Ethnocultural Dimensions of the University
Adviser/Advisee Relationship

by

SUSAN LYNN CARPENTER

Hon. B. Mus., University of Western, Ont. 1993
B.A. (English Concentration), University of Western, Ont. 1993
B.Ed., University of Windsor, 1994

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS

in

THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES
(Department of Educational Studies - Higher Education)

We accept this thesis as conforming
to the required standard

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

SEPTEMBER, 1998

© Susan Lynn Carpenter, 1998

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfilment of the requirements for an advanced degree at the University of British Columbia, I agree that the Library shall make it freely available for reference and study. I further agree that permission for extensive copying of this thesis for scholarly purposes may be granted by the head of my department or by his or her representatives. It is understood that copying or publication of this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Department of _Educational Studies_

The University of British Columbia
Vancouver, Canada

Date _September 29, 1998_

# Abstract

When observing in a Canadian undergraduate university academic advising office I noticed that Caucasian Canadian students were more likely to get their needs met by an adviser than Asian or Asian Canadian students were. Advisers were more accommodating toward students who were more vocally assertive. However, Asian students were less likely to question the adviser. This behaviour is characteristic of an Eastern communication style which is listening=centred, and grounded in politeness and "saving-face", especially with those of authority, like an adviser. Hence, the purposes of this study were: (1) to find out if students from various cultural backgrounds have different assumptions about interacting with academic advisers; (2) to operationalize Hofstede's (1980) dimensions of culture to measure university adviser/advisee relationships; and (3) to examine the extent to which Hofstede's dimensions of culture are usable when deployed in a study of advising.

The study included the use of a new Adviser/Advisee Relationship Scale (AARS) which I designed to ascertain students' assumptions about interacting with advisers. Over 1200 undergraduate students at the University of British Columbia completed the survey. The questionnaire had three components: (1) the AARS; (2) a standardised five-factor personality test; and (3) questions about demographic characteristics.

This study showed that only one of Hofstede's (1980) dimensions of culture, Uncertainty Avoidance, remained intact after factor analysis of items in the AARS. Yet, three new dimensions emerged: (1) Nervous Helplessness; (2) Manipulative Assertiveness; and (3) Passive Compliance. Three cultural variables - (1) Self-Defined Culture, (2) First Language, and (3) Country of Birth - correlated with students' responses to the AARS and personality test.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

# List of Tables

# Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Roger Boshier, for being an awesome Supervisor. Every student should be so lucky as to have a Professor so enthusiastic and encouraging. Roger made it possible for me to present this thesis' pilot study at the Comparative and International Education Society's (CIES) 1997 Western Regional Conference last November at University of Southern California and then the concluding findings at their 1998 Conference this past June here at the University of British Columbia. Both events were great academic and personal experiences for me. For the terrific amount of time, teaching, encouragement, and dedication, I thank you Roger.

My Committee members Lynn Alden, from Personality Psychology, Hans Schuetze, from my Department - Higher Education, and John Kirkness, my External Examiner, have all been very helpful to share with me their piece of my puzzle. Each was willing to give me any time and information I asked for. Super committee!

Next I would like to thank my family and friends for encouraging me to follow my academic goals. My Dad, Jerry Carpenter, has been an excellent educator; his love for humanity has inspired me to look into ways of helping all people - especially those who might be being overlooked by others. You're the greatest Dad! And my Mom, Bernice, and my loving Grandma, Helen Otto, have both given me such faith and love to follow my dreams - even if those dreams lead me 3000 miles away! Thank you for letting me go with grace and love. Tina Hondzel in London, Tracey Rilett and Daria Lysy in Windsor, and John Hoy, Cameron Chu, Makiko Nakai, Lara Taylor, Mavis Jemielita, and Trevor Hill, in Vancouver, have all given me such incredible encouragement and support to follow my goals. I realize now that the actual achievement was the journey, not the destination, and I thank all of you for your help along my "way". As well, it has been such a treasure to be a part of each one of your journeys.

# CHAPTER I

## Introduction

University department or faculty academic advising offices provide students with information and guidance. Students visit an academic adviser if they need to drop or add a course, reschedule a class, transfer credits from a previous institution, plan courses for graduation, choose electives or an academic major. Consequently, academic advising in universities is an important service for students. Without it students may be unable to discern institutional conventions and regulations or to plan and complete their program of studies. Hence, academic advising can help guide students to graduate. Similarly, inadequate advising may prevent students from graduating on schedule (Dalili, 1982). This may be a particular problem for international students whose time and money is limited. The institution's courses, programs, regulations, and expectations may be less well known to international students, so it is up to the adviser to provide this information.

At the University of British Columbia (UBC) the number of international undergraduate students has increased from 1.3% of the undergraduate body in 1978/79 to 3.6% in 1996/97. Likewise, international graduate students have seen their numbers increase from 16.1% of the graduate population in 1978/79 to 21.88% by 1996/97 (UBC Registrar's Office, personal communication, July 16, 1998). International students are coming from more countries around the world as well: for instance, in 1978/79, international students came to UBC from 88 countries worldwide (UBC Office of Institutional Analysis & Planning, 1981); by 1997/98, up to 108 countries were represented (UBC Office of Institutional Analysis & Planning, 1997). Similarly, Vancouver, the city were UBC is located, has a great mix of Eastern and Western cultures. This is a characteristic the city shares with other Pacific Rim

communities such as those along the coast of Australia and California. In 1996, Statistics Canada (1998) reported that there were 1.8 million people in Vancouver, of which a little over half a million (564,600) were ethnic minorities. More than half of these (279,040) were Chinese. Similarly, the largest ethnic group of undergraduate international students at UBC are of Chinese origin (see Table 1). Hence, the city's ethnic milieu is reflected in the composition of the University's student body.

Table 1

<u>International Students at UBC: Top 20 Countries of Origin</u>

| <u>Country</u> | <u>Graduate Students</u> | <u>Undergraduates</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|---|---|---|---|
| U.S.A. | 233 | 61 | 294 |
| Japan | 71 | 166 | 237 |
| People's Rep. of China | 153 | 28 | 181 |
| Hong Kong | 24 | 132 | 156 |
| United Kingdom | 56 | 75 | 131 |
| Australia | 33 | 72 | 105 |
| Rep. of Korea | 29 | 43 | 72 |
| Germany | 38 | 29 | 67 |
| Taiwan | 9 | 48 | 57 |
| Singapore, Rep. | 6 | 44 | 50 |
| India | 47 | 2 | 49 |
| Malaysia | 11 | 37 | 48 |
| Indonesia | 15 | 30 | 45 |
| Sweden | 0 | 44 | 44 |
| Saudi Arabia | 1 | 39 | 40 |
| Iran | 36 | 3 | 39 |
| Mexico | 25 | 6 | 31 |
| New Zealand | 27 | 2 | 29 |
| France | 12 | 13 | 25 |
| Kenya | 15 | 5 | 20 |

(UBC Office of Institutional Analysis & Planning, 1997).

Because of this diversity, many divisions of student services have been expanding and changing to help serve the needs of international students. However, university academic advising offices have been slow to recognise the complexities of the crosscultural dimensions of advising. For instance, a recent "tale of advising"

revealed that only one of the 33 Canadian advisers surveyed listed cultural communication as an important issue (Trigg, 1997). Academic advising offices have yet to address comprehensively the likelihood that the students' and advisers' ethnocultural backgrounds may effect the nature of how well they get along and understand each other. Therefore, it is important to study students' assumptions about advisers because communicative interaction is the medium through which advising takes place. Furthermore, a number of Canadian studies suggest that both international and host students are dissatisfied with the quality of what happens during the academic advising sessions (Calderwood, 1993; Gome, Hall & Murphy, 1993; UBC Alma Mater Society, 1996; Walker, 1994). Students complain, for example, about the inadequate service and the impersonal treatment they receive; specifically, they report that advisers aren't as knowledgeable, friendly, sympathetic, helpful, or competent as they should be (UBC Alma Mater Society, 1996).

## 1.1 Advising

During the advising process, adviser and student must communicate in a one-to-one setting. Consequently, communication is the medium through which academic advising takes place. There are three levels upon which communication takes place: ontological (thinking), relational (interacting), and discursive (talking) (Mortensen, 1994). Although communication is meant to occur on all three levels, each person brings previous experiences, outlooks, understanding, and ways of communicating to the interaction. Subsequently, what is said is not always what is thought or understood. Therefore the adviser should be aware of how each student's cultural background may influence the way the student thinks and communicates verbally and nonverbally. For example, what students say may not be what they are feeling, but rather what they are thinking the adviser expects. Politeness and respecting authority

might be more important in some cultures than disclosing personal needs and arguing individual views.

However, levels of acculturation exist within cultures as well. For instance, Chinese students from Hong Kong may be more "Westernised", since they have been subject to British conventions for the past hundred years, in comparison to Chinese students coming from Mainland China who may have retained customs considered more "traditionally Chinese". Similarly, length of time in Canada may effect Asian students' level of "Westernisation" or acculturation. For instance, students who have lived in Canada all their life, despite being born in Hong Kong, may not exhibit the same cultural behaviour as International students who have been in Canada only two months. Similarly, location and familial influence in Canada may effect levels of cultural traditionalism. Canadian-born Chinese students who have lived in the Chinatown area of Vancouver, and maintained their Chinese language and customs with family and friends, may be less acculturated into Canadian's western society than, say, Chinese-born Canadians who have not. Therefore, it is not place of birth, or time in Canada, but first language and home and social environments that may better predict a person's level of cultural behaviour and communication style.

Most Canadian academic advisers will expect students to clearly state their purpose and not withhold pertinent information. Subsequently, problems may occur if students do not disclose their academic concerns, and their vocational or scholastic aspirations. For instance, if advisers are helping students choose courses to finish an Arts degree, but the latter fail to mention they want to enter a Bachelor of Education program afterward, the advisers will not be able to inform their students that a more well-rounded choice of electives and additional science courses might help increase the chances of getting accepted. Gao, Ting-Toomey, and Gudykunst (1996) found the Chinese communication style is characteristically low in self-disclosure, more implicit

than explicit, and focused on a listening-centred rather than verbal approach; Hall (1976) called this high context. This could cause miscommunication for an adviser coming from a low-context communication style who is not used to having to pick up subtle ambiguities with feelings and needs alluded to rather than stated outright.

## 1.2 Culture and Personality

These perspectives on interaction in the adviser/advisee relationship can be examined by measuring students' cultural dimensions. In a landmark study, Hofstede (1980) provides a framework for understanding people's cultural dimensions. He found cultural differences among an international corporations' employees in 66 countries. Because his focus was on employees who were in a power relationship with supervisors, and in a position to work hard and abide by company rules and regulations, I thought that it may be related to students' assumptions about interacting with academic advisers. Hence, three differences identified by Hofstede (in his words: Power Distance, Uncertainty Avoidance, and Individualism) were adapted in the creation of a questionnaire, designed to investigate culture's effect on the adviser/adviser relationship. For example, the amount of Power Distance students feel toward the adviser is a measure of their respect for the adviser, and their fear for authority: these are presumed to be displayed through willingness to argue with and question the adviser. Next, Uncertainty Avoidance is a measure of the extent to which students experience stress, conform to rules, and tolerate uncertainty in the advising relationship. Lastly, Individualism is the degree to which students feel independent from the adviser and the institution, and how much initiative students are willing to take in order to get their needs met.

Subsequent analysis and reflection reveal that personality factors may also mediate the impact of the cultural dimensions of the adviser/advisee relationship.

Hence, a standardised personality test was used to account for personality.

Regression equations will show whether cultural predicting variables, such as First

Language, Self-Defined Culture, and Country of Birth, or rather personality variables,

such as Neuroticism, Extroversion, Openness, Agreeableness, and

Conscientiousness, to be defined later in this study, predict assumptions about

advising relationships.

## 1.3 Purposes

In summary, the purposes of this study were to:

> 1. Find out if students from different cultural backgrounds
> differ in their assumptions about interacting with academic advisers.
>
> 2. Operationalize Hofstede's dimensions of culture to measure university
> adviser/advisee relationships, and
>
> 3. Examine the extent to which Hofstede's dimensions of cultural
> difference "hold-up" when deployed in a study of adviser/advisee
> relationships.

# CHAPTER II

## Academic Advising

In the days when Canadian universities were overwhelmingly inhabited by Caucasian students and faculty, advising was less of a problem than now. Everyone spoke English, "advice" was not culturally nuanced and most people knew what to do.

These days it is not so simple. Although there are now more "ethnic" advisers, advising is still largely done by Canadian-born Caucasian advisers. But the student body has changed dramatically. For example at UBC, although the Registrar's Office does not keep statistics on students' ethnic backgrounds, if you look around campus you will notice that most ethnic minorities are Chinese. Similarly, most ethnic minority international undergraduate students are Chinese (see Table 1).

Table 1 shows that, coming from the top twenty countries, most undergraduate international students are Eastern (530) compared to Western (241). Most Asian international students are Chinese (308) coming from countries such as the People's Republic of China, Hong Kong, and Taiwan. Hence, there is now considerable potential for cultural collision - misunderstandings that stem from differing ontological, behavioural, and discursive modes of communication (Mortensen, 1994). What is said is not what is always meant or understood and this may effect the way adviser's yield power.

Trigg (1997) found that 87 per cent of the 33 Canadian advisers surveyed believed they had the authority (either entirely or in part) to apply discretion when making decisions concerning students' academic programs. For instance, advisers believed they had power to allow students' requests regarding: (1) rules and regulations; (2) appeals on academic standing; (3) appeals on admissions decisions; and (4) appeals on transfer credit (Trigg, 1997). This could be disconcerting for a

student whose behaviour clashes with the adviser's expectations due to cultural or personality differences.

When volunteering in a university academic advising office I noticed Caucasian were more apt then Asian students to question the adviser's judgments when not in their favour, argue their needs, assert their desires, and disclose additional information in order to clarify their position. The Asian students were more apt to agree with the adviser and then leave without argument. Consequently, it was the students who asked for clarification and additional options who were provided with the information or requests they wanted to improve their problems, whereas students who did not argue were not given additional consideration or favour from the adviser. Hence, it is important to know more about how students from different ethnic backgrounds would react and feel in the adviser/advisee relationship.

Since Graduate students deal with a research Supervisor or assigned faculty member as academic adviser this study focused on undergraduate students who would see an academic adviser from their faculty or department in an academic advising office.

This study's goal was to investigate students' assumptions about interacting in the academic advising process. Therefore, the literature was explored from three angles: (1) defining academic advising through the role of students and academic advisers and the two different types of advising approaches used in North America; (2) investigating advising's importance for students and the institution; and (3) exploring the issues surrounding the possible improvement of academic advising.

## 2.1 Conceptual Considerations

Role of Students

During an advising interaction students are expected to communicate effectively

by voicing concerns and giving medical information if leniency is desired. This means students who feel comfortable with the adviser may better reveal their needs, ask for clarification, and leave the advising office with a sense of resolution.

However, international students or recently immigrated ethnic minority students may have trouble interacting effectively. Many researchers claim that many of these students are unable to converse clearly in the host language, and may be insecure about articulating their problems and needs (Dalili, 1982; Deressa & Beavers, 1986; Leong & Sedlacek, 1986; Wherly, 1988). Hence, familiarity with the host language, ability to disclose adequate information, and feeling comfortable in the advising environment may aid students' success in the advising process. Consequently, Canadian students may have an easier time participating successfully in the advising process.

Role of Adviser

Advisers must be effective communicators. According to Gordon (1992) advisers should be able to demonstrate: "communication skills (articulating information, listening skills, writing skills), interpersonal skills (sensitivity to individual students' needs, flexibility in dealing with various types of people, ability to be assertive when needed, positive reaction to difficult situations), and referral skills (ability to know when, how, and where to refer students to campus and community resources)" (p.175). At the centre of all these processes is the notion that adviser/advisee relationships involve *interaction*.

Academic advising is an active participatory process in which both students and advisers need to interact. Even under ideal circumstances where cultural differences do not exist, communication can be challenging; students have to disclose all of their expectations and advisers need to be able to articulate and implement rules and judgments effectively.

A Master's thesis exploring Canadian academic adviser's perceptions of the advising process listed, in order of significance, a compilation of what academic adviser's consider as their duties: "(1) program planning activities with students; (2) explain academic policies and procedures to students; (3) explain policies and procedures to the public; (4) explain policies/procedures to faculty and staff in other areas; (5) contact students at risk academically; (6) determine if students have met degree requirements; (7) review students' records for promotion; (8) explain non-academic policies and procedures to students; and (9) assist in resolving student-instructor conflict" (Trigg, 1997, p.51).

In Canadian universities, adviser's perform a prescriptive role. This means they must be knowledgeable about academic programs, requirements, specific majors, the institution's requirements and the curricular demands of individual programs. As well, they are required to be familiar with the institution's policies, procedures, regulations, and academic and nonacademic campus resources. Advisers also need to be able to interpret faculty rules to students so they may learn to negotiate policies set forth by the institution. The adviser can also act as a student advocate by contacting a professor with whom the student is having trouble. Most of the time the adviser acts as an administrator who rubber stamps approval for course adding or withdrawal, outlines student's graduation requirements, switches course sections to resolve timetable conflicts, and keeps records.

## 2.2  Types of Advising

Since the early 1970's academic advising has been labelled as either "prescriptive" or "developmental" (Crookston, 1972). This writer redefined the concept of advising to go beyond the traditional method of prescription to address the students' developmental areas.

## Prescriptive Advising

Prescriptive academic advising is characterised by a formal authority-based relationship where the adviser is the authority and students typically do what they are told. There is little or no personal interaction; discussion is limited usually to what courses to take and when. A course of action is prescribed. In this sense, traditional advising would follow a medical model of diagnosis-treatment, with the adviser as physician and students as patients. However, many students approach academic advisers for help that goes beyond those prescriptive aids. When this happens in many Canadian advising offices, students requiring additional help are referred to specific centres (See Appendix I #12).

