey and Wilson, 1993). Table 6 displays the results.

Insert Table 6 about here

Understanding Factors That Significantly Contribute to First Semester Academic Performance

A series of simple block linear regressions were conducted to explore what factors significantly predicted academic performance (first-semester average grade point averages) while controlling for academic preparation (High School Percentile Ranks and SAT scores), gender, ethnicity, credit load, and pre-test scores. The higher the students' levels of academic

hope, the higher their first semester grade point averages even while controlling for academic preparation, gender, ethnicity, course load, and pre-hope scores (adjusted $\underline{R}^2$ =.309, $\underline{F}$ (8, 210)=11.30, $\underline{R}^2$ change=.036; $\underline{p}$<.001). Level of academic hope (e.g., students report that they are energetically pursuing their academic goals) accounted for approximately 4% of the variance in academic performance after academic preparation, gender, ethnicity, course load, and pre-hope scores were entered into the model. In an effort to better understand how hope levels impacted academic performance, students were coded into one of three categories based on their post-hope scores: high, medium, and low. There were 107 students in the low group, 79 in the medium group, and 68 in the high group. One-way analyses of variance procedures were conducted to examine differences between the groups. The low-, medium-, and high-hope groups' GPAs were 2.69 (SD=.89), 2.85 (SD=2.86), and 3.06 (SD=.77), respectively; only the high- and low-hope groups were different at p< .05 based on a Bonferroni significant difference test.

The better the students' time management self-efficacy levels, the higher their academic performance levels (adjusted $\underline{R}^2$ =.251, $\underline{F}$ (8, 197)=9.26, $\underline{R}^2$ change=.019; $\underline{p}$<.05). Level of ability to successfully manage time (e.g., students report that they can maintain a balance between school and work demands) accounted for approximately 2% of the variance in academic performance after academic preparation, gender, ethnicity, course load, and pre-time efficacy scores were entered into the model. The higher the students' degree completion self-efficacy (e.g., students report that they can complete their degree in a timely manner), the higher their first semester grade point averages even while controlling for academic preparation, gender, ethnicity, course load, and pre-degree self-efficacy scores (adjusted $\underline{R}^2$ =.290, $\underline{F}$ (8, 213)=11.89, $\underline{R}^2$ change=.035; $\underline{p}$<.001). Level of degree completion self-efficacy accounted for approximately 4% of the variance in academic performance after other variables were entered into the model.

LIMITATIONS

When interpreting the results, one must be aware of several limitations. It is critical to note that causal relationships can't be inferred given the methodology employed in this research (e.g., survey research and correlational designs). Thus, caution should be taken when interpreting the results of the linear regression procedures -- true causality cannot be determined. Further, common method variance may have contributed to the results. The use of both objective (i.e., actual academic performance) and perceptual measures of advising processes were employed to reduce any potential percept-percept bias.

Additionally, the pre-post designs were used in an effort to validly assess student' gains. Maturation could also account for the results. In other words, due to the fact that no control group was employed, it is difficult to ascertain if students would have shown improvements in hope, efficacy, and campus social integration with the passage of time in the absence of advising. Another potential limitation is the construct validity of the measures. Labeling factors based on what "emerges" from principal components analyses is a relatively subjective process. It is possible that the factor labeled as "Academic Hope" is tapping another concept. However, the items were constructed based hope theory and the final scale items resemble others employed in the literature (e.g., Snyder, Sympson, Ybasco, Borders, Babyak, and Higgins 1996).

DISCUSSION

During a semester of intrusive advising in a first-year seminar course students made significant gains in the following areas: academic hope, goal setting self-efficacy, career decision making self-efficacy, and level of campus integration. It appears that students were achieving intended advising outcomes. Results suggest that advising had the most influence on students' levels of career decision making-self-efficacy levels. The effect of advising on career decision

14

making self-efficacy was in the "high" range. The "effect size" is a name given to a family of indices that measure the magnitude of a treatment effect (Lipsey, 1990). However, results suggest that advisors may have to exert more effort to make students feel more efficacious about their ability levels with regard to obtaining a degree and effectively managing their time.