## Developmental Advising

In contrast, developmental advisers take a deeper look at how to solve the problem before referring students to other services. Consequently, developmental academic advising may include personal or career counselling. It proposes a holistic approach to advising by being concerned with students' adjustment and progression through university (Crookston, 1972; Grites, 1977; Ender, Winston, Jr., & Miller, 1982; Thomas & Chickering, 1984). Ender, Winston, Jr., and Miller (1982) characterise the developmental advising process as: "... not a one-step, paper endorsing activity, [but one which] is concerned with human growth, is goal related, requires establishment of a caring human relationship, the Advisors serve as adult role models and mentors, is the cornerstone of collaboration between academic and student affairs, [and it] utilises all campus and community resources" (pp.7-8).

Prescriptive advising puts the onus on the student to disclose information and assert their needs. It is thus important that adviser's become aware of different cultural groups' varying styles of communicating.

## 2.3 Importance of Advising

<u>Improving Student Retention</u>

Higher education institutions are concerned with student retention. As government subsidies and the traditional student body is decreasing, the higher education system is becoming more client-oriented in order to maintain enrolments. Therefore, higher education institutions are evaluating and refining their services to improve student retention. Advising is provided to aid student retention.

Adequate advising helps many students complete their degree. For instance, Metzner (1989) studied 1,033 first-year university students in the United States and found that high-quality advising aided persistence through its effect on better grades and university satisfaction. Other researchers support these findings (Forrest, 1985; Braxton, Duster & Pascarella, 1988; Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991). As well, Metzner (1989) found that poor advising contributed to attrition. The highest attrition rate was among students who received no academic advising.

One factor that encourages attrition has been students' lack of understanding of how to plan and organise their activities (Anderson, 1987; Astin, 1986; Noel, Levitz, & Saluri, 1987). Also, academic boredom, transition/adjustment problems, limited and/or unrealistic expectations about college, academic under-preparedness, incompatibility of the student and the institutions and irrelevancy of course requirements lead to attrition (Hartley, 1987). These difficulties often manifest themselves in what is generally regarded as a poor student-institution fit.

While this poor "fit" can be the result of a student being in the wrong institution and might be solved by transferring, higher education institutions want to keep valuable clients and are realising that to do so they will need to better assist students.

<u>Tinto's Influence on Retention Literature</u>

Since 1975, much research in the field of post-secondary student retention has been grounded on Tinto's (1975) model of the persistence/ withdrawal process. He claimed academic and social integration facilitate student retention. Research on retention has either confirmed Tinto's argument that the fit between the individual and the institution is a good predictor of dropout or persistence (Grosset, 1991; Nora, 1987; Nora & Rendon, 1990; Pascarella & Terenzini, 1980), or found integration to be negatively associated with persistence (Anderson, 1981; Pascarella & Chapman, 1983; Pascarella, Smart, & Ethington, 1986). However, academic integration's relation to student retention has never been questioned.

Researchers have found that academic integration had stronger effects on institutional commitments, and, therefore, stronger indirect effects on persistence than did social integration (Anderson, 1981; Braxton & Brier, 1989; Pascarella & Chapman, 1983; Pascarella, Smart, & Ethington, 1986). Researchers even doubt students experiencing social integration to be a major deciding factor of persistence or withdrawal if they live off campus or are older (Bean & Metzner, 1985; Benjamin & Holdings, 1995; Ethington, 1990; Guppy & Bednarski, 1993; Johnson, 1991; Stahl & Pavel, 1992; Voorhees, 1987). Academic advising is a tool used to facilitate integration by informing students about degree requirements, course options, policies, help resources, and expectations.

<u>Aiding Student Success</u>

Students need to know what is required of them in order to graduate. Yet, the requirements for a Canadian degree and the institution's policies and expectations may be unknown to most international students, as well as first year host students. It is up to the adviser to inform students of institutional policies which may effect them.

Interaction is the medium through which advising takes place. Therefore,

students need to be able to communicate effectively so the adviser can inform and guide them appropriately. This may be difficult for international students and ethnic minorities who may have trouble vocalising their needs due to limitations with the host language or cultural differences in communication. Recall that at the University of British Columbia (UBC), the largest number of ethnic minorities and international undergraduate students are Chinese (UBC Office of Institutional Analysis & Planning, 1997). Hence, Chinese students' high-context, or indirect, communication style may be misunderstood by a non-Asian Canadian adviser.

Smith and Smith (1989) suggest strategies useful in advising Asian students: (1) pay special attention to the client's cultural values and specific way of approaching problems; (2) take a more active role in the process than with Caucasian clients; (3) use the directive, advice type of approaches which may be more proper and comfortable for the Asian students; and (4) be sure to consider individual differences when working with each student.

Helping international students marks an even higher level of service from academic advisers. However, this additional work would help the institution retain the higher revenue generated by international students, as well as aid this higher risk student population. It is especially up to the academic adviser to do this since International House advisers must refer students to academic advisers if they have any academic problems. Hence, this requires academic advisers to have developed crosscultural communication skills in order to interact successfully with international students.

## 2.4  Improving Academic Advising

<u>Students' Dissatisfaction with Advising</u>

Canadian researchers found that students are not satisfied with advising (Calderwood, 1993; Fielstein & Lammers, 1992; Gome, Hall & Murphy, 1993; UBC

Alma Mater Society, 1996; Walker, 1994).  At UBC, only 56 per cent of those surveyed from the Faculty of Arts said they were satisfied with the academic advising their faculty provided (UBC Alma Mater Society, 1996).  The methodology of this study is suspect.  Nevertheless, complaints ranged from inadequate service and impersonal treatment to specific complaints that the advisers aren't as knowledgeable, friendly, sympathetic, helpful, or competent as they could be.  Calderwood (1993) surveyed international students at Alberta Universities and found only 49 per cent (n=63) believed advisers provided them with sufficient assistance to correctly choose courses.  Walker (1994) examined the undergraduate experience at eight Canadian universities and found similar results.  While these studies asked the students their opinions of quality of service they did not address students' assumptions about how they would act and feel when interacting with an adviser.

Adviser/Advisee Interactions

During adviser/advisee interactions either intercultural communication (which occurs between individuals from the same culture), or crosscultural communication (between persons from different cultures), exists.  An effective strategy to enhance intercultural or crosscultural interaction would be the capacity to:  (1) communicate respect; (2) be non-judgmental; (3) personalise one's knowledge and perceptions; (4) display empathy; (5) be flexible; (6) take turns; and (7) have tolerance for ambiguity (Samovar & Porter, 1991).  Specifically for crosscultural communication, there are many cultural differences to be aware of - eye contact, physical contact, turn-taking, self-disclosure, comfort in ambiguity, comfort with silences, greetings, attention to listening, ways of dealing with conflict, and decision-making and persuasion styles (Moore, 1987).

Since most undergraduate academic advisers at University of British Columbia are European Canadian or Canadian and most undergraduate ethnic minority

and international students are Chinese or Asian, crosscultural communication taking place in the advising relationship would be eastern versus western. This puts the onus on the adviser to be aware that discursively Asian students may need to be probed more to reveal adequate self-disclosure and individualistic needs, and that their non-argumentative communicative style might be more a reflection of cultural conditioning, of filial piety and "face-saving" tactics, rather than actual thoughts and feelings. Cultural sensitivity and awareness must come from within the institution through the crosscultural communication skills of the academic adviser. By being mindful of potential cultural differences, advisers can use their communication skills to better enhance the quality of successful interaction which takes place in the adviser/advisee relationship.

While Canadian studies on academic advising reveal a significant level of students' dissatisfaction with advisers and advising, researchers have yet to investigate the adviser/advisee relationship. As the study body expands to include an increasing number of ethnic minorities and international students, crosscultural communication becomes a daily phenomenon in the advising process. Since Canada is a mosaic of different ethnic cultures, advisers' increased knowledge and awareness of crosscultural communication may enhance the advising experience for all students. As even two Canadians, an Italian-Canadian adviser and a Japanese-Canadian student, engage in the advising process, the adviser's skill to facilitate a positive interaction may "make or break" the advising encounter.

# CHAPTER III

# Culture and Personality

Three research questions are being addressed by this thesis: (1) if students from various cultural backgrounds differ in their assumptions of interacting with academic advisers; (2) if Hofstede's dimensions of culture can be operationalized to measure university adviser/advisee relationships; and (3) if Hofstede's dimensions of cultural difference "hold-up" when deployed in a study of advising relationships.

This chapter explores five issues concerning culture and personality, namely: (1) how to measure culture; (2) how to measure personality; (3) the reliability of a western personality instrument when assessing people from outside western cultures; (4) the relationship between culture and personality; and (5) the interaction between a student's culture and personality and its effect on the advising process.

## 3.1   Dimensions of Culture

Hofstede (1980) surveyed more than 116,000 people, through 1967 to 1973, who worked for a multinational corporation in 66 different countries (the survey was translated into 20 languages). The questions dealt with the worker's values, satisfaction, and perception. Through statistical analysis he came up with a four-dimensional model of cultural differences: Power Distance, Uncertainty Avoidance, Individualism, and Masculinity.

Hofstede found that countries differed on their ratings of these four cultural dimensions. For instance, people in Western countries, such as Canada and the United States, scored substantially lower than those in Eastern countries on Power Distance and Uncertainty Avoidance, yet significantly higher on Individualism (see Table 2). Each dimension used in this study will now be discussed.

Power Distance

Hofstede (1980) defined Power Distance as the degree to which members of a society believe power to be legitimate. It is the distance, observed by a subordinate, between the subordinate and his or her authority figure. Hofstede measured Power Distance using three questions which dealt with: (1) perceptions of the superior's style of decision-making; (2) colleagues' fear to disagree with superiors; and (3) the type of decision-making which subordinates prefer in their boss. Hofstede (1980) claimed that "People are more accurate in describing others than in describing themselves" (p. 103). However, his crosscultural study took place within each country so participants would be describing others of the same cultural background. Yet, for this study, the ethnic minority students would be describing the "Western" Canadian student rather than themselves if questions were not asked to reflect their own feelings.

Uncertainty Avoidance

Uncertainty Avoidance is the degree to which members of a society feel uncomfortable with the unknown and ambiguity (Hofstede, 1980). He asserted that Uncertainty Avoidance leads to the beliefs needed to maintain conformity in institutions. In tight cultures people feel anxious and insecure since their behaviour can easily be found to be improper. Japan has been described as the prototypical tight culture and this is displayed in Hofstede's results (see Table 2).

On average Hofstede claimed that homogeneous cultures were tight whereas more heterogeneous cultures like Canada and the United States were looser. However, Hong Kong and Singapore were two homogeneous cultures found to be low in Uncertainty Avoidance perhaps because these are two cultures where East (China) meets West (Britain). Loose cultures are quite tolerant of behaviour that does not conform to expectations, whereas people from tight cultures enjoy predictability,

certainty, and security. They like to know what a person from a looser culture is going to do and get upset if their expectations are not met. Hence, people from Western cultures may contain less Uncertainty Avoidance as a cultural trait.

Table 2

Extent to which Cultural Dimensions Occur in Eight Societies*

| Country | Power Distance | Uncertainty Avoidance | Individualism |
|---|---|---|---|
| Canada | 39 | 48 | 80 |
| USA | 40 | 46 | 91 |
| Japan | 54 | 92 | 46 |
| Hong Kong | 68 | 29 | 25 |
| Thailand | 64 | 64 | 20 |
| Taiwan | 58 | 69 | 17 |
| Singapore | 74 | 8 | 20 |
| Philippines | 94 | 44 | 32 |

*The higher the number, the greater the quantity. Hence, the U.S.A. has more "individualism" than, say Taiwan.

Hofstede (1980) believed people try to cope with uncertainty through technology, law, and religion. Therefore, he used three indicators to measure Uncertainty Avoidance: (1) rule orientation; (2) employment stability; and (3) stress. For the first indicator of Uncertainty Avoidance, rule orientation, he asked whether or not workers believed company rules should not be broken, even if it is in the company's best interest. Disagreement indicated a higher level of tolerance for uncertainty; in contrast, those who wished to avoid uncertainty would not like to decide

whether or not a rule should be broken. This "authority of rules" relates conceptually to Uncertainty Avoidance, while the authority of persons relates to Power Distance.

Individualism

Individualism exhibits the relationship between the individual and the collectivity which dominates in a particular society (Hofstede, 1980). Therefore, it is thought to account for a great deal of social behaviour. Individualism is prominent in the West and collectivism in the East (see Table 2). In some cultures, Individualism is seen as a good thing and a source of well-being. In others, it is seen as alienating. Individualist and collectivist cultures differ among many beliefs. For instance, in individualist cultures, personal goals are more important to members of that culture than are in-group goals, whereas collectivists put the needs of the groups' above their own. They do this not always out of full compassion for others, but with the belief that in the long-run they will benefit from it. Collectivists also believe more strongly in the acceptance of high Power Distance through hierarchy which could account for why many countries scoring low on Individualism conversely score high on Hofstede's (1980) Power Distance dimension (see Table 2). As well, harmony and face-saving are important attributes among collectivists, who prefer to resolve conflicts amicably to a greater extent than do individualists (Leung, 1987).

Hofstede (1980) measured the taking of individual initiative based on six work goals - personal time, freedom, and challenge, (which stress the person's independence from the organization and the individual's personal accomplishment, and positively relate to individualism) and use of skills, physical conditions and training (which stress what the organization should do for the individual, and negatively relate to individualism). Hofstede claims that worker's compliance to company regulations is more of a moral involvement from collectivists and calculative involvement from individualists.

## 3.2 Critiquing Hofstede

Hofstede's (1980) dimensions of culture are widely referenced in the fields of crosscultural communication (see Keaten et al., 1997; Kim et al., 1996) and organizational management (see Offermann & Hellmann, 1997; Suzuki, 1997). The most popular of his four dimensions which has spurred further investigation and research was Individualism/Collectivism (see Bhawuk & Brislin, 1992; Fijneman et al., 1996; Hui & Triandis, 1986; Schwartz, 1990, 1994). By conducting research in 66 countries, 40 of which were used in the analysis, Hofstede has provided cross-cultural psychologists with a basis from which to select cultures for comparisons (e.g., Bond & Forgas, 1984; Gudykunst, Yang, & Nishida, 1985). However, one concern about Hofstede's (1980) dimensions is that they may not produce applicable results around the world (Chinese Culture Connection, 1987). However, Bond and others, from the Chinese Culture Connection (1987), developed a survey to study Chinese values and search for culture-free dimensions of culture. They did this by asking a number of Chinese social scientists to prepare in Chinese a list of at least ten "fundamental and basic values for Chinese people." Then respondents were asked to indicate on a 9-point scale how important each of the concepts was to them, where a score of 9 meant "of supreme importance" and a score of 1 meant "of no importance at all". Twenty-two Chinese nations were surveyed, mainly consisting of university students. Four factors were found: Integration, Confucian Work Dynamism, Human-Heartedness, and Moral Discipline. There were correlations among the four Hofstede dimensions and these four Chinese Values (CVS). While the second factor, Confucian work Dynamism, bore no relation to any of the Hofstede dimensions, there was a high and significant correlation between Hofstede's Masculinity and CVS's Human-Heartedness as a "feminine" valuing. Power Distance and Individualism correlated significantly with Integration and Moral Discipline. The researchers believe Integration and Moral

Discipline can be combined to create Collectivism. Hence, overlapping dimensions suggest that the dimensions were universal and relatable to Hofstede's. This backed the notion that Hofstede's western research findings that there are four dimensions of culture are applicable in the East. While anthropologists may cringe at the attempt to quantify culture into these categorical dimensions it is a valid attempt to rigorously compare cultural differences.

### 3.3   Measuring Personality

Both culture and personality may influence a person's behaviour, so personality was measured in this study in order to account for personal differences. For instance, two people from different cultures might behave similarly if they have opposing personalities. For instance, an introverted Canadian and an extroverted Japanese might rate similarly, not because of any similarities between their cultures, but because of the balancing of opposing factors of their personalities.

The standardised personality inventory used in this study, Costa and McCrae's (1992) NEO Five-Factor Inventory claims five factors constitute personality - Neuroticism, Extroversion, Openness, Agreeableness, and Conscientiousness - and that each of these is comprised of six facets.

Neuroticism facets:
N1: Anxiety
N2: Angry Hostility
N3: Depression
N4: Self-Consciousness
N5: Impulsiveness
N6: Vulnerability

Extroversion facets:
E1: Warmth
E2: Gregariousness
E3: Assertiveness
E4: Activity
E5: Excitement-Seeking
E6: Positive Emotions

Openness facets:
O1: Fantasy
O2: Aesthetics
O3: Feelings
O4: Actions
O5: Ideas
O6: Values

Agreeableness facets:
A1: Trust
A2: Straightforwardness
A3: Altruism
A4: Compliance
A5: Modesty
A6: Tender-Mindedness

Conscientiousness facets:
C1: Competence
C2: Order
C3: Dutifulness
C4: Achievement Striving
C5: Self-Discipline
C6: Deliberation
(Costa & McCrae, 1992, p.49).

How a student rates on these five personality factors will be taken into account later in regression equations to see how culture and personality predict adviser/advisee relationships.

### 3.4  Reliability of Western Personality Instrument

Many researchers would assert that a western personality test, like McCrae and Costa's (1992) is unrelatable to eastern personality factors. Because of this, in 1990 Bond and his colleagues and students at the Chinese University of Hong Kong began to collect data on a Chinese translation of the NEO PI-R, a 240-item measure of the Five-Factor Model. For example, Liu (1991), Luk and Bond (1993), and then Ho (1994) combined a sample of 352 subjects (161 male, 191 female) from first year psychology classes and found that the internal consistencies of the scales in the final

version were able to be generalized to the Chinese cultural context. One exception was "Values", which suggests that attitudes toward Openness to Experience may differ in American and Chinese cultures so the Chinese personality inventory should contain different items for it. Similarly, other researchers have found that Openness was not replicated in a Philippine (Guthrie & Bennett, 1971) or Japanese (Bond, Nakazata, & Shiraisihi, 1975), undergraduate sample. In the Japanese undergraduate sample, the fifth factor, Culture/Openness, emerged, but was only defined by two of four intended variables. Yik and Bond (1993) also researched Chinese personality self-ratings and found that Openness predicted their degree of Westernisation and academic major.

Researchers also attempted to measure personality from a distinctly Chinese perspective. Yang and Bond (1985) found factors derived from Chinese trait descriptive adjectives. They performed factor analyses on ratings of six targets, and found three bipolar factors which appeared to be reapplicable: Social orientation-Self-centeredness, Competency-Impotency, and Extraversion-Introversion. Later Yang and Bond (1990) reanalysed this data and identified what they called the 'Chinese Big Five': Social Orientation-Self-Centeredness, Competence-Impotence, Expressiveness-Conservativism, Self-Control-Impulsiveness, and Optimism-Neuroticism. Other researchers who created personality inventories since the early 1980's to examine the structure of Chinese personality, P.C. Cheung, Conger, Hau, Lew, and Lau (1992) also found that their item clusters lead to five reapplicable factors which further corresponded to the western five factor model. For instance, their Outgoing-Withdrawn corresponded to Extroversion, Self-Serving-Principled to low Conscientiousness, Conforming-Non-Conforming to low Openness, Unstable-Stable to Neuroticism, and Strict-Accepting to low Agreeableness. As well, Ho's (1994) factor analysis of Chinese personality suggested four factors which also correspond to the five factor model: (1) Job Confidence to Extroversion; (2) Filial Piety to Agreeableness;

(3) Authority Submission negatively to Openness; and (4) Neuroticism. Yik and Bond (1993) and Cheng, Cheng, Ng and Yip (1991) also found results which suggest that the same five factors are found in Chinese as in American samples. All these data support the claim that the dimensions of the Five-Factor-Model, like the NEO-FFI used in this study, are as important in Chinese as they are in Western psychology.

### 3.5   Relationship between Culture and Personality

Advising involves one-to-one interpersonal communication between an adviser and a student. How they interact may depend upon what Hofstede (1980) calls "human mental programming". There are three tiers to "human mental programming". At the base of the pyramid is the universal level which is shared by all mankind. It involves a person's biological functions and expressive behaviours such as laughing and crying and associative and aggressive behaviours similar to animals. At the second tier is the collective level in which different groups of people share beliefs and traditions due to their cultural background. It involves our language, amount of respect for elders, our nonverbal style of interaction, and so forth. At the top of the pyramid is the individual level where peoples' thinking becomes more distinct due to their individual personalities. Hence, a student's cultural background and personality may effect the way in which he or she communicates and feels similarly or differently from the adviser in the adviser/advisee relationship.

Since personality is enduring trait patterns of behaviour, or consistent tendency to behave in a certain way, a person's culture may have shaped his personality. In fact, cultural groups have been found to differ on personality traits. For instance, McCrae and associates (1998) found that Asian students were higher in Neuroticism, Introversion, and Agreeableness, and lower in Openness and Conscientiousness than North American college students. These Asian students' lower scores on Openness

may have been due to the fact Openness is defined differently in their culture, so they are not as open to the "American" rating of it. As well, they may have rated themselves lower on Conscientiousness because of their higher competition within themselves and harder judgment of themselves.

Between the collective and the individual level, personality factors are related to cultural dimensions of Power Distance, Uncertainty Avoidance, and Individualism. Since Power Distance measures the students' level of respect for authority, and Uncertainty Avoidance respect for institutional rules, Asian students who may score higher on these cultural predictors may also be higher in Neuroticism and Agreeableness. Concerning Agreeableness, researchers have found that Chinese in the People's Republic of China (Domino, 1992) and Chinese-Americans (Cook &Chi, 1980; Cox, Lobel, & McLeod, 1991) are more cooperative or equalitarian than are Caucasian Americans. Similarly, Trubisky, Ting-Toomey, and Lin (1991) found Taiwanese students preferred styles of conflict resolution that involved obliging, avoiding, compromising, and yielding more than Americans. Another way cultural dimensions may be related to personality factors are that Western students who may score higher on Individualism may also score higher on Extroversion, Openness, and Conscientiousness due to their stronger cultural base which values autonomous assertive behaviour and confidence. In contrast, Asian students may be lower in Extroversion, Openness, and Conscientiousness. For example, Shenkar and Ronen (1987) believe Chinese people use emotional restraint and self-control, conform to politeness rituals, and avoid aggressive persuasion techniques when negotiating or communicating.

Consequently, in the advising process a student's culture and personality may effect the adviser/advisee relationship since both may influence the communicative style of the student. The Western communication style is characterised by it's

assertive, linear logic which values self-disclosure and vocalisation so as to produce clarity and directness. It may appear higher in Extroversion, Openness, and lower in Agreeableness, than say, an Eastern communication style. For instance, Eastern or Chinese communication contains the characteristics of hanxu (implicit communication), tinghua (listening-centeredness), keqi (politeness), zijiren (a focus on insiders), and mianzi (face-directed communication strategies) (Gao, Ting-Toomey, and Gudykunst, 1996).

Hence, a student's personality and cultural influence on his or her communication style may negatively effect the way in which an adviser views the significance of the student's problem. For instance, if a student is introverted or has an implicit communication style they may not fully vocalise their needs. Consequently the adviser may not be shown the importance of their request. While most Chinese students might politely listen to advisers and perhaps not challenge them in order to save their own and the adviser's face (dignity), non-Asian Canadian students might vocalise their needs persistently until the adviser resolves the situation.

## 3.6 Effect of Culture and Personality in Advising

Culture effects individual's values, habits, tastes, beliefs, relationships, and goals, as does personality. Consequently, researchers have found that some personality factors are directly related to cultural traits. For instance, in Hong Kong, Ho (1994) found filial piety correlated with Agreeableness and, to a lesser extent, Conscientiousness. For this study filial piety could be related to Power Distance which in turn could be related to Agreeableness and Conscientiousness.

As well, mean level differences in personality trait scores may exist across cultures. For instance Canadians may be more extroverted than Chinese. Yet, acculturation may change behaviour. For instance, Chinese and other Asian students

who have been in Canada for a long period of time may be more Western than Chinese students who have lived in Canada for only a short time. Hence, culture is a complex variable to study since there are so many possible influential factors at play with it.

Recall the purposes of this study were to: (1) discover if students from different cultural backgrounds differ in their assumptions of interacting with academic advisers; (2) operationalize Hofstede's dimensions of culture to measure university adviser/advisee relationships; and (3) examine the extent to which Hofstede's dimensions of cultural difference "hold-up" when deployed in a study of adviser/advisee relationships.

This chapter discussed culture and personality measurement, research surrounding the reliability of a Western personality instrument, the relationship between culture and personality, and the interaction between student's culture and personality and its effect on the advising process. In the next chapter, the methodology of the study will be presented.

# CHAPTER IV

# Methodology

This study was designed to examine how students vary with respect to their adviser/advisee relationships. The other purposes were to operationalize Hofstede's (1980) dimensions of culture to measure university adviser/adviser relationships, and to examine the extent to which Hofstede's factors would remain intact when deployed in a study of academic advising. These purposes were accomplished by doing a survey as follows.

## 4.1   Instrument Development

The survey was constructed in three parts: (1) the Adviser/Advisee Relationship Scale (AARS) was created to operationalize and test the deployment of Hofstede's factors in a study of academic advising, and to see if students vary with respect to their assumptions about interacting with advisers; (2) the NEO Five-Factor Inventory (Costa & McCrae, 1992) was included as a standardised personality test to measure five factors of personality - Neuroticism, Extroversion, Openness, Agreeableness, and Conscientiousness; and (3) socio-demographic variables were included to collect comparable information about students. These three parts of the questionnaire will now be discussed.

## 4.2   Adviser/Advisee Relationship Scale (AARS)

The author created the AARS to measure student's dimensions of culture. One of three cultural dimensions - Uncertainty Avoidance, Power Distance, or Individualism - was built into each item. Ten items were created for each of the three dimensions totalling 30 items. The items were created to relate to the items Hofstede (1980) used to examine dimensions of culture.

<u>Operationalizing Hofstede's Dimensions of Culture</u>

In this part of the study the task was to deploy Hofstede's ideas in a study of advising. To make sure students answer questions within each of the three sets without acquiescing, reverse items were created to test for inconsistencies. For instance, the following pairs for Power Distance items display low then high Power Distance: 1 vs. 4, 2 vs. 3, 5 vs. 6, 8 vs. 7 and 9, and then 10 being high. Similarly oppositely paired items for Uncertainty Avoidance were created, such as: 8 vs. 1 and 6, 2 vs. 3 and 5, 7 and 10 vs. 9, and 4 being high. Lastly, for Individualism items, low to high pairs were: 2 vs. 10, 7 vs. 8, 3 vs. 5 and 6 and 9, and 1 as well as 4 by themselves displaying low individualism.

Validity was achieved by the following means. Eight education research students examined items that were written by the author. They were given a pack of cue cards with one item written on each card and asked to sort the cards under the three headings - Uncertainty Avoidance, Power Distance, or Individualism . Items not easy to classify were revised or omitted. The final version of AARS was developed.

<u>Items and Scaling</u>

Here are the three cultural dimensions comprising the AARS - their items and scaling.

<u>For Power Distance (PD):</u>

| When working with an Academic Adviser I would likely: | HIGH SCORER WOULD BE |
| --- | --- |
| 1. Argue my needs. | Low PD |
| 2. Question the Adviser's advice. | Low PD |
| 3. Accept the Adviser's authority. | High PD |
| 4. Only speak when spoken to. | High PD |
| 5. Expect the Adviser to bend rules for me. | Low PD |
| 6. Try to agree with the Adviser. | High PD |
| 7. Feel helpless; the Adviser is in control. | High PD |
| 8. Assert my own opinions. | Low PD |
| 9. Feel intimidated by the Adviser's authority. | High PD |
| 10. Want to meet across a table. | High PD |

Power Distance for this study is a measure of the interpersonal power or influence between an adviser and a student as assumed by the student. In the academic advising setting the adviser is in a power position in regard to the student. The adviser has knowledge of university policy and degree requirements, is in a position to direct the student, and has the power to bend rules for students. In the advising relationship, Power Distance exists mainly to the extent to which the student feels he or she is at the mercy of the adviser. For instance, the degree to which the student is willing to argue, question and assert him or herself would display a low Power Distance in comparison to agreeing with and accepting everything the adviser has to say. This was similar to one of the ways Hofstede (1980) measured Power Distance which was with questions which dealt with workers perceptions of colleagues' fear to disagree with superiors.

For Uncertainty Avoidance (UA):

| When working with an Academic Adviser I would likely: | HIGH SCORER WOULD BE |
| --- | --- |
| 1. Feel tense. | High UA |
| 2. Want to be given choices more than directions. | Low UA |
| 3. Want specific directions more than choices. | High UA |
| 4. Conform to University regulations. | High UA |
| 5. Want electives chosen for me. | High UA |
| 6. Feel nervous. | High UA |
| 7. Want to be left to make a final decision on my own. | Low UA |
| 8. Not feel fearful. | Low UA |
| 9. Give more information than needed. | High UA |
| 10. Not mind leaving without an 'answer'. | Low UA |

Uncertainty Avoidance has to do with the extent to which students feel comfortable with the adviser and with themselves in the advising setting - making their own decisions, for instance, choosing courses, and not minding having to wait for resolution to a problem. Recall Hofstede measured Uncertainty Avoidance in regard to: (1) rule orientation; (2) employment stability; and (3) stress. For this study rule

orientation was measured by students' likelihood to conform to institutional rules.  In place of measuring employment stability, which was not considered to be relatable to students since all of those in school are believed to think they are apt to finish their degree, students' comfort level was measured by finding out whether or not they mind having to make their own decisions.  For the third indicator, stress, students were given questions such as:  feel tense, feel nervous, and not feel fearful.

For Individualism (Ind):

| When working with an Academic Adviser I would likely: | HIGH SCORER WOULD BE |
|---|---|
| 1.  Take the lead in the conversation. | High Ind |
| 2.  Feel dependent on the Adviser. | Low Ind |
| 3.  Try to avoid conflict at all costs. | Low Ind |
| 4.  Not care what the Adviser's thinks of me. | High Ind |
| 5.  Try to manipulate the Adviser into giving me what I want. | High Ind |
| 6.  Not necessarily follow the Adviser's advice. | High Ind |
| 7.  Feel the Adviser is mainly on the University's side. | Low Ind |
| 8. Think the Adviser is on my side rather than the University's. | High Ind |
| 9.  Try to convince the Adviser to see things my way. | High Ind |
| 10.  Feel independent from the institution. | High Ind |

Hofstede (1980) defines Individualism as something which "describes the relationship between the individual and the collectivity which prevails in a given society" (p. 213).  For this study, Individualism was measured with items that might reflect students' individual initiative, such as the extent to which they would take the lead in the conversation, try to manipulate the adviser into giving them what they want, not follow the adviser's advice, and attempt to convince the adviser to see things their way.  Other questions depicting the extent to which students would feel independent from the adviser, not care what the adviser thinks of them, and their degree of independence from the institution.  Two other questions were included to show

whether or not students felt the adviser was on their side or the institution's. In collectivist cultures members feel more suspicion toward those in authority and people who are not in their "in-group" of family and immediate friends, whereas individualistic cultures would more likely believe the adviser is on their side rather than the University's. Students from individualistic cultures would also be more direct and assertive in their communication tactics and more autonomous in their behaviour.

Although Hofstede (1980) had a fourth dimension called Masculinity it was not measured in this study because it was not deemed relevant to advising. For instance, for Masculinity, Hofstede (1980) measured differences in work goal importance to compare those workers who endorse: (1) male goals, such as advancement and earnings; and (2) female goals such as interpersonal aspects, rendering service, and physical environment. Yet for this study, all respondents have the same goals regardless of gender; mainly to graduate, achieve good grades and hope the adviser will meet their needs. Also, Masculinity was not included because the built in concept of advancement goal (masculine) versus interpersonal aspects (feminine) was viewed by the author as being similar to the Individualism/Collectivism dimension. Gender was included as an independent variable.

### 4.3 NEO Five-Factor Inventory

Costa and McCrae's (1992) NEO Five-Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI) was employed as a standardised personality test. It measures: Neuroticism, Extroversion, Openness, Conscientiousness and Agreeableness. Each factor is comprised of six facet scales (see pages 22 and 23).

The NEO-FFI is a shortened version (from 181 to 60 items) of Form S of the NEO PI-R. It consists of five 12-item scales that measure each of five domains. On average, the NEO-FFI scales account for 75 per cent as much variance as the full NEO

PI validimax factors (Costa and McCrae, 1992). As expected when forming abbreviated scales, some precision is traded for speed and convenience.

All NEO-FFI scales are roughly balanced to control for acquiescence. This means that respondents who use an excessive number of agree or strongly agree responses will tend to receive average scores. The last item, a general validity check, will sometimes identify a random respondent who happens to answer disagree or strongly disagree.

## 4.4   Socio-Demographic Variables

Since this study's focus was on whether different types of students interact with their advisers in the advising process differently it was necessary to collect demographic data pertaining to: (1) personal descriptors; (2) cultural indicators; and (3) location in the University.

Personal Descriptors

Gender and age were used as personal descriptors.

Three Cultural Indicators

This study was primarily designed to examine ethnocultural predictors of adviser/advisee relationship. It is not easy to ascertain a person's ethnocultural orientation. Hence, three variables were used to measure different, though related, aspects of culture - Self-Defined Culture, First Language, and Country of Birth. Other variables of culture to account for acculturation were: Time in Canada and International Student Status.

(1) Self-Defined Culture

Many Canadians are of different ethnic heritage. For instance, there are French Canadians, Chinese Canadians, English Canadians, Italian Canadians, and so on. Each of these would all be coded separately and then later regrouped together under

"North American". However, for those who listed three or more nationalities the first one was coded plus Canadian, if Canadian was one of three listed. For example, if Irish-Italian-Canadian was given then "Irish Canadian" was used and coded, but if Irish-Italian-German was listed only Irish would be coded. Some Canadians call themselves Canadian, others by their ethnic background, for instance, Japanese. Whichever way the student defined themselves was the way it was taken and later regrouped into one of five categories: North American, Asian Canadian, European, Asian, or Other. Hence, it was decided to form an open-ended question to allow for the student's own interpretation of themselves as follows: "Every person has a different family origin, culture and nationality. Also, each person may have their own sense of who they are. To what cultural group do you feel you belong?"

(2) First language Spoken

It is not a simple task to determine languages spoken in a household. In this study although a full range of individual languages were to be gathered the author knew they would later be collapsed into four comparable categories: European, Arabic, Asian and African. Since English, a European language, would be a common first or second language in addition to a students ethnic language such as Chinese, students were asked to only give their first language. First language is also referred to by anthropologists as "Mother tongue" and there is a good chance that the mother's native language would be the first language taught to a child. Hence, it was decided to form the question as follows: "What language from the list below, did you first learn to speak? (Check one only)."

(3) Country of Birth

It is difficult to tell a students' ethnic background simply by their self-defined culture. Many students call themselves Canadian though they were born in a different country like Taiwan. If we know they were born in Taiwan we also have a good

chance of guessing they are Chinese. Yet time in Canada and whether they are an International student may also give a better idea of their level of acculturation or "Westernisation". Hence, the question was broken down into four parts: (a) Were you born in Canada?; (if not) (b) In which country were you born?; (c) How long have you lived in Canada? (in years and months); and, (d) Are you an International Student?

Location to the University

Descriptive data such as faculty, subjects taken, use or non-use of advising and counselling services, year of University, and worst and best grades were asked to be able to compare students concerning their location to the University.

## 4.5   Study Population

This was an ex post facto study - a survey - where more significance was attached to relationships between variables within the data than to the "representativeness" of the sample. Moreover, these days it is exceedingly difficult to secure access to a random sample of university students. Hence, data for this study was secured in three phases from a population-of-convenience as described below.