Results also imply that advising practices that help foster students' feelings of academic hope and efficacy in their abilities to manage their time, and complete their degrees in a timely manner may help boost their academic performance levels. This type of research design does not allow for causal inferences. Thus, caution must be exerted when inferring that confidence levels in these areas *caused* students to perform better academically. The one issue that lends credence to this hypothesis is that students self-reported prior to receiving their end-of-the-semester grades.

This study explored if students' levels of academic hope changed over time. It appears that hope levels significantly increased over a semester of experiencing advising during a first-year seminar course. Thus, there are implications in terms of teaching and fostering students' academic hope using a variety of intrusive interventions on college campuses. One of the most important aspects of conducting studies on academic advising within universities is developing mechanisms for using results to improve advising services. Ideally, information derived from this investigation will assist administrators, faculty, and advisors in making data-driven decisions about allocating scarce resources to advising interventions that have a demonstrable positive impact on student learning and achievement.

APPENDIX A: ALL TABLES AND FIGURES
Table 1. Academic Advising Survey Factors with Item Factor Loadings

Factor 1: Academic Hope	Factor Loading
Item 15: At the present time, I am energetically pursuing my academic goals.	.496
Item 16: There are lots of ways around any school-related problems that I may face.	.454
Item 17: I can think of many ways to reach my current academic goals.	.494
Item 18: At this time, I think I can achieve the goals I have set for myself.	.662
Item 21: I am able to meet the demands and requirements of college.	.716
Item 22: I can successfully manage and cope with stress.	.545
Item 23: I can adjust to college life.	.430
scale α= .853	

Factor 2: Academic Goal Self-Efficacy	Factor Loading
Item 4: I have a good understanding of my academic goals.	.501
Item 9: I know what is required of me to succeed academically.	.612
Item 10. I have learned to accept responsibility for achieving my academic goals.	.652
Item 11. I have an academic plan for the next year.	.262*
Item 12. I feel that I can make good decisions about my academic plan.	.395
scale α= .814: *included due to face validity of item and a priori scale development.	

Factor 3: Career Decision Making Self-Efficacy	Factor Loading
Item 5: I have a good understanding of how to decide on a major or future career.	.704
Item 6: I know which courses fulfill requirements for my major.	.771
Item 7: I know the process of getting into a degree granting school (e.g. Business, Nursing, Education, etc.).	.774
Item 8: I am able to identify links between my chosen major and possible careers.	.679
scale α= .811	

Factor 4: Time Management Self-Efficacy	Factor Loading
Item 1: I understand the amount of time I need to devote to studying.	.742
Item 13. I can maintain a balance between school and my personal life.	.537
Item 14. I can maintain a balance between school and work demands.	.551
**scale α= .707	

Factor 5: Degree Completion Self-Efficacy	Factor Loading
Item 19. I feel confident that I will be able to complete my degree.	.754
Item 20. I feel confident that I will complete my degree in a timely manner.	.796
** Confidence in Degree Completion scale α= .831; this "factor" was formed based on face validity of items and a priori item development.	

Factor 6: Campus Social Integration	Factor Loading
Item 2: I know about campus resources to help me succeed academically.	.704
Item 3: I have a good understanding of ways to become engaged at IUPUI (co-curricular and campus life activities).	.648
Item 24: I feel a sense of belonging at IUPUI.	.396
Item 25: The advisor/advisee relationship is important to a student's overall academic experience.	.094*
**scale α= .566; *Included due to face validity of item and a priori scale development.	

** Reliability analysis performed on pre-post dataset, pre-items (n=294).

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics for Pre-Advising Survey (Rank Ordered by Mean Rating)