## 4.6   Procedures (Data Collection)

Phase One: Students sitting at tables in the cafeteria of the UBC Student Union building were approached and the author greeted them with, "Hi. I'm a Graduate student here at UBC and I'm doing my thesis on students' interaction with academic advisers. This survey is for my thesis. It takes ten to fifteen minutes to complete. It's anonymous so I won't be needing your name. Would you be interested in filling it out for me?". If the student agreed the author gave them the survey and a pen and while they were in the process of filling it out the author approached other students and handed out more surveys to be completed.

Sometimes a student would say, "But I don't think I've ever met with an

academic adviser so maybe I can't fill out this survey".

The author would reply, "That's O.K. The survey is based on students' assumptions rather than perceptions so it is about how you would feel or act".

Then the student would agree to fill it out, possibly based on their initial interest. If they disagreed the author would smile and say, "O.K. no problem", and walk away to approach other potential participants. Approximately 180 surveys were completed in this manner.

Phase Two: The author tried to disseminate surveys through friends and colleagues. For instance, four friends were given ten surveys each to give to other students they knew in their classes or dorms. Three of the four friends returned approximately seven out of ten surveys.

Phase Three: During this phase the questionnaire was administered to approximately three small UBC Education classes of 25 or less and eleven large undergraduate classes of 80 or more. First, the author approached individual professors, with large classes, in English, Chemistry, Biology, Political Science, Physics and Geography, in order to obtain a well rounded sample of students from different faculties. She approached them by leaving a survey and cover letter in their campus mailbox and then contacted them through e-mail a couple days later. Only six out of twelve positive responses were received from this attempt; two of the other six flat-out refused and the other four were not able to be contacted. Then the author tried to reach professors in-person at their offices on campus to explain her research and need for survey dissemination. Four out of five professors contacted in this manner agreed to help. If the professor was interested then the author made plans to go to that class ten minutes before it was to start, or for ten minutes after it was to finish, to hand out her questionnaire to students. Each time the author briefly introduced herself and put an overhead on the projector which she read aloud (see Appendix III).

## 4.7 Preparing Data For Analysis

Spreadsheet

SPSS 7.5 was used to create a spreadsheet containing subjects' answers. A category was created for each item and labelled accordingly. Variable names and value labels were assigned to each item.

Incomplete surveys/missing data

Unfinished surveys, that included demographic data of gender or culture, were still put in to the SPSS program to be used even as partial data. For the first part of the survey, the AARS, missing data was left uncoded and SPSS set to average the score for categories containing missing data. However, in the midsection of the survey, the NEO-FFI, if nine or fewer items were left blank the Neutral response was recorded for those items as instructed in the NEO-FFI manual.

Scoring the instruments

For the first two of the three parts of the questionnaire, the AARS and NEO-FFI, Likert scales were used. For the AARS a six-point Likert scale - (1) Strongly Disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Slightly Disagree, (4) Slightly Agree, (5) Agree, (6) Strongly Agree - was used to code respondents' answers. Then the recode command was used to reverse responses to items which loaded negatively for the factor analysis (see Table 4: Factors of Adviser/Advisee Relationships). Items which needed to be reverse coded were: UA8, PD8, IND8, IND1, UA2 and UA7.

For the NEO-FFI, a five-point Likert scale - (1) Strongly Disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Neutral, (4) Agree, (5) Strongly Agree - was implemented. Then the recode command was used to reverse responses for the following inverse items: P1, P3, P8, P9, P12, P14, P15, P16, P18, P23, P24, P27, P29, P30, P31, P33, P38, P39, P42, P44, P45, P46, P48, P54, P55, P57, P59. Then P1 + P6 + P11, (continuing on in intervals of five), were added together and then divided by twelve to get the Neuroticism score for

each respondent. This was done using the SPSS 7.5 program by asking it to add those twelve items together and then divide by their sum. The same process was then done with P2 + P7, and so forth, for Extroversion; P3 + P8, etc., for Openness; P4 + P9, etc., for Agreeableness; and, P5 + P10, etc., for Conscientiousness.

For the third part of the questionnaire, the socio-demographic questions, gender was scored using 1 for Man and 0 for Woman. Age was scored in years. The cultural predictors - First Language, Self-Defined Culture, and Country of Birth - underwent three levels of coding (see 'Coding Independent Variables' p. 42-47). Length of time in Canada was converted to months and then renamed Time Influence with those here less than 59 months as 1 and more than as 0. International Student Status and whether they have talked to different types of advisers were all coded using 1 for yes and 0 for no. For the question of student's Faculty, each Faculty given was assigned a number and then those Faculties who had less than fifteen respondents were grouped into Other in order to make the statistical analysis more manageable. For Year of University, each answer was given a number and then later recoded to make it into an interval variable up to seven years. For instance, Diploma Program, First Year Education, Masters, Law, and Twelve Month Education were all recoded as 5 for Fifth Year, while Unclassified Year, and Audit were recoded as 1 for First Year.

## 4.8   Test Retest Reliability

Two procedures were used to examine the reliability of the AARS. A post-test was given to a class of over one hundred students two weeks after it's initial completion. Both times participants were asked to print their day, year, and city of birth on the first page in the top right hand corner for matching purposes. While 125 surveys had been collected from the class during the pretest, of those nineteen did not identify their day, year or city of birth. For the post-test 96 completed the questionnaire

and, of those 96, nine failed to identify their day, year, city of birth. Overall, 55 surveys were able to be matched.

The pretest post-test was analysed by producing a correlation matrix for the derived factors (see Table 3), reported in Chapter 5, as well as individual items which comprised those factors (see Table 4). For instance, responses made to item 1 on the "test" were compared to item 1 on the "retest". And so on for items 2 to 23. The Pearson product-moment correlations for each item are shown in Table 4.

Table 3

Test Retest Scores for Four AARS Factors

| Factor | Test | | Retest | | |
| | $\overline{X}$ | SD | $\overline{X}$ | SD | Corr. |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Nervous Helplessness | 3.55 | .33 | 3.46 | .25 | .37** |
| Uncertainty Avoidance | 3.82 | .47 | 3.82 | .40 | .65*** |
| Manipulative Assertiveness | 3.39 | .47 | 3.34 | .36 | .45*** |
| Passive Compliance | 3.41 | .62 | 3.35 | .62 | .80*** |

** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed).
*** Correlation is significant at the .001 level (2-tailed).

Next scale scores derived from the factors were then calculated. The "test" scale scores were then compared with the "retest" ones and all all but two of the twenty-three were significantly correlated at the .01 level (see Table 4). One item, UA4, did not correlate significantly, while one item, PD7, correlated at the .05 level.

Hence, with respect to consistency over-time, the AARS was declared reliable.

Internal consistency is another matter but was addressed by performing the factor

analyses reported in Chapter 5.

Table 4

Test Retest Scores for the AARS

| | Item | Test | | Retest | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | X | SD | X | SD | r |
| I | UA8 not feel fearful | 4.07 | 1.02 | 4.18 | 1.09 | .39** |
| | UA6 feel nervous | 3.67 | 1.06 | 3.47 | 1.12 | .75** |
| | PD9 feel intimidated | 3.20 | 1.13 | 2.85 | 1.06 | .47** |
| | UA1 feel tense | 3.29 | 1.15 | 3.05 | 1.03 | .58** |
| | PD7 feel helpless | 2.47 | 1.07 | 2.22 | .88 | .34* |
| | PD8 assert opinions | 4.67 | .70 | 4.69 | .77 | .64** |
| | IND7 feel A. on U's side | 3.18 | 1.26 | 3.27 | 1.08 | .81** |
| | IND8 feel A. on my side | 3.67 | 1.02 | 3.58 | .90 | .76** |
| | PD4 speak when spoken to | 3.44 | 1.10 | 3.38 | 1.11 | .57** |
| | IND1 take the lead | 3.80 | 1.10 | 3.85 | .97 | .58** |
| II | UA3 want directions | 2.89 | 1.05 | 2.96 | .90 | .62** |
| | UA2 want choices | 4.56 | .83 | 4.55 | .83 | .56** |
| | UA7 want to make decision | 5.05 | .71 | 4.96 | .74 | .64** |
| | UA5 want electives chosen | 2.78 | 1.26 | 2.82 | 1.20 | .77** |
| III | IND5 try to manipulate | 2.53 | 1.15 | 2.51 | 1.14 | .60** |
| | PD5 expect rules bent | 4.58 | .92 | 4.51 | .94 | .57** |
| | IND9 convince Adviser | 3.81 | 1.07 | 3.73 | 1.01 | .71** |
| | PD2 question advice | 3.25 | 1.00 | 3.28 | 1.02 | .54** |
| | PD1 argue my needs | 2.76 | .99 | 2.69 | .94 | .53** |
| IV | UA4 conform to regulations | 1.89 | 1.07 | 1.96 | .72 | .26 |
| | IND3 avoid conflict | 4.49 | .98 | 4.22 | 1.08 | .67** |
| | PD3 accept authority | 3.84 | .98 | 3.89 | .94 | .65** |
| | PD6 try to agree | 3.44 | .79 | 3.33 | .86 | .55** |

* Correlation is significant at .05 level (2-tailed).
** Correlation is significant at .01 level (2-tailed).

## 4.9    Coding Independent Variables

**Self-Defined Culture**

In these post modern times identifying a respondent's "culture" is no easy task. Recall, that at the centre of this study was the notion that respondents from different parts of the world approach and interact with their advisers differently.

In the questionnaire respondents answered this question: "Every person has a different family origin, culture and nationality.  Also, each person may have their own sense of who they are.  To what cultural group do you feel you belong? (Please specify)."  Some respondents wrote "Canadian, " or "Irish-Canadian".  Others noted their religion (e.g. "Jewish") and a few put "None" or "Trash".  This variable of Self-Defined Culture was coded in a highly, medium, and low differentiated way.

Phase One:  High Differentiation

For the 1209 students surveyed, hundreds of students wrote a unique answer for their self-defined culture, such as "high flying white guy", which was put under Frivolous (70), to extensive answers such as Pakistani Kuwaiti English Canadian which was put under Pakistani Canadian (17.5).  Recall that for answers with more than two combined nationalities the first one and Canadian were combined, or if Canadian was not one of them, just the first country given was coded.  During this phase a numeric code was assigned to 103 categories as follows:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1 = Canadian | 28 = Irish | 59=Korean |
| 2 = European Canadian | 29 = French | 60=Chinese |
| 3 = Irish Canadian | 30 = Scottish | 61=Japanese |
| 2.5 = Norwegian Canadian | 31 = German | 62=South Asian |
| 4 = German Canadian | 32 = Ukrainian | 63 = Indian* |
| 5 = Scottish Canadian | 32.5 = Polish | 64 = Vietnamese |
| 6 = English Canadian | 33 = Croatian | 65 = Burman |
| 7 = Dutch Canadian | 33.5 = Czech | 66 = Singaporean |
| 8 = French Canadian | 34 = Hungarian | 67 = Malaysian |
| 9 = Polish Canadian | 35 = Portuguese | 68 = Indonesian |
| 10 = Czech Canadian | 36 = Italian | 69 = Filipino |
| 11 = Croatian Canadian | 37 = Greek | 70 = Frivolous** |

11.5 = Serbian Canadian 38 = Israeli 71 = Atheist
12 = Estonian Canadian 39 = Iranian 72 = Jewish
13 = Ukrainian Canadian 40 = Persian 73 = Christian
13.5 = Hungarian Canadian 41 = Armenian 73.1 = Catholic
14 = Italian Canadian 42 = Pakistani 73.2 = Protestant
14.5 = Portuguese Canadian 43 = Egyptian 74 = Mennonite
15 = Persian Canadian 44 = Eurasian 75 = Muslim
14.6 = Turkish Canadian 45 = Norwegian Japanese 75.5 = Sikh
16 = Israeli Canadian 46 = Italian Japanese 76 = None
17 = Islamic Muslim Canadian 47 = White Asian 77 = Every culture
17.5 = Pakistani Canadian 48 = English Chinese 78.5 = North American
18 = Indo Canadian 49 = Portuguese Chinese 78 = American
19 = Mexican/Spanish Canadian 49.5 = Anglo-Indian 79 = Latin American
20 = Afro-Canadian 49.6 = Korean Caucasian 80 = First Nations
21 = Eurasian Canadian 50 = Asian Canadian 81 = Africa
22 = European 51 = Chinese Canadian 82 = Caribbean
23.5 = Danish 52 = Korean Canadian 83 = Jamaican
23 = Finnish 53 = Japanese Canadian 84 = New Zealander
24 = Scandinavian 54 = Filipino Canadian 84.5 = Russian
24.5 = Norwegian 55 = Vietnamese Canadian 85 = Blank - incompletion
25 = Swiss 56 = Taiwanese Canadian 86 = Blank due to choice
26 = Dutch 57 = Asian 87 = not sure
27 = English 58 = Taiwanese 89 = Caucasian

* (Indian, Sikh, East Indian, Hindus, Punjabi)
** (anything other than ethnicity or religion, ie. trash, high-flying white guy, etc.)
note: numerical values containing .5 were included into the list, at its most appropriate
spot, at a later time.

Phase Two:  Medium Differentiation

Using the recode command in SPSS, the 103 codes were then collapsed into

25 to produce:

1 = North American (1, 78, 78.5)
2 = North and North West European Canadian (2-8)
3 = North East European Canadian (9, 10, 12, 13, 13.5)
4 = South East European Canadian  (11, 11.5, 14)
5 = South West European Canadian  (14.5)
6 = Middle Eastern Canadian (14.6-17)
7 = South Asian Canadian  (17.5, 18)
8 = Asian Canadian  (50-56)
9 = European, North and North West European (22-31)
10 = North East European (32, 32.5, 34)

11 = South West European (35)
12 = South East European  (33, 33.5, 36, 37)
13 = Middle Eastern  (38-41, 43)
14 = Other (44-49.6, 71-77, 89)
15 = Asian and East Asian (57-61)
16 = South Asian (42, 62, 63)
17 = South East Asian (64-69)
18 = Frivolous (70)
19 = Latin American (79)
20 = First Nations (80)
21 = Latin cultures (79, 83, 82)
22 = African (81)
23 = New Zealand (84)
24 = blank due to incompletion (85)
25 = blank due to choice (86)

Phase Three:  Low Differentiation

During this phase the 25 codes were collapsed, using the SPSS recode

command, into five codes to represent continental regions.  Of exception, Asian

Canadian was kept as its own separate code since most crosscultural interaction to

occur at UBC for adviser/advisee relationships may be Western versus Eastern.

1 = North American (1-6)
2 = Asian Canadian (7-8)
3 = European (9-12)
4 = Asian (15-17)
5 = Other (13, 14, 18-25)

Although there was some analysis based on the more differentiated

categorisations of Self-Defined Culture it was the low differentiation schema, with the

group Other omitted, that was deployed to examine adviser/advisee relationships.

**First  Language**

In the questionnaire respondents answered the question:  "What language from

the list below, did you first learn to speak?".  The first twelve answers were supplied for

them and then an additional box marked "Other (Please specify)" was added to be

able to embrace all possible answers. There were 44 answers in total.

Phase One:  High Differentiation

During this phase a numeric code was assigned to each first language given:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1 = English | 16 = Taiwanese | 31 = Tamil |
| 2 = Italian | 17 = Tagalog | 32 = Portuguese |
| 3 = German | 18 = Korean | 33 = Urdu |
| 4 = French | 19 = Persian | 34 = Filipino |
| 5 = Cantonese | 20 = Lao | 35 = Marathi |
| 6 = Japanese | 21 = Fujian | 36 = Armenian |
| 7 = Mandarin | 22 = Croatian | 37 = Hungarian |
| 8 = Vietnamese | 23 = Russian | 38 = Farsi |
| 9 = Hindi | 24 = Arabic | 39 = Norwegian |
| 10 = Punjabi | 25 = Swedish | 40 = Chinese Dialect |
| 11 = Spanish | 26 = Thai | 41 = Hebrew |
| 12 = Ukrainian | 27 = (later omitted) | 42 = Serbian |
| 13 = Czech | 28 = Finnish | 43 = Greek |
| 14 = Karachi | 29 = Tigrinya | 44 = Dinka |
| 15 = Gujarati | 30 = Polish | |

Phase Two:  Medium Differentiation

During this phase the 44 categories from Phase One were collapsed, using the recode command, into ten.  These ten codes were chosen to represent languages spoken in the regions of Europe and Asia, and the continents of North America, Africa, and the Middle East.  The high differentiated languages were recoded as follows:

1 = North American (1, 4)
2 = North and North West European (3, 25, 28, 39)
3 = North Eastern European (12, 13, 22, 23, 30, 37, 42)
4 = South Eastern European (2, 43)
5 = South Western European (11, 32)
6 = Middle Eastern (19, 24, 33, 36, 38, 41)
7 = East Asian (5, 6, 7, 16, 18, 21, 40)
8 = South East Asian (8, 17, 20, 26, 34)
9 = South Asian (9, 10, 14, 15, 31, 35)
10 = African (29, 44)

Phase Three:  Low Differentiation

In order to compare students culturally by first language the ten codes were

then collapsed, using the recode command, into four. This was done to allow the comparison of European, Middle Eastern, Asian, and African languages. Hence, the ten regions were collapsed as follows:

1 = European (1,2,3,4,5)   2 = Middle Eastern (6)   3 = Asian (7,8,9)   4 = African (10)

Once again, the low differentiation categorisation was employed when using First Language as a variable.

**Country of Birth**

For Country of Birth, respondents were asked, "Were you born in Canada?." If so, they were asked to check the box marked "Yes" and then to skip to question 9. If they were not born in Canada they were expected to go on to the next three questions which asked, "In which country were you born?", "How long have you lived in Canada?", and "Are you an International Student?." While time in Canada was recorded in years and months, and International student status yes = 1 and no = 0, for the open ended question, "In which country were you born?" each answer was given a numeric code and analysed as follows.