Item:	N	^{a}Mean	Std. Deviation
1. I have learned to accept responsibility for achieving my academic goals.	727	4.37	.67
2. I feel confident that I will be able to complete my degree.	720	4.31	.70
3. I have a good understanding of my academic goals.	728	4.30	.83
4. I understand the amount of time I need to devote to studying.	738	4.29	.74
5. I know what is required of me to succeed academically.	732	4.27	.68
6. The advisor/advisee relationship is important to a student's overall academic experience.	725	4.25	.80
7. At this time, I think I can achieve the goals I have set for myself.	731	4.20	.70
8. I can adjust to college life.	731	4.12	.70
9. I am able to meet the demands and requirements of college.	734	4.12	.68
10. At the present time, I am energetically pursuing my academic goals.	728	4.12	.80
11. I feel confident that I will complete my degree in a timely manner.	726	4.10	.79
12. I can maintain a balance between school and work demands.	674	4.01	.77
13. I can maintain a balance between school and my personal life.	737	4.00	.74
14. I feel that I can make good decisions about my academic plan.	731	3.97	.83
15. I have a good understanding of how to decide on a major or future career.	730	3.94	1.08
16. I can think of many ways to reach my current academic goals.	733	3.93	.80
17. There are lots of ways around any school-related problems that I may face.	728	3.77	.80
18. I am able to identify links between my chosen major and possible careers.	715	3.76	1.00
19. I feel a sense of belonging at IUPUI.	733	3.73	.91
20. I can successfully manage and cope with stress.	732	3.70	.92
21. I know about campus resources to help me succeed academically.	735	3.69	.88
22. I have a good understanding of ways to become engaged at IUPUI (co-curricular and campus life activities).	739	3.64	.94
23. I know which courses fulfill requirements for my major.	711	3.38	1.20
24. I know the process of getting into a degree granting school (e.g. Business, Nursing, Education, etc.).	716	3.27	1.13
25. I have an academic plan for the next year.	725	3.26	1.11

^{a} Mean ranges from 1-5 where Strongly Agree =5 Agree=4 Undecided= 3 Disagree=2 Strongly Disagree=1; missing responses and N/As were excluded from the analysis.

Table 3. Descriptive Statistics for Post-Advising Survey (Rank Ordered by Mean Rating)

Item:	N	[a]Mean	Std. Deviation
1. I have learned to accept responsibility for achieving my academic goals.	492	4.31	.73
2. I understand the amount of time I need to devote to studying.	494	4.30	.69
3. I know what is required of me to succeed academically.	492	4.27	.72
4. I feel confident that I will be able to complete my degree.	491	4.22	.83
5. I have a good understanding of my academic goals.	493	4.19	.84
6. I know about campus resources to help me succeed academically.	492	4.17	.71
7. At this time, I think I can achieve the goals I have set for myself.	492	4.14	.77
8. The advisor/advisee relationship is important to a student's overall academic experience.	489	4.13	.86
9. I can adjust to college life.	494	4.13	.75
10. I have a good understanding of how to decide on a major or future career.	489	4.12	.94
11. I feel that I can make good decisions about my academic plan.	492	4.10	.76
12. I am able to meet the demands and requirements of college.	494	4.10	.74
13. I know which courses fulfill requirements for my major.	476	4.08	.92
14. I am able to identify links between my chosen major and possible careers.	491	4.04	.89
15. I can think of many ways to reach my current academic goals.	492	4.00	.78
16. Overall, I am satisfied with my experiences at IUPUI.	481	3.99	.84
17. I feel confident that I will complete my degree in a timely manner.	491	3.98	.89
18. I have an academic plan for the next year.	491	3.98	.96
19. I can maintain a balance between school and work demands.	463	3.97	.81
20. I have a good understanding of ways to become engaged at IUPUI (co-curricular and campus life activities).	491	3.97	.84
21. At the present time, I am energetically pursuing my academic goals.	492	3.96	.89
22. There are lots of ways around any school-related problems that I may face.	492	3.96	.78
23. I can maintain a balance between school and my personal life.	493	3.95	.82
24. I would recommend the University College advising services to other students.	472	3.95	.98
25. Overall, I am satisfied with my University College advising experiences at IUPUI.	473	3.92	.97
26. I know the process of getting into a degree granting school (e.g. Business, Nursing, Education, etc.).	488	3.84	1.02
27. I can successfully manage and cope with stress.	494	3.78	.91
28. I feel a sense of belonging at IUPUI.	491	3.72	1.00

[a] Mean ranges from 1-5 where Strongly Agree =5 Agree=4 Undecided= 3 Disagree=2 Strongly Disagree=1; missing responses and N/As were excluded from the analysis.

Table 4. In the Last Semester, How frequently did you meet With a University College Advisor (outside of class time)?