Phase One:  High Differentiation

During this phase a numeric code was assigned to each respondent. The following 42 categories were given:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 0 = Canada | 15 = Korea | 30 = Hokkian/Chinese |
| 1 = Britain | 16 = Malaysia | 31 = Austria |
| 2 = Brunei | 17 = Philippines | 32 = Eritirea/Ethiopia |
| 3 = Burma | 18 = Poland | 33 = Trinidad |
| 4 = China | 19 = Scotland | 34 = New Zealand |
| 5 = Czech Rep. | 20 = Taiwan | 35 = South America |
| 6 = El Salvador | 21 = Vietnam | 36 = Brazil |
| 7 = Fiji | 22 = Singapore | 37 = Belgium |
| 8 = Germany | 23 = France | 38 = United Arabic Emirates |
| 9 = Hong Kong | 24 = U.S.A. | 39 = Chile |
| 10 = India | 25 = Indonesia | 40 = Peru |
| 11 = Iran | 26 = Australia | 41 = Israel |
| 12 = Jamaica | 27 = Ukraine | 42 = Norway |

13 = Japan          28 = Egypt
14 = Kenya          29 = Switzerland

## Phase Two:  Medium Differentiation

During this phase the 42 categories from Phase One were collapsed into eleven to put countries into regions of continents, such as Western Europe and Eastern Europe.  They were collapsed as follows:

1 = Canada/U.S.A (0, 24)
2 = West Europe (1, 8, 19, 23, 29, 31, 37, 42, 43)
3 = East Europe (5, 18, 27)
4 = Middle East (11, 28, 38, 41)
5 = India (10)
6 = East Asia (4, 9, 13, 15, 20, 30)
7 = South East Asia (2, 3, 16, 17, 22, 21, 25)
8 = Africa (14, 32)
10 = South Pacific (7, 26, 34)
11 = Latin America (6, 12, 33, 35, 36, 39, 40)

## Phase Three:  Low Differentiation

For this phase the ten codes were collapsed, using the recode command, to represent a stronger divide between eastern and western countries as follows:

1 = West (1, 2, 3)
2 = Middle East (4)
3 = East (5, 6, 7)
4 = Other (8, 9, 10)

The categories from low differentiation were used in the statistical analysis for this study.

These three variables -Self-Defined Culture, First Language, and Country of Birth - were used in this research to act as cultural predictors for the analysis.  The next chapter will show the factors of the adviser/advisee relationship which emerged and how students scores differed on those factors according to these three cultural predictors.

# CHAPTER V

# Results

The purpose of this study was to examine ethnocultural predictors of adviser/advisee relationships. With this in mind the author administered a questionnaire to 1209 students at UBC. Nested in this questionnaire were 30 items (concerning student advising) derived from Hofstede's (1980) dimensions of culture.

The purpose of this chapter is to present a factor structure of the Hofstede items, derive scale scores, and present bivariate relationships between AARS scores and independent variables such as gender, subject enrolled, in and so on.

## 5.1 Factor Structure of Adviser/Advisee Relationships

A correlation matrix was calculated off the raw scores on each of the 30 Hofstede items for the 1182 respondents for whom data was available. This matrix was then subject to a variety of principal component analyses. At first, the author requested the rotation without limiting the number of factors. This yielded five factors. The first explained 17 per cent of the variance and contained three Uncertainty Avoidance items, four Power Distance items, and two Individualism items, one of which was split across two factors. Factor II, IV, and V were similarly comprised of a mixture of items, whereas Factor III contained all Uncertainty Avoidance items.

Four items which loaded below .40 were taken out and new rotations produced. After continuing to delete items loading below .40, fourteen different solutions (with both orthogonal and oblique rotations) were generated and examined. It became apparent that four factors best displayed an adequate grouping of items. When items were forced into three factors the grouping of all Uncertainty Avoidance items got compounded with Power Distance items, so keeping a four factor model allowed for a

cleaner categorisation. Hence, the four factor solution shown in Table 5 was deployed to generate scale scores for each respondent.

Table 5

Factors of Adviser/Advisee Relationships

| | FACTORS | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| I | II | III | IV |
| Nervous Helplessness | Uncertainty Avoidance | Manipulative Assertiveness | Passive Compliance |
| UA8 | -.77 | – | – | – |
| UA6 | .76 | – | – | – |
| PD9 | .74 | – | – | – |
| UA1 | .70 | – | – | – |
| PD7 | .60 | – | – | – |
| PD8 | -.60 | – | – | – |
| IND7 | .56 | – | – | – |
| IND8 | -.55 | – | – | – |
| PD4 | .43 | – | – | – |
| IND1 | -.41 | – | – | – |
| UA3 | – | .65 | – | – |
| UA2 | – | -.62 | – | – |
| UA7 | – | -.62 | – | – |
| UA5 | – | .58 | – | – |
| IND5 | – | – | .70 | – |
| PD5 | – | – | .66 | – |
| IND9 | – | – | .63 | – |
| PD2 | – | – | .47 | – |
| PD1 | – | – | .44 | – |
| UA4 | – | – | – | .73 |
| IND3 | – | – | – | .70 |
| PD3 | – | – | – | .67 |
| PD6 | – | – | – | .52 |
| % of variance | 21.45 | 11.91 | 7.83 | 6.68 |
| cumulative % of variance | 21.45 | 33.36 | 41.19 | 47.87 |

All factors consisted of items where agreeing and disagreeing (with each item stem) were included; hence, negative values emerged. This is a desirable situation

because it suggests that respondents were not acquiescing to authoritative sounding items. The loadings shown here were derived from a varimax rotation with Kaiser normalizations.

The factors that emerged did not replicate Hofstede's structure. One, Uncertainty Avoidance, was similar to what Hofstede envisaged, but three other factors were comprised of items from each of Hofstede's previously stated orientations. Hence the author's new names for dimensions will be used from now on.

Nervous Helplessness

Here are the items and factor loadings for Factor 1, "Nervous Helplessness".

When working with an Academic Adviser I would likely:

| UA8 | not feel fearful. | -.77 |
| UA6 | feel nervous. | .76 |
| PD9 | feel intimidated by the Adviser's authority. | .74 |
| UA1 | feel tense. | .70 |
| PD7 | feel helpless; the Adviser is in control. | .60 |
| PD8 | assert my own opinions. | -.60 |
| IND7 | feel the Adviser is mainly on the University's side. | .56 |
| IND8 | think the Adviser is on my side rather than the University's. | -.55 |
| PD4 | only speak when spoken to. | .43 |
| IND1 | take the lead in the conversation. | -.41 |

Factor 1 contained a combination of items reflecting feelings of nervousness and helplessness. Students scoring high in this factor reported that they would feel fearful, nervous/tense, intimidated, and helpless during an advising encounter. They believe that they would most likely not assert their own opinions, speak openly, or take any lead in the conversation.

Uncertainty Avoidance

The items and factor loadings for Factor II, "Uncertainty Avoidance", were:

When working with an Academic Adviser I would likely:

| UA3 | want specific directions more than choices. | .65 |
| UA2 | want to be given choices more than directions. | - .62 |
| UA7 | want to be left to make a final decision on my own. | -.62 |
| UA5 | want electives chosen for me. | .58 |

Students scoring high in this factor reported that they would feel most comfortable during the advising experience if the adviser were to give them specific directions concerning course options and electives and if the adviser would not leave them to make a final decision on their own. High scorers on this factor believed they would have a low tolerance for uncertainty and appreciate the adviser giving them solid directions.

## Manipulative Assertiveness

Here are the items and loadings for Factor III, "Manipulative Assertiveness".

When working with an Academic Adviser I would likely:

| IND5 | try to manipulate the Adviser into giving me what I want. | .70 |
|------|-----------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| PD5  | expect the Adviser to bend rules for me. | .66 |
| IND9 | try to convince the Adviser to see things my way. | .63 |
| PD2  | question the Adviser's advice. | .47 |
| PD1  | argue my needs. | .44 |

Participants scoring high on this factor claimed that they would behave in an assertive manipulative manner toward the adviser. For instance, they felt they would not mind questioning or arguing in order to try to get the adviser to see things their way. These participants would have a high level of expectation that the Adviser should bend rules and give them what they want. High individualism for personal concern above others, and low power distance toward the adviser would allow these participants to assert their own needs and not mind trying to manipulate the situation to try to get what they want.

## Passive Compliance

The items and loadings for Factor IV "Passive Compliance" were:

When working with an Academic Adviser I would likely:

| UA4  | conform to University regulations. | .73 |
|------|------------------------------------|-----|
| IND3 | try to avoid conflict at all costs. | .70 |
| PD3  | accept the Adviser's authority. | .67 |
| PD6  | try to agree with the Adviser. | .52 |

Students scoring high on this factor believed that they would not challenge the adviser and even comply with unfavourable decisions the adviser might make on their behalf. They reported that they would feel a strong need to conform to University regulations, avoid conflict, accept the adviser's authority and try to agree with the adviser. While Hofstede's dimension of Power Distance had to do with level of respect for authority, and Uncertainty Avoidance's for institutional rules, this factor contains both of those dimensions as well as a collectivist nature of trying to avoid conflict and save-face "at all costs." Hence, students scoring high on this factor claimed that they would not likely challenge the adviser or institutional rules, but comply willingly.

## 5.2 Scale Scoring

Scale scores, which indicated the extent to which each factor shaped the participants' relationship with the adviser, were calculated by summing over raw scores associated with each item encompassed in each factor. Hence, before proceeding, the author calculated a Nervous Helplessness, Uncertainty Avoidance, Manipulative Assertiveness, and Passive Compliance score for Participant One, Participant Two, and so on. Recall that participants used a six-point Likert scale where Strongly Disagree was scored 1 and Strongly Agree 6. Hence a mean Nervous Helplessness score of 3.55 (S.D.=.33) meant most participants were using scale points around "Slightly Disagree" (see Table 3).

Calculating Scale Scores

Note that in the Nervous Helplessness' factor, six items had positive and four had negative loadings. For scale scoring purposes, and all subsequent calculations, total scale scores were derived as follows. First, responses to items that had negative loadings were recoded so 1 became equal to 6, 2 became equal to 5, 3 became equal to 4 and so forth. Next, responses to items that comprised each factor were summed

and the total divided by the number of items (e.g. 10 for Nervous Helplessness) to derive a mean item/scale score.

### 5.3 Cultural Predictors and Adviser/Advisee Relationships

AARS scores were calculated by summing over items that comprised each factor. Next, mean AARS scores for culture predicting variable, Self-Defined Culture, First Language, and Country of Birth were then calculated and examined.

**Self-Defined Culture**

For the variable Self-Defined Culture, mean AARS scores for each group, North American, Asian Canadian, European, and Asian, were compared and the significance of differences tested by a One way Analysis of Variance (see Table 6).

Table 6

Mean AARS Scores for Students According to their Self-Defined Culture

| Culture | n | I Nervous Helplessness X̄ | SD | II Uncertainty Avoidance X̄ | SD | III Manipulative Assertiveness X̄ | SD | IV Passive Compliance X̄ | SD |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| North American | 456 | 2.96 | .75 | 2.27 | .71 | 3.48 | .70 | 3.96 | .73 |
| Asian Canadian | 156 | 3.15 | .66 | 2.53 | .72 | 3.54 | .75 | 4.14 | .60 |
| European | 85 | 2.92 | .76 | 2.28 | .69 | 3.44 | .82 | 3.88 | .80 |
| Asian | 252 | 3.33 | .71 | 2.68 | .73 | 3.62 | .76 | 4.13 | .77 |
| Total | * | 3.09 | .74 | 2.42 | .74 | 3.52 | .74 | 4.03 | .73 |
| F-ratio | | 15.3 | | 20.27 | | 2.37 | | 5.23 | |
| Significance | | p<.001 | | p<.001 | | ns | | p<.001 | |

* n varied from 944 to 949

In Table 6, the higher the mean score the more likely the group endorsed each factor. Hence, Asians ($\overline{X}$ = 3.33) were more likely to feel they would act with Nervous Helplessness during advising than Europeans ($\overline{X}$ = 2.92); Asians ($\overline{X}$ = 2.68) were more likely to report that they would want to avoid uncertainty than North Americans ($\overline{X}$ = 2.27); and Asian-Canadians ($\overline{X}$ = 4.14) were more likely to feel that they would be passive compliant than were Europeans ($\overline{X}$ = 3.88).

**First Language**

Students who had different first languages differed significantly on all four factors (see Table 7). For instance, students whose first language was Asian scored the highest on Nervous Helplessness (F = 36.18, p<.001) and Manipulative Assertiveness (F = 4.30, p<.01), while Middle Eastern speakers tied with Asian ($\overline{X}$ = 4.12) to report that they would be more "passive compliant" than those with a European first language ($\overline{X}$ = 3.93).

Table 7

<u>Mean AARS Scores for Students According to their First Language</u>

| | | I Nervous Helplessness | | II Uncertainty Avoidance | | III Manipulative Assertiveness | | IV Passive Compliance | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| First Language | n | X | SD | X | SD | X | SD | X | SD |
| European | 776 | 2.96 | .73 | 2.29 | .70 | 3.50 | .72 | 3.93 | .76 |
| Mid. Eastern | 13 | 3.28 | .87 | 2.79 | .73 | 3.57 | .80 | 4.12 | .70 |
| Asian | 381 | 3.35 | .69 | 2.72 | .74 | 3.63 | .77 | 4.12 | .72 |
| Total | * | 3.09 | .74 | 2.43 | .74 | 3.54 | .74 | 3.99 | .75 |
| F-ratio | | 36.18 | | 48.87 | | 4.30 | | 8.98 | |
| Significance | | p<.001 | | p<.001 | | p<.01 | | p<.001 | |

* n varied from 1165 to 1170     Note: African n=3 therefore too low to include

However, for Uncertainty Avoidance Middle Eastern speakers were highest $(\overline{X} = 2.79)$. In contrast, those whose first language was European scored the lowest on all four factors. This would be similar to Hofstede (1980) finding Western countries scoring lowest on the elements used to comprise these factors (PD, UA, -Ind).

**Country of Birth**

Regarding Table 8, participants from different countries varied on all but one dimension. For instance, participants born in the East reported that they would feel "nervously helpless" (F = 17.32, p<.001), while participants born in the Middle East reported that they would manifest Uncertainty Avoidance, followed by those born in the East (F = 18.94, p<.001), and act with manipulative assertiveness (F = 3.55, p<.01).

Table 8

Mean AARS Scores for Students According to their Country of Birth

| Country of Birth | n | I Nervous Helplessness | | II Uncertainty Avoidance | | III Manipulative Assertiveness | | IV Passive Compliance | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | X | SD | X | SD | X | SD | X | SD |
| West | 845 | 3.00 | .74 | 2.34 | .73 | 3.51 | .74 | 3.96 | .75 |
| Middle East | 16 | 3.19 | .82 | 2.78 | .79 | 3.75 | .68 | 3.92 | .59 |
| East | 267 | 3.37 | .68 | 2.71 | .70 | 3.66 | .74 | 4.09 | .77 |
| Other | 24 | 3.03 | .80 | 2.41 | .84 | 3.34 | .58 | 4.03 | .67 |
| Total | * | 3.09 | .74 | 2.43 | .75 | 3.55 | .74 | 4.00 | .75 |
| F-ratio | | 17.32 | | 18.94 | | 3.55 | | 2.07 | |
| Significance | | p<.001 | | p<.001 | | p<.01 | | ns | |

* n varied from 1147 to 1152

In contrast, students born in the West were the most likely group to report that they would not feel nervously helpless, be uncomfortable with uncertainty, or act manipulatively assertive during advising.

## 5.4 Bivariate Relationships

Table 9 shows the extent to which mean AARS scores varied according to the socio-demographic and other characteristics of respondents. In the following analysis the focus is on where respondents differed.

Gender

Manipulative Assertiveness was the only factor upon which men and women differed. Men were more likely to report that they would be manipulatively assertive during advising. It is possible that in general men are more assertive than women in trying to get their needs met. As well, most academic advisers are women so men might feel more confident when dealing with a woman in a power relationship.

Born in Canada

Those born outside of Canada were more likely to report that they would feel nervously helpless, want to avoid uncertainty, and be passive compliant during advising. Perhaps living in a different country may be more stressful. As well, most students not born in Canada were born in Asian countries, and Asian students scored higher on Neuroticism which entered into all three regressions. The education system in Asia is more structured so they might feel more comfortable following orders.

Time in Canada

Those living in Canada less than five years were more likely to report that they would feel nervously helpless, avoid uncertainty and be manipulatively assertive during advising. Their shorter time in Canada might increase their level of stress, and their emotional and financial sacrifice from studying abroad might also be higher.

Table 9 57

Socio-Demographic Characteristics of Respondents & their Relation to AARS Scores

| Variable | n | Nervous Helplessness | | | Uncertainty Avoidance | | | Manipulative Assertiveness | | | Passive Compliance | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | X | SD | F | X | SD | F | X | SD | F | X | SD | F |
| **Gender** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Male | 482 | 3.05 | .71 | ns | 2.44 | .76 | ns | 3.66 | .76 | 19.87*** | 3.98 | .77 | ns |
| Female | 695 | 3.12 | .76 | | 2.44 | .74 | | 3.46 | .71 | | 4.00 | .75 | |
| **Born in Canada** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Yes | 786 | 3.00 | .73 | 36.48*** | 2.33 | .73 | 50.23*** | 3.52 | .74 | ns | 3.96 | .75 | 4.26* |
| No | 372 | 3.28 | .72 | | 2.65 | .73 | | 3.58 | .74 | | 4.06 | .76 | |
| **Time Here** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| > or = 5 years | 1075 | 3.06 | .74 | 25.57*** | 2.40 | .73 | 27.53*** | 3.53 | .74 | 4.62* | 4.00 | .74 | ns |
| < 5 years | 102 | 3.44 | .71 | | 2.80 | .78 | | 3.69 | .75 | | 3.94 | .90 | |
| **Int'l Student** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Yes | 28 | 3.47 | .84 | 7.53** | 2.69 | .73 | ns | 3.61 | .68 | ns | 3.60 | .89 | 8.00** |
| No | 1131 | 3.08 | .74 | | 2.42 | .74 | | 3.54 | .74 | | 4.00 | .75 | |
| **Year of U** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| First | 345 | 3.12 | .71 | ns | 2.44 | .74 | ns | 3.67 | .76 | 3.50** | 4.08 | .74 | 3.02** |
| Second | 292 | 3.10 | .76 | | 2.43 | .79 | | 3.53 | .65 | | 4.01 | .69 | |
| Third | 257 | 3.07 | .77 | | 2.45 | .75 | | 3.55 | .77 | | 3.95 | .80 | |
| Fourth | 168 | 3.03 | .73 | | 2.44 | .71 | | 3.39 | .79 | | 3.96 | .78 | |
| Fifth | 64 | 2.92 | .66 | | 2.30 | .61 | | 3.44 | .67 | | 3.67 | .79 | |
| Sixth | 3 | 2.90 | .26 | | 1.42 | .38 | | 3.07 | .81 | | 3.67 | .72 | |
| Seventh | 3 | 2.83 | .75 | | 3.00 | .90 | | 3.13 | .23 | | 4.08 | .80 | |
| **Best Grades** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 90's | 397 | 2.99 | .71 | 3.01** | 2.36 | .72 | 3.33** | 3.57 | .77 | ns | 3.88 | .80 | 4.60*** |
| 80's | 555 | 3.11 | .76 | | 2.43 | .76 | | 3.52 | .70 | | 4.05 | .71 | |
| 70's | 163 | 3.19 | .73 | | 2.53 | .76 | | 3.54 | .79 | | 4.09 | .74 | |
| 60's | 10 | 3.34 | .73 | | 2.50 | .73 | | 3.52 | .87 | | 4.30 | .71 | |
| 50's | 3 | 2.90 | .85 | | 3.58 | .58 | | 3.67 | .61 | | 3.67 | 1.38 | |
| **Worst Grades** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 90's | 10 | 3.45 | .75 | 6.51*** | 2.54 | .56 | 5.93*** | 3.90 | .81 | ns | 3.73 | .92 | 2.59* |
| 80's | 122 | 2.95 | .75 | | 2.30 | .73 | | 3.57 | .76 | | 3.85 | .80 | |
| 70's | 343 | 2.96 | .75 | | 2.29 | .68 | | 3.56 | .76 | | 3.93 | .74 | |
| 60's | 398 | 3.09 | .71 | | 2.50 | .76 | | 3.49 | .71 | | 4.06 | .74 | |
| 50's | 197 | 3.28 | .73 | | 2.59 | .81 | | 3.55 | .75 | | 4.05 | .75 | |
| 40's or below | 60 | 3.26 | .75 | | 2.36 | .71 | | 3.62 | .74 | | 4.09 | .80 | |

* p<.05        ** p<.01        *** p<.001

Hence, their likeliness to feel nervous, more helpless, and uncertain in a foreign environment, and aspiration to get their needs met might be greater.

## International Student Status

International students reported that they would feel more nervous and helpless and be more challenging during advising than Canadian host students. Perhaps if Canadian students were studying in Asia they would report that they would feel more nervous and helplessness and more challenging and noncompliant there.

## Year of University

First year students were more likely to report that they would be manipulatively assertive and passive compliant with advisers than students in higher years. First year students might have more "at stake" to try to stay in their program since first years can be a weeding out process. Hence, they might be in a position where they might need to be manipulative as a defence mechanism to survive. Yet, younger students might also have a higher respect for authority, see the adviser as more of an "elder", and be less familiar with the system so they might act more passively and compliant.

## Best Grades

Students who scored high on Nervous Helpless and Passive Compliance had best grades that were in the 60's, and high scorers on Uncertainty Avoidance had best grades in the 50's. They may not be as strong critical thinkers to be able to challenge.

## Worst Grades

With the exception of the ten respondents with worst marks in the 90's, there was a tendency for the Nervous Helplessness scores to get higher as the reported "worst grades" got lower. Similarly, lower marks were associated with higher levels of Uncertainty Avoidance and Passive Compliance.

Table 10 shows the extent to which students who spoke to advisers at UBC and relevant scores on the four AARS dimensions.

Table 10
AARS Scores by Speaking to Different Types of Advisers

| Variables | n | Nervous Helplessness | | | Uncertainty Avoidance | | | Manipulative Assertiveness | | | Passive Compliance | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | X | SD | F | X | SD | F | X | SD | F | X | SD | F |
| **Faculty Academic Adviser** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| yes | 541 | 3.05 | .78 | | 2.43 | .77 | | 3.51 | .77 | | 3.98 | .76 | |
| no | 609 | 3.12 | .71 | | 2.43 | .73 | | 3.57 | .72 | | 4.00 | .74 | |
| **Departmental Academic Adviser** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| yes | 452 | 3.03 | .77 | 3.83* | 2.43 | .75 | | 3.50 | .73 | | 3.99 | .78 | |
| no | 696 | 3.12 | .72 | | 2.43 | .74 | | 3.57 | .74 | | 4.00 | .74 | |
| **International House** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| yes | 20 | 3.31 | .75 | | 2.80 | .75 | 5.03* | 3.77 | .70 | | 3.45 | .83 | 10.71*** |
| no | 1131 | 3.08 | .74 | | 2.42 | .74 | | 3.54 | .74 | | 4.00 | .75 | |
| **Career Counselling Office** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| yes | 92 | 3.15 | .76 | | 2.51 | .72 | | 3.57 | .85 | | 4.08 | .79 | |
| no | 1059 | 3.08 | .74 | | 2.42 | .75 | | 3.54 | .73 | | 3.99 | .75 | |
| **Student Health Psychiatrist** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| yes | 12 | 3.28 | .78 | | 2.73 | .72 | | 4.03 | .80 | 5.37* | 3.77 | 1.05 | |
| no | 1139 | 3.08 | .74 | | 2.43 | .75 | | 3.54 | .74 | | 4.00 | .75 | |
| **Women Students' Office** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| yes | 26 | 3.07 | .59 | | 2.36 | .71 | | 3.41 | .71 | | 3.69 | 1.14 | 4.28* |
| no | 1125 | 3.09 | .74 | | 2.43 | .75 | | 3.55 | .74 | | 4.00 | .74 | |
| **The Ombud's Office** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| yes | 6 | 3.03 | 1.11 | | 3.00 | .89 | | 3.80 | 1.23 | | 3.71 | .80 | |
| no | 1145 | 3.09 | .74 | | 2.43 | .74 | | 3.54 | .74 | | 4.00 | .75 | |
| **AMS Speakeasy** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| yes | 20 | 2.95 | .70 | | 2.44 | .83 | | 3.79 | .73 | | 3.56 | .90 | 6.72** |
| no | 1131 | 3.09 | .74 | | 2.43 | .74 | | 3.54 | .74 | | 4.00 | .75 | |
| **Counselling Services** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| yes | 73 | 3.12 | .86 | | 2.59 | .81 | | 3.52 | .83 | | 4.05 | .73 | |
| no | 1078 | 3.08 | .73 | | 2.42 | .74 | | 3.54 | .73 | | 3.99 | .75 | |
| **Equity Office** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| yes | 6 | 2.70 | .78 | | 2.17 | .58 | | 3.20 | 1.03 | | 3.79 | .91 | |
| no | 1145 | 3.09 | .74 | | 2.43 | .75 | | 3.54 | .74 | | 4.00 | .75 | |
| **Legal Clinic** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| yes | 9 | 2.84 | .89 | | 2.28 | .61 | | 3.73 | .57 | | 3.56 | .54 | |
| no | 1142 | 3.09 | .74 | | 2.43 | .75 | | 3.54 | .74 | | 4.00 | .75 | |
| **First Nation's House of Learning** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| yes | 7 | 3.41 | .61 | | 2.68 | .87 | | 3.86 | .75 | | 3.00 | .88 | 12.38*** |
| no | 1143 | 3.08 | .74 | | 2.43 | .74 | | 3.54 | .74 | | 4.00 | .75 | |
| **Pacific Spirit** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| yes | 4 | 3.40 | .78 | | 2.94 | 1.03 | | 4.30 | .38 | 4.22* | 3.75 | 1.14 | |
| no | 1147 | 3.09 | .74 | | 2.43 | .74 | | 3.54 | .74 | | 3.99 | .75 | |
| **Residence/Dorm** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| yes | 160 | 3.00 | .71 | | 2.32 | .72 | 3.83* | 3.56 | .75 | | 3.85 | .73 | 7.28** |
| no | 991 | 3.10 | .75 | | 2.45 | .75 | | 3.54 | .74 | | 4.02 | .75 | |
| **Other(s)** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| yes | 53 | 2.94 | .74 | | 2.27 | .70 | | 3.56 | .75 | | 3.95 | .83 | |
| no | 1096 | 3.09 | .74 | | 2.44 | .75 | | 3.54 | .74 | | 4.00 | .75 | |

*p <.05   ** p <.01   *** p<.001

Students who had spoken to a Departmental Academic Adviser were more likely to report that they would feel nervously helpless in an advising encounter (see Table 10). This could be because students who had spoken to their department adviser felt tense knowing that (s)he is a key authority figure in their department.

Those who spoke to an adviser from International House, but not a Dorm/ Resident adviser, were more likely to report that they would feel Uncertainty Avoidance in advising. This could be because only International students would speak to an International adviser and these students also reported they would experience more uncertainty avoidance than host students. The reason why those who spoke to a Dorm adviser scored lower on Uncertainty Avoidance is speculative.

Students who had spoken to a Student Health Psychiatrist or Pacific Spirit House Adviser were more likely to report that they would be manipulative assertively during advising. Future research could investigate why this is so.

Those students who had spoken to an adviser from International House, Women's Students' Office, AMS Speakeasy, First Nations House of Learning, or Residence/Dorm were more likely to report that they would be challenging and non-compliant with an adviser than those who had not. This could be because it's important for them to resolve a conflict in their living environment or some other stressful personal situation. Also, they may be viewing these advisers more as service providers and they do not feel they have to necessarily follow their advice since it's not necessarily academically related.

For the category of "Other" some respondents wrote: spouse, family members, friends, financial aid officer, tuition fee payment clerk, liaison officer, international exchange program's adviser, church, Colour Connected Against Racism (CCAR), professors, graduate supervisor, classmates, a coach, other departments or faculty.

Respondents did not vary according to what faculty they were to be enrolled in.

# CHAPTER VI

# Multivariate Predictors of Adviser/Advisee Relationships

At the centre of this study was the notion that "culture" would be a good predictor of adviser/advisee relationships. As shown in the previous chapter there are stable relationships. However, questions remain about the relative importance of culture, as compared to, say, personality and other factors.

This chapter presents four regression equations where AARS scores were the dependent variables and Gender, Age, Asian First Language, Asian Self-Defined Culture, Asian Country of Birth, International Student Status, Time Influence (here five years or more versus less than five years), Canadian or not, Faculty, Best Grades, Worst grades, and five personality factors - Neuroticism, Extroversion, Openness, Agreeableness and Conscientiousness, were the independent variables. In a sense, culture now had to "compete" with personality to explain variance in adviser/advisee relationships.

In step-wise regressions, used for this study, the computer found the variable which by itself accounts for the largest per cent of the variance in the dependent variable, then added on to it a second variable that combined with it to predict further variance, and so on. What follows are four regression equations and a concluding table depicting the extent to which each independent variable entered the regression equations.

## 6.1   Regression for Nervous Helplessness

The regression equation for Nervous Helplessness consisted of five variables that explained twenty per cent of the variance. Four of them were personality factors (see Table 11). The largest single influence was from Neuroticism. Those

students who reported that they were most likely to feel nervously helpless were more neurotic, more likely to have an Asian first language, more introverted, less conscientious and less open than those who were less inclined to feel nervously helpless in advising.

Table 11

Socio-Demographic and Other Variables Explaining Nervous Helplessness

| Variable | n | X̄ | SD | Beta | R | r2 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Neuroticism | 1167 | 2.87 | .67 | .33 | .40 | .16 |
| Asian First Language | 1174 | .32 | .47 | .15 | .44 | .19 |
| Extroversion | 1168 | 3.44 | .52 | -.06 | .44 | .20 |
| Conscientiousness | 1166 | 3.55 | .55 | -.07 | .45 | .20 |
| Openness | 1166 | 3.47 | .58 | -.06 | .45 | .20 |

In Table 11, only one cultural variable, Asian First Language, was present; however, it was second only to Neuroticism in contributing toward Nervous Helplessness. If a student believes they would feel nervously helpless in the advising experience they might be shy, and shyness could be characterised by those personality variables present in this regression equation - ie., introversion, less confidence for viewing oneself as conscientious, less open, and more neurotic than other students.

### 6.2 Regression for Uncertainty Avoidance

Table 12 shows independent variables that explained Uncertainty Avoidance. Five explained fourteen per cent of the variance. The largest single influence was

those having an Asian first language. Those who reported that they would be most likely to feel Uncertainty Avoidance during advising were likely to have an Asian first language, be less open, more neurotic, older, and in Canada less than five years.

Table 12

Socio-Demographic and Other Variables Explaining Uncertainty Avoidance

| Variable | n | X̄ | SD | Beta | R | r2 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Asian First Language | 1174 | .32 | .47 | .19 | .26 | .07 |
| Openness | 1166 | 3.47 | .58 | -.20 | .33 | .11 |
| Neuroticism | 1167 | 2.87 | .67 | .15 | .36 | .13 |
| Age | 1174 | 21.03 | 4.68 | .12 | .38 | .14 |
| Time Influence | 1182 | .09 | .28 | .06 | .38 | .14 |

## 6.3 Regression for Manipulative Assertiveness

Table 13 shows to what extent chosen variables explain Manipulative Assertiveness. Four variables explained thirteen per cent of the variance.

Table 13

Socio-Demographic and Other Variables Explaining Manipulative Assertiveness

| Variable | n | X̄ | SD | Beta | R | r2 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Agreeableness | 1167 | 3.55 | .50 | -.33 | .33 | .11 |
| Age | 1174 | 21.03 | 4.68 | -.12 | .35 | .12 |
| Extroversion | 1168 | 3.44 | .52 | .11 | .36 | .13 |
| Gender | 1182 | .41 | .50 | .06 | .37 | .13 |

The largest single influence was from the personality variable Agreeableness.
This regression equation shows that students who reported that they would act more
manipulatively assertive in the advising relationship were also less agreeable,
younger, extroverted, and more likely to be male than those who did not feel they
would behave in this way. No cultural variables entered this equation. Therefore, this
"cultural" dimension of the adviser/advisee relationship is more a manifestation of
personality than crosscultural interaction.

## 6.4 Regression for Passive Compliance

Table 14 shows the extent to which the independent variables explained
Passive Compliance. The equation consisted of eight variables that explained twelve
per cent of the variance. The largest single influence was Openness.

Table 14

Socio-Demographic and Other Variables Explaining Passive Compliance

| Variable | n | X | SD | Beta | R | r2 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Openness | 1166 | 3.47 | .58 | -.17 | .20 | .04 |
| Agreeable-ness | 1167 | 3.55 | .50 | .19 | .27 | .07 |
| Neuroticism | 1167 | 2.87 | .67 | .15 | .30 | .09 |
| Age | 1174 | 21.03 | 4.68 | -.08 | .32 | .10 |
| International Student | 1163 | .02 | .15 | -.08 | .32 | .11 |
| Asian Culture vs. Non | 1182 | .35 | .48 | .09 | .33 | .11 |

This table shows that students who reported that they would be most likely to act

passive and compliant in the adviser/advisee relationship were also less open, more agreeable and neurotic, younger, not international students, yet had defined themselves culturally as Asian. Three of five personality factors surfaced to explain part of the variance for Passive Compliance - Openness (negatively), Agreeableness, and Neuroticism.

### 6.5  Those who Saw an Adviser Versus Those who Did Not

After completing the foregoing analysis we wondered if the effects of some predictors were suppressed because only slightly more than half of the respondents had actually spoken to an academic adviser. With this in mind eight new regression equations were produced. The first four were for those who had seen a faculty or department academic adviser, while the second four were for those who had not.

Thus, for the 659 students who had seen an academic adviser those who reported that they would be most likely to feel nervously helpless were more neurotic, had an Asian first language, had been in Canada less than five years, had higher grades and were more disagreeable than those less likely to endorse this factor. These five variables explained eighteen per cent of the variance in Nervous Helplessness.

The Nervous Helplessness equation for the 426 students who had not seen an adviser was quite different. Those who had not spoken to an academic adviser but assumed they would feel nervously helpless were more likely to be neurotic, introverted, and younger. These three variables explained 27 per cent of the variance.

For the 659 students who had spoken to an adviser and reported that they were more likely to experience Uncertainty Avoidance had an Asian first language, were less open, older, neurotic, and less agreeable. These five variables accounted for fourteen per cent of the variance in Uncertainty Avoidance.

Uncertainty Avoidance's regression equation for those who had not spoken to an adviser looked a little different. They were also less open, had an Asian first language, and neurotic, yet also more introverted. These four variables account for sixteen per cent of the variance.

Those who spoke to an adviser and reported that they were more likely to be manipulative assertive were also less agreeable, younger, and extroverted. These three variables accounted for fifteen per cent of the variance.

Those who did not speak to an adviser yet reported to be more likely to behave manipulatively assertive were also less agreeable, yet had an Asian first language and were extroverted. These three variables account for ten per cent of the variance.

The 659 students who spoke to an adviser and reported that they would be more passive and compliant were also less open, agreeable, younger, neurotic, not an international student, and had lower best grades. These six variables only accounted for thirteen per cent of the variance.

The regression equation for those 426 students who had not spoken to an adviser looked different also. Although they were less open, agreeable, and neurotic, they were also more likely to have an Asian first language. These four variables accounted for eleven per cent of the variance for Passive Compliance.

Overall, those who did not speak to an academic adviser assumed that they would be more Manipulative Assertive ($F = 4.38$, $p < .05$) in the advising relationship than those who had spoken to an adviser.

## 6.6 Discussion of Results

While the cultural predictor Asian Country of Birth did not enter into any regression equations, Asian First Language and Asian Self-Defined Culture did. Only one adviser/advisee relationship factor, Manipulative Assertiveness, did not have

cultural variables enter at all. However, all five personality factors entered equations. Age was another strong predictor, entering three of four equations, while Gender, International Student Status, Time Influence and Best Grades were also present (see Table 15).

Table 15: Socio-Demographic and Other Variables' Role in Four Regression Equations

| Variable Categories | I Nervous Helplessness | II Uncertainty Avoidance | III Manipulative Assertiveness | IV Passive Compliance |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Gender | - | - | X | - |
| Age | - | X | X | X |
| | | | | |
| Asian First Language | X | X | - | - |
| Asian Self-Defined Culture | - | - | - | X |
| Asian Country of Birth | - | - | - | - |
| International Student | - | - | - | X |
| Time Influence | - | X | - | - |
| Canadian | - | - | - | - |
| | | | | |
| Faculty | - | - | - | - |
| Best Grades | - | - | - | X |
| Worst Grades | - | - | - | - |
| | | | | |
| Neuroticism | X | X | - | X |
| Extroversion | X | - | X | - |
| Openness | X | X | - | X |
| Agreeableness | - | - | X | X |
| Conscientiousness | X | - | - | X |

These regression equations suggest that Asian students were most likely to report that they would feel nervous and helpless, uncertainty and avoidance, and exhibit Passive compliance in an advising relationship. However, personality factors better explained adviser/advisee relationship factors than did cultural variables since they showed up more frequently in the regression equations. For instance, Neuroticism and Openness explained part of the variance in three of four AARS factors

- Nervous Helplessness, Uncertainty Avoidance, and Passive Compliance. Also, the other personality factors - Extroversion, Agreeableness and Conscientiousness - combined differently to each enter two AARS factors.

This could mean that personality is a more powerful predictor of adviser/advisee interaction than culture. Or it could be a fault in the regression analysis where the cultural predictors contained two items, whereas the personality factors each contained twelve which might give them an advantage to enter.

Therefore, in order to make sure the composition of factors did not have items that directly reflected personality, all four factors' items were carefully examined and only items in one factor, Nervous Helplessness (NH), were believed to directly reflect a personality factor. Therefore, three of NH's ten items were deleted since they were believed to be manifestations of Neuroticism - UA8 feel fearful, UA7 feel nervous, and UA1 feel tense. A new NH factor was then computed and a new regression run to see if cultural predictors might now enter the equation first (see Table 16).

Table 16

A Comparison of Regressions for the Old and New Nervous Helplessness Factor

| Old Nervous Helplessness Regression | | New Nervous Helplessness Regression | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Factor | Beta | Factor | Beta |
| Neuroticism | .33 | Neuroticism | .29 |
| Asian First Language | .15 | Asian First Language | .13 |
| Extroversion | -.06 | Openness | -.11 |
| Conscientiousness | -.07 | Agreeableness | -.08 |
| Openness | -.06 | Time Influence | .08 |
| | | Conscientiousness | -.07 |

Despite the new NH factor not including three items thought to be manifestations of Neuroticism, the personality variable Neuroticism still entered the equation first. However, the cultural variable of Time Influence now entered the equation. This revealed that students living in Canada less than five years were more likely to feel Nervous Helplessness in the advising relationship than those living here for longer periods of time.

# CHAPTER VII

# Summary and Conclusions

The increase of students at Canadian Universities from different ethnic backgrounds presents new challenges for faculty, staff and administration. This new population brings additional changes for resources, values and expectations to the institutions they attend. While student services have been expanding and diversifying to meet the needs of this broad clientele, academic advisers have been slow to realise that ethnocultural differences may effect adviser/advisee interactions. Many students are dissatisfied with their advising experiences yet researchers have largely failed to examine students' assumptions about interacting with advisers.

An increasing number of international students and immigrants in Vancouver are from Asia (Statistics Canada, 1998). When volunteering in an advising office I noticed these students had trouble getting their needs met since they were agreeing with the adviser's initial refusal to drop courses past the due date, not transfer non easily identifiable credits from another institution, and so forth. Had these students contributed more to the discussion by asking about ways in which their problems could be solved the adviser may have delved into their situations further and then chosen to yield discretionary power in their favour.

Purpose

This study sought to find out if students from different cultural backgrounds differ in their assumptions about interacting with academic advisers. Also, it operationalized Hofstede's dimensions of culture to measure university adviser/advisee relationships, and examined the extent to which his dimensions of culture "hold-up" when deployed in a study of adviser/advisee relationships.

<u>Discussion</u>

After operationalizing Hofstede's (1980) dimensions of culture in the university adviser/advisee relationship it was found that only one - Uncertainty Avoidance - was was present in the Adviser/Advisee Relationship scale. However, due to other factors forming from a combination of items thought to concern Power Distance, Uncertainty Avoidance, and Individualism, three new factors emerged - namely, Nervous Helplessness, Manipulative Assertiveness, and Passive Compliance.

Students from different cultural backgrounds differed in their assumptions about interacting with academic advisers. The three variables used to identify students' culture, namely Self-Defined Culture (Table 6), First Language (Table 7), and Country of Birth (Table 8), all showed that students differ by culture. For instance, for Nervous Helplessness, all three variables were consistent in their scores of Asian students reporting that they would be the cultural group most likely to feel nervously helpless while interacting with an adviser, while European or Western students reported that they were the cultural group least likely to. For Uncertainty Avoidance, the three cultural predictors showed varying results. Respondents who defined themselves as Asian then Asian Canadian, or whose first language was Middle Eastern, or who were born in the Middle East and then East reported that they were the groups most likely to manifest Uncertainty Avoidance in the adviser/advisee relationship. Hence, the only consistency for that factor was that those students who were North American or whose first language was a European one, such as English, were the least likely to feel they would display Uncertainty Avoidance during advising. For the third factor, Manipulative Assertiveness, students whose first language was Asian, or those born in the Middle East, believed themselves to be most likely to display Manipulative Assertiveness, while European or Caucasians were least likely to. For the fourth factor, Passive Compliance, those who defined themselves as Asian Canadian, or

whose first language was Middle Eastern or Asian were most likely to feel that they would display Passive Compliance.

Regression equations for the four factors - Nervous Helplessness, Uncertainty Avoidance, Manipulative Assertiveness, and Passive Compliance - helped us understand what variables interacted to predict variance in these factors. For Nervous Helplessness, participants who were more neurotic, had an Asian first language, were introverted, viewed themselves as less conscientious and less open to broad ideas and experiences reported they would be most likely to feel Nervously Helplessness in the advising relationship. Consequently, four of the five variables which interacted to explain Nervous Helplessness were personality factors, and only one cultural predictor variable - Asian first language. This means that as a new cultural dimension of the adviser/advisee relationship Nervous Helplessness may be more a reflection of personality's influence on the adviser/advisee relationship.

For Uncertainty Avoidance, the regression analysis showed that participants who had an Asian first language, were less open, more neurotic, older, and living in Canada less than five years would be most likely to assume that they would feel Uncertainty Avoidance during advising. Uncertainty Avoidance was the one Hofstede dimension of culture which "held up" and its strongest predicting variable was Asian First Language. However, two personality factors, Openness and Neuroticism, entered into the equation next so personality was still a significant variable in predicting scores on this factor.

For Manipulative Assertiveness, participants who were less agreeable, younger, extroverted, and more likely to be male reported that they would be more inclined to display manipulative assertive behaviour. No cultural predicting variables entered into the regression equation for this factor. However, two personality factors entered, Agreeableness (negatively) and Extroversion, as well as the

socio-demographic variables of age and gender.

For Passive Compliance, participants who were less open, more agreeable and neurotic, younger, not international students yet from Asian culture reported that they would be most likely to be passive and compliant in the advising relationship. Hence, the cultural predictor was lower on the list than three contributing personality factors, Openness, Agreeableness, and Neuroticism, for explaining Passive Compliance, yet it was still present.

These results suggest that advisers should be aware of culture and personality's effect on students' assumptions of communicating in the adviser/advisee relationship. Particularly, when advisers yield power they should be more culturally sensitive toward Asian students who may be higher in nervous helplessness, uncertainty avoidance, manipulative assertiveness, and passive compliance.

Since only a little more than half (657 out of 1083) of the students surveyed had even talked to an academic adviser. Additional regression equations were produced to compare those students who had and had not spoken to an academic adviser. Only thirteen to eighteen per cent of variance was explained in equations for those who had spoken to an adviser, and ten to 27 per cent for those who had not. Therefore a large percentage of the variance was still left unexplained.

Both cultural and personality variables entered into regression equations. Hence, it is clear that culture and personality have plenty to do with students' assumptions about interactions between advisers and advisees. Yet, variables entering the first set of regression equations explained only about twenty per cent of the variance in AARS and several unresolved issues remain. Some might be the subject of future research. Others might evoke interesting speculation, but are difficult to examine in empirical ways.

# 7.1 Three Unresolved Issues

<u>Sources of Unexplained Variance</u>

The variables entering each of the four equations explained from 12 to 20 per cent of variance. In the case of Nervous Helplessness 20 per cent of the variance was explained. Hence, 80 per cent of the variance in Nervous Helplessness remains unexplained. Why?

What variables, other than those included in the survey, could explain Nervous Helplessness? It is believed that internal and external variables are present for each of the four dimensions of student's assumptions of interacting in the adviser/advisee relationship.

*Internal Variables*

An internal variable, besides culture and personality, could be students' awareness of their limited power in the relationship which makes them feel helpless, uncertain that they will get their needs met. This may cause them to feel nervous, helpless, to want to avoid uncertainty, and to be submissive and compliant, or it may fuel them to behave manipulatively and assertively. As well, the student's attitude toward interacting with a person in power and their previous experiences with advisers could affect their assumptions of how they would think and behave in the AARS. Additionally, students' familial, societal, and previous educational environments may all have conditioned them to think and relate to the adviser in a particular way. Finally, the degree to which students feel they must get their needs met by the adviser might also be an internal variable contributing toward how the student feels he or she will behave in the advising relationship.

*External Variables*

Many external variables may affect students behaviour in advising relationship as well. The adviser's personality and treatment of the student, and the advising

environment - physically and culturally. For instance, if the student met with an adviser before and found their personalities clashed, that the adviser was dominant and stubborn, next time they might react submissively or assertively. Similarly, the environment might influence the student to react in a certain way. For instance, the waiting room for the Arts Advising Office at UBC is similar to that of a doctor's office. At many times through out the year there is a long wait to speak with an adviser since the adviser spends, on average, a half hour with each student. When it is the next student's turn he or she is called in, greeted cordially with a handshake, seated down in the adviser's office and asked, "What can I help you with?". This is very similar to that of a dentist or doctor's office. The cultural environment of the advising office may affect student assumptions about interacting with the adviser. For instance, if "the word is out" that the advisers are unhelpful, uninterested or rude a student may let their preconceived notions influence their interaction. Note that each student is an individual who might react to internal and external variables differently. Hence, it is important that advisers be aware of all possible ways students may feel and react.

## Problems with Hofstede's Dimensions

The second purpose of this study was to operationalize Hofstede's dimensions of culture - Power Distance, Uncertainty Avoidance, Individualism. The 30 items pertaining to adviser/advisee interactions were all based on Hofstede's dimensions of culture. Yet, after factor analysis, only the Uncertainty Avoidance factor was visible. In other words, items deemed to be manifestations of Power Distance, and Individualism intermingled with each other.

The fact Hofstede's dimensions of culture failed to "hold-up" in this study could be due to two factors: (1) imprecise operationalization, or (2) inadequacies of Hofstede's model. Each will now be discussed.

*Imprecise Operationalization of Hofstede's Dimensions*

Perhaps this survey's items, employed for the Adviser/Advisee relationship, didn't really reflect Hofstede's items as well as they could have since the advising relationship might not be a relatable context, or the author may not have adequately reflected them. The items might have been a stronger measurer of personality factors since personality is embedded in culture. Also, Hofstede's questions asked workers to answer how other workers would feel because he believed people gave more honest answers when describing others than when describing themselves. In contrast, this survey asked respondents to give their own opinions since describing other students would lead to a Canadian cultural mosaic of students' assumptions about advising. The danger with asking students to reflect individually is that the author has no way of knowing each one's level of acculturation and assimilation into western society. However, this was attempted to be accounted for by including questions like Length of Time in Canada and International student status.

*Inadequacies of Hofstede's Model*

Hofstede's work was conducted 28 years ago, in the early 1970's. The amount of cultural change and assimilation of different cultures that has occurred since then can only be speculated upon. As well, Hofstede's model was derived from a western perspective on culture through which his questions were created. Recall that Bond and others, from the Chinese Culture Connection (1987), developed a survey to study Chinese values and search for culture-free dimensions of culture. They found that Hofstede's dimensions were relatable to their values yet not "exactly", but rather in an overlapping way. Therefore, it is hard to tell to what extent Hofstede's dimensions are still an adequate characterisation of culture. A standardised cultural identity test could be included in further research.

Culture Embedded in Personality

The purpose of this study was to examine ethnocultural predictors of the advising relationship. However, from the outset, personality was deemed to be a crucial variable. With regard to Nervous Helplessness four out of the five possible personality variables entered the equation, for Uncertainty Avoidance two out of five, for Manipulative Assertiveness two, and for Passive Compliance four of five. Of the five personality variables Neuroticism entered three out of the four regression equations, Extroversion entered two, Openness three, Agreeableness one, and Conscientiousness two (see Table 15). It is hazardous to generalise across all four equations but, in general the advising relationship seems to be largely determined by personality variables. However, the degree of Asian cultural influence is also important in three of the four equations. In this regard note that in the equation for the Hofstede factor that held-up (Uncertainty Avoidance), the cultural predictor Asian First Language was the first variable to enter the equation (beta .19). In the other three equations a personality factor was always the first variable to enter the equation.

In general, it is personality that determines assumptions about advising. However, personality is deeply embedded in culture and as Ho (1994) found, the Chinese cultural trait of filial piety had a high loading on the personality factors of Agreeableness and Conscientiousness. Similarly, McCrae and others (1998) found that Asian students were higher in Agreeableness than North American college students. Similarly researchers have found that Chinese in the People's Republic of China (Domino, 1993) and Chinese Americans (Cook & Chi, 1980; Cox, Lobel, & McLeod, 1881) are more cooperative than Caucasian Americans.

## 7.2   Recommendations

Crosscultural Training for Advisers

Since students of different cultural backgrounds vary in their assumptions about advising, advisers need to be aware of these differences and try to adjust their interaction strategies and communication styles accordingly.  For instance, if many Asian students are low in self-disclosure, advisers need to ask more directed questions in order to help themselves uncover students' desires and needs.  Similarly, if Asian students are more likely to comply and not challenge the adviser than the adviser should be additionally sensitive to these students instead of taking the easier route of satisfying the university's rules and regulations with these less challenging clients.  If special circumstances exist in which Asian students warrant  exemption from institutional policies then most likely it would have to be up to the adviser to find out this information and act upon it.

Hence, a specific training program which includes these types of issues and others concerning advising could be created and administered to advisers through workshops and booklets across the country.

Researching Implementation of Crosscultural Training for Advisers

More research may need to be done to find out the best information needed to provide effective crosscultural communication for academic advisers.  This may lead toward better advising for all students regardless of their ethnicity.  Greater sensitivity toward minority issues, more intrusive advising methods, and more accurate student assessments and placement in courses may result.

Replication and Refinement of this Study

As previously suggested, this study could be refined and replicated to see if comparable findings would occur in other university populations across Canada. Other groups such as graduate students could be surveyed as well to determine if

relationships or patterns emerge among this population.

## Production of Similar Questionnaires

Since only twenty, fourteen, thirteen, and twelve per cent of the variance was explained by the four regression equations, other questionnaires similar to the Adviser/Advisee Relationship survey could be produced to contain more items reflecting the new factors which emerged, such as Nervous Helplessness, Manipulative Assertiveness, and Passive Compliance. Since this is an initial attempt at uncovering cultural dimensions of the adviser/advisee relationship there is lots of room to fine-tune, develop, and expand the instrument created for this study.

## Measuring Adviser's Assumptions and Personalities

Although this study only surveyed students' assumptions about advising and students' personality types, advisers' assumptions of what students think and their own personality profiles could also be measured. Then these results could be compared to data collected about students they have advised.

## Investigating Students' Assumptions of Interacting For Different Advising Topics

This study could also be used as a basis to further research students' assumptions about interacting with advisers at different points of the academic process. For instance, a list of advising topics could be examined keeping in mind the four cultural dimensions of the adviser/advisee relationship to see how students coming from each dimension would act differently concerning each advising topic or process. This could be done by having a group of students fill-out this study's survey and then ask those who were prototypes for certain ethnocultural dimensions to undergo an interview. In the interviews the researcher could ask them to explain how they would act concerning specific problems which could arise. This would give a practical insight into how knowledge of how different types of students are likely to feel- and-behave can be used to improve advising encounters.

Analysing Culture and Personality Interacting in Advising

This study has just begun to uncover the extent culture and personality influence student's feelings and behaviour in the adviser/advisee relationship. A closer analysis of the interaction and correlation between these two variables, culture and personality, could be done and more studies undertaken along this line.

## 7.3   Summary

At the beginning of this study, the expectations were that Asian students would show a higher level of Power Distance, Uncertainty Avoidance, and lower level of Individualism than Caucasian students. This was due to the fact that these were Hofstede's (1980) dimensions of culture and he had found these significant differences with the large populations he examined. Based upon previous literature of differing communication styles of Eastern and Western people, and the knowledge that communication is the medium through which advising takes place, the connection was made that students of different ethnic background, specifically Asian versus Caucasian, would differ in their assumptions of interacting with academic advisers.

Over 1200 students from UBC completed the questionnaire used for this study. Care was taken to find large groups of undergraduate classes in different faculties in order to collect a wide variety of participants. Student's Self-Defined Culture, First Language, and Country of Birth were used as cultural predictors.

Results revealed that Asian students were most likely to claim to feel nervous helplessness, uncertainty avoidance, manipulative assertiveness and passive compliance in the adviser/advisee relationship; in contrast, North American students were least likely to report they would manifest these feelings and behaviours during an advising encounter. As well, students born in the Middle East reported that they would be likely to manifest higher levels of Uncertainty Avoidance and Manipulative

Assertiveness than those born elsewhere. As well, those with a Middle Eastern first language had higher Uncertainty Avoidance scores than those speaking other first languages.

This study advances knowledge in that it attempts to reveal how students would act, behave, and feel in the adviser/advisee relationship. Hence, this study provides a better basis for understanding the adviser/advisee relationship. Better advising may result and lead toward greater student satisfaction and retention.

# Bibliography

Anderson, K. L. (1981). Post-high school experiences and college attrition. Sociology of Education, 54 (1), 1-15.

Anderson, E. (1987). Forces influencing student persistence and achievement. In L. Noel, R. Levitz, & D. Saluri (Eds.), Increasing student retention. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Astin, A. W. (1986). Preventing students from dropping out. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Baer, M. L., & Carr, S. (1985). Academic advisor - catalyst for achieving institutional and student goals. NASPA Journal, 23 (1), 36-44.

Bean, J. P., & Metzner, B. S. (1985). A conceptual model of nontraditional undergraduate student attrition. Review of Educational Research, 55 (4), 485-540.

Behrens, J. C. (1966). Take a good look at faculty advising. College and University Business, 41 (6), 47-48.

Benjamin, M., & Hollings, A. E. (1995). Toward a theory of student satisfaction: An exploratory study of the "quality of student life". Journal of College Student Development, 36 (6), 574-586.

Bhawuk, D. P. S., & Brislin, R. (1992). The measurement of intercultural sensitivity using the concepts of individualism and collectivism. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 16, 413-436.

Bond, M. H. (1994). Trait theory and cross-cultural studies of person perception, Psychological Inquiry, 5, 114-117.

Bond, M. H., & Forgas, J. P. (1984). Linking person perception to behavioral intention across cultures: The role of cultural collectivism. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 15 (3), 337-352.

Bond, M. H., Nakazato, H., & Shiraisihi, D. (1975). Universality and distinctiveness in dimensions of Japanese person perception, Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 6, 346-357.

Braxton, J. M., & Brier, E. M. (1989). Melding organizational and international theories of student attrition: A path analytic study. Review of Higher Education, 13 (1), 47-61.

Braxton, J., Duster, M., & Pascarella, E. (1988). Causal modeling and path analysis: An introduction and illustration in student attrition research. Journal of College Student Development, 29, 263-272.

Calderwood, D. (1993). International students at Alberta universities: Perceptions and levels of satisfaction. Master's thesis in Education, Lethbridge, Alberta.

Cheng, C. H., Cheng, P. Y. L., Ng, C. M. A. & J. J. F. Yip (1991). Validation of the eight-factor model of Chinese personality across instruments. Unpublished manuscript, Chinese University of Hong Kong.

Cheung, P. C., Conger, A. J., Hau, K., Lew, W. J. F., & Lau, S. (1992). Development of the multi-trait personality inventory (MTPI): Comparison among four Chinese populations. Journal of Personality Assessment, 59, 528-551.

Chickering, A. W. (1969). Education and identity. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Chickering, A. W. & Associates (1981). The Modern American college. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1981.

Chinese Culture Connection (1987). Chinese values and the search for culture-free dimensions of culture. Journal of Cross-cultural Psychology, 18 (2), 143-164.

Cook, H., & Chi, C. (1984). Cooperative behavior and locus of control among American and Chinese-American boys, Journal of Psychology, 118, 169-177.

Costa, P. T., Jr., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO PI-R) and NEO Five-Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI) Professional Manual. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources, Inc.

Cox, T. H., Lobel, S. A., & McLeod, P. L. (1991). Effects of ethnic group cultural differences on cooperative and competitive behavior on a group task. Academy of Management Journal, 34, 827-847.

Crockett, D. S., & Levitz, R. S. (1984). Current advising practices in colleges and universities. In R. Winston, T. Miller, S. Ender, T. Grites & Associates (Eds.), Developmental Academic Advising. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Crookston, B. B. (1972). A developmental view of academic advising as teaching. Journal of College Student Personnel, 13 (1), 12-17.

Dalili, Farid (1982). Roles and responsibilities of international student advisors and counselors in the United States. University of Akron Press. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 226 658)

Deressa, B., & Beavers, I. (1986). Academic and non-academic needs of international students. Journal of College Student Personnel, 20, 411-416.

Domino, G. (1992). Cooperation and competition in Chinese and American children. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 23, 456-467.

Ender, S. C., Winston, Jr., R. B., & Miller, T. K. (1982). Academic advising as student development. In Winston, R. B., Jr., Ender, S. C., & Miller, T. K. (Eds.), Developmental approaches to academic advising. New Directions for Student Services, No. 17, 3-18. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Ethington, C. A. (1990). A psychological model of student persistence. Research in Higher Education 31 (3), 279-293.

Fielstein, L. L. & Lammers, W. J. (1992). The relationship of student satisfaction with advising to administrative support for advising services. NACADA Journal, 5 (1), 1-7.

Fijneman, Y. A., Willemsen, M. E., Poortinga, Y. H. (1996). Individualism-Collectivism: An empirical study of a conceptual issue. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 27 (4), 381-402.

Forrest, A. (1985). Creating conditions for student and institutional success. In L. Noel, R. Levitz, & D. Saluri (Eds.), Increasing student retention: Effective programs and practices for reducing the dropout rate, (pp. 62-77). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Gao, G., Ting-Toomey, S., & Gudykunst, W. B. (1996). Chinese communication processes. In M. H. Bond (Ed.), The Handbook of Chinese Psychology, (pp. 280-293). New York: Oxford Press.

Gome, I. M., Hall, M. P., & Murphy, T. J. (1993). In the shadow of the tower: The view of the undergraduate experience. The Canadian Journal of Higher Education, xxiii (3), 18-35.

Gordon, V. N. (1992). Handbook of academic advising. Westport: Greenwood Press.

Grites, T. J. (1977). Student development through academic advising: A 4 x 4 model. NASPA Journal, 14 (3), 33-37.

Grosset, J. M. (1991). Patterns of integration, commitment, and student characteristics and retention among younger and older students". Research in Higher Education, 32 (2), 159-178.

Guppy, N. & Bednarski, V. (1993). Enhancing student retention in higher education: A literature review. Report for BC Council on Admission and Transfers: Anthropology and Sociology, University of British Columbia.

Gudykunst, W. B., Yang, S. M., & Nishida, T. (1985). A cross-cultural test of uncertainty reduction theory: Comparisons of acquaintances, friends, and dating relationships in Japan, Korea, and the United States. Human Communication Research, 11 (3), 407-455.

Guthrie, G. M. & A. B. Bennett (1971). Cultural differences in implicit personality theory, International Journal of Psychology, 6, 305-312.

Hall, E. T. (1976). Beyond Culture. New York: Doubleday.

Hallberg, E. C. (1964). Realism in academic advising. The Journal of College Student Personnel, 6 (2), 114-117.

Hartley, M. P. (1987). 'H.E.L.P. for students: One university's action approach to increasing student retention. College and University, 63 (1), 80-94.

Ho, E. K. F. (1994). Validating the five-factor model of personality: The Hong Kong Chinese case. Unpublished Bachelor's thesis, Chinese University of Hong Kong.

Hofstede, G. (1980). Culture's Consequences: international differences in work-related values. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Hofstede, G., & Bond, M. H. (1988). The Confucius connection: From cultural roots to economic growth, Organizational Dynamics, 16 (4), 4-21.

Hui, C. H., & Triandis, H. C. (1986). Individualism-Collectivism: A study of cross-cultural researchers. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 17 (2), 225-248.

Johnson, D. (1991). Formulating a Conceptual Model of Nontraditional Student Attrition and Persistence in Post-Secondary Vocational Education Programs. Berkeley, CA: National Center for Research and Vocational Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 332012).

Keaten, J., Kelly, L., & Pribyl, C. B. (1997). Communication apprehension in Japan: Grade School through secondary school. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 21 (3), 319-343.

Kim, Min-Sun, Hunter, J. E., Miyahara, A., Horvath, A., Bresnahan, M., & Yoon, H. (1996). Individual-vs. Culture-level dimensions of individualism and collectivism: Effects on preferred conversational styles. Communication Monographs, 63, 29-49.

Kramer, H. C., & Gardner, R. E. (1983). Advising by faculty. Washington, DC: National Education Association.

Leong, F. T. L., & Sedlacek, W. E. (1986). A comparison of international and U.S. students' preferences for help sources. Journal of College Student Personnel, 27 (5), 426-430.

Leung, K. (1987). Some determinants of reactions to procedural models for conflict resolution: A cross-national study. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 53 (5), 898-908.

Liu, F. Y. (1991). The generalizability of the NEO Personality Inventory to an university sample in Hong Kong. Unpublished Bachelor's thesis, the Chinese University of Hong Kong.

Luk, C. L., & Bond, M. H. (1993). Personality variation and values endorsement in Chinese University students, Personality and Individual Differences, 14 (3), 429-37.

McCrae, R. R., Bond, M. H., Yik, S. M., Trapnell, P. D., & Paulhus, D. L. (1998). Interpreting personality profiles across cultures: Bilingual, acculturation, and peer rating studies of Chinese undergraduates. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74 (4), 1041-1055.

Metzner, B. S. (1989). Perceived quality of academic advising: The effect of freshman attrition. American Educational Research Journal, 26 (3), 422-442.

Mortensen, C. D. (1994). Problematic communication : the construction of invisible walls. Westport, Conn. : Praeger, 1994.

Moore, K. M. (1976). Faculty advising: panacea or placebo? The Journal of College Student Personnel, 17 (5), 371-375.

Moore, J. W. (1987). Understanding, advising, and teaching international students: A handbook for faculty. Western Oregon State College, Monmouth. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 289 427).

Noel, L., Levitz, R., Saluri, D. & Associates (1987). Increasing student retention. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Nora, A. (1987). Determinants of retention among Chicano college students: A structural model. Research in Higher Education, 26 (1), 31-59.

Nora, A., & Rendon, L. I. (1990). Determinants of predisposition to transfer among community college students: A structural model. Research in Higher Education, 31 (3), 235-255.

Offermann, L. R., & Hellmann, P. S. (1997). Culture's consequences for leadership behavior: National values in action. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 28 (3), 342-351.

Pascarella, E. T., & Chapman, D. (1983). A multiinstitutional, path analytic validation of Tinto's model of college withdrawal in a commuter-institution setting. American Educational Research Journal, 20, 87-102.

Pascarella, E. T., Smart, J., & Ethington, C. (1986). Long-term persistence of two-year college students. Research in Higher Education, 24 (1), 47-71.

Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (1980). Predicting freshman persistence and voluntary dropout decisions for a theoretical model. Journal of Higher Education, 51 (1), 60-75.

Pascarella, E. T. & Terenzini, P. T. (1991). How college affects students. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Perry, Jr., W. G. (1970). Forms of intellectual and ethical development in the college years: A scheme. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Raskin, M. (1979). Critical issue: Faculty advising. Peabody Journal of Education, 56 (2), 99-108.

Samovar, L. A., & Porter, R. E. (1991). Intercultural communication: A reader. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Schwartz, S. H. (1990). Individualism-Collectivism: Critique and proposed refinements. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 21 (2), 139-157.

Schwartz, S. H. (1994). Beyond individualism/collectivism. New cultural dimensions of values. In U. Kim, H. C. Triandis, C. Kagitcibasi, S. C. Choi, & G. Yoon (Eds.), Individualism and collectivism: Theory, method, and applications (pp. 85-119). London: Sage.

Shenkar, O., & Ronen, S. (1987). The cultural context of negotiations: The implications of Chinese interpersonal norms, Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 23 (2), 263-275.

Smith, P. S. F., & Smith, H. A. (1989). Asian students in North American universities: Implications for faculty and staff. Paper presented at the World Congress of Comparative Education, Montreal Canada. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 311 780)

Stahl, V., & Pavel, M. (1992). Assessing the Bean and Metzner Model with Community College Student data. Dissertation presented at the annual meeting of the American educational research association. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 344 639)

Statistics Canada (1998). Visible minority population, 1996 Census. http://www.statcan.ca:80/english/Pgdb/People/Population/demo40h.htm

Suzuki, S. (1997). Cultural transmission in international organizations: Impact of interpersonal communication patterns in intergroup contexts. Human Communication Research, 24 (1), 147-180.

Thomas, R., & Chickering, A. W. (1984). Education and identity revisited. Journal of College Student Personnel, 25 (5), 392-399.

Tinto, V. (1975). Dropout from higher education: A theoretical synthesis of recent research. Review of Educational Research, 45, 89-125.

Triandis, H. C., Bontempo, R., Betancourt, H., Bond, M. H., Leung, K., Brenes, A., Georgas, J., Hui, H. C., Marin, G., Setiadi, B., Sinha, J. B. P., Verma, J., Spangenberg, J., Touzard, H., & de Montmollin, G. (1986). The measurement of the etic aspects of individualism and collectivism across cultures, Australian Journal of Psychology, 38 (3), 257-267.

Trigg, W. (1997). Academic advising for arts undergraduate students at english-speaking Canadian public Universities: The advisor's story. Published Master's thesis, University of British Columbia.

Trubisky, P., Ting-Toomey, S., & Lin, S.L. (1991). The influence of individualism-collectivism and self-monitoring on conflict styles, International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 15 (1), 65-84.

UBC Alma Mater Society (1996). Survey on Academic Advising at the University of British Columbia. Vancouver: UBC Alma Mater Society.

UBC Office of Institutional Analysis & Planning. (1981). UBC Registration by Country of Citizenship.

UBC Office of Institutional Analysis & Planning. (1997). International Enrolment - Winter Session, 1997.

Voorhees, R. A. (1987). Toward building models of community college persistence: A logit analysis. Research in Higher Education, 27 (2),115-129.

Walker, J. L. (1994). Undergraduate experiences at eight Canadian universities. University of Manitoba. Unpublished report.

Wherly, B. (1988). Cultural diversity from an international perspective, Part II. Journal of Multicultural Counselling and Development, 16 (1), 3-15.

Yik, M. S., & Bond, M. (1993). Exploring the dimensions of Chinese person perception with indigenous and imported constructs: Creating a culturally balanced scale. International Journal of Psychology, 28 (1), 75-95.

Yang, K. S. & Bond, M. H. (1985). Dimensions of Chinese person perception: An emic approach. In C. Chiao (Ed.), Proceedings of the Conference on Modernization and Chinese culture (pp. 309-325). Hong Kong: Institution of Social Studies, The Chinese University of Hong Kong.

Yang, K. S. & Bond, M. H. (1990). Exploring implicit personality theories with indigenous or imported constructs: The Chinese case. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58 (6), 1087-95.

| 5. | Question the Adviser's advice. | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Slightly Disagree | Slightly Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 6. | Feel dependent on the Adviser. | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Slightly Disagree | Slightly Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| 7. | Want specific directions more than choices. | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Slightly Disagree | Slightly Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| 8. | Accept the Adviser's authority. | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Slightly Disagree | Slightly Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| 9. | Conform to University regulations. | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Slightly Disagree | Slightly Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| 10. | Try to avoid conflict at all costs. | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Slightly Disagree | Slightly Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| 11. | Only speak when spoken to. | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Slightly Disagree | Slightly Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| 12. | Not care what the Adviser thinks of me. | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Slightly Disagree | Slightly Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| 13. | Want electives chosen for me. | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Slightly Disagree | Slightly Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| 14. | Expect the Adviser to bend rules for me. | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Slightly Disagree | Slightly Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| 15. | Try to manipulate the Adviser into giving me what I want. | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Slightly Disagree | Slightly Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| 16. | Feel nervous. | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Slightly Disagree | Slightly Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |

| 17. | Try to agree with the Adviser. | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Slightly Disagree | Slightly Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 18. | Not necessarily follow the Adviser's advice. | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Slightly Disagree | Slightly Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| 19. | Want to be left to make a final decision on my own. | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Slightly Disagree | Slightly Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| 20. | Feel helpless; the Adviser is in control. | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Slightly Disagree | Slightly Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| 21. | Feel the Adviser is mainly on the University's side. | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Slightly Disagree | Slightly Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| 22. | Not feel fearful. | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Slightly Disagree | Slightly Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| 23. | Assert my own opinions. | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Slightly Disagree | Slightly Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| 24. | Think the Adviser is on my side rather than the University's. | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Slightly Disagree | Slightly Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| 25. | Give more information than needed. | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Slightly Disagree | Slightly Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| 26. | Feel intimidated by the Adviser's authority. | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Slightly Disagree | Slightly Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| 27. | Try to convince the Adviser to see things my way. | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Slightly Disagree | Slightly Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| 28. | Not mind leaving without an 'answer'. | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Slightly Disagree | Slightly Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |

29. Want to meet across
a table.

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Slightly Disagree | Slightly Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |

30. Feel independent from
the institution.

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Slightly Disagree | Slightly Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |

For each statement, circle the response that best represents your opinion.

1. I am not a worrier.

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |

2. I like to have a lot of
people around me.

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |

3. I don't like to waste
my time daydreaming.

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |

4. I try to be courteous
to everyone I meet.

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |

5. I keep my belongings
clean and neat.

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |

6. I often feel inferior
to others.

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |

7. I laugh easily.

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |

8. Once I find the right way to do
something, I stick