	N	Percent
About once a week	12	3%
Two to three times a month	18	4%
Once a month	25	5%
Two or three times	181	38%
One time (only once a semester)	223	46%
Never	24	5%
Total	483	100%

Table 5. In the Last Year, Please Describe Which Situation Best Describes Your Advising Experiences

	N	Percent
I almost always meet with the same advisor.	247	52%
I do not have an "assigned" advisor and meet with different advisors.	82	17%
Other (please specify)	51	11%
I don't know.	97	20%
Total	477	100%

Table 6. Advising Gains: Pre-Post Test Results by Factor*

Academic Advising Survey Factors:	*N*	*Pre-Test*	*Post-test*	*Effect Size Cohen's d*
Factor 1: Academic Hope	278	**3.99**	**4.09**	**0.15**
Factor 2: Goal Setting Efficacy	276	**4.04**	**4.29**	**0.39**
Factor 3: Career Decision Making Efficacy	253	**3.60**	**4.12**	**0.65**
Factor 4: Time Management Self-Efficacy	251	4.12	4.15	0.02
Factor 5: Degree Completion Efficacy	284	4.23	4.18	0.03
Factor 6: Campus Integration	278	**3.85**	**4.08**	**0.38**

*Bolded items are significantly different based on a paired samples t-test ($p<.001$).

REFERENCES

Bandura, A. (1997). Self-efficacy: The exercise of control. New York: W.H. Freeman.

Bandura, A (1994). Self-efficacy. In V.S. (ed.), Encyclopedia of human behavior (Vol. 4, pp.71-81. New York: Academic Press.

Banta, T. W., Hansen, M. J., Black, K. E., & Jackson, J. E. (2003). Assessing advising outcomes. NACADA Journal, 22(1).

Cuseo, J. (2004). Assessment of academic advisors and academic advising programs, Marymount College, unpublished document.

Creamer, D. G. (2000). Use of theory in academic advising. In V.N Gordon, and W. R Habley (Eds.), Academic Advising: A Comprehensive Handbook. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Fox, L, Zakely, J., Morris, R, & Jundt, M. (1993). Orientation as a catalyst: Effective retention through academic and social integration. In M. L Upcraft, R.H. Mullendore, B.O. Barefoot, & D. S. Fidler (Eds). Designing Successful Transitions: A Guide for Orienting Students to College. (Monograph Series No. 13). Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina, National Resource Center for the First-Year Experience and Students in Transition.

Gordon, V.N, & Habley, W. R. (2000). Academic Advising: A Comprehensive Handbook. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Kramer, G. L., & Spencer, R. W. (1989). Academic advising. In M. L. Upcraft and J. N Gardner (Eds.), The Freshman Year Experience: Helping Students Survive and Succeed in College. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Lipsey, M. W. (1990). Design Sensitivity: Statistical Power for Experimental Research. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Lackaya, T., Margalit, M, Ziv, O, & Ziman, T. (2006). Comparisons of self-efficacy, mood, effort, and hope between students with learning disabilities and their non-LD-matched peers. Learning Disabilities Research and practice, 12(2), 111-121.

McCalla -Wiggins. B. (2000). Integrating academic advising and career and life planning. In V.N Gordon, and W. R Habley (Eds.), Academic Advising: A Comprehensive Handbook. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Nora, A. (1993). "Two-year colleges and minority students' educational aspirations: Help or hindrance?" Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research, Vol. 9, 212-247.

O'Banion, T. (1972). An academic advising model. Junior College Journal, 42, 62-69.

Pascarella, E.T. and Terenzini, P.T. (1991). How College Affects Students. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Snyder, C. R. (1995). Conceptualizing, measuring, and nurturing hope. "Current Trends" Focus Article in Journal of Counseling and Development, 73, 355-360.

Snyder, C. R., Shorey, H. S., Cheavens, J., Pulvers, K. M., Adams, V., III, & Wiklund C. (2002). Hope and academic success in college. Journal of Educational Psychology.

Snyder, C. R., Sympson, S. C., Ybasco, F. C., Borders, T. F., Babyak, M. A., & Higgins, R. L. (1996). Development and validation of the State Hope Scale. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70, 321-335.

Steele, G. E, & McDonald, M.L. (2000). Advising students in transition. In V.N Gordon, and W. R Habley (Eds.), Academic Advising: A Comprehensive Handbook. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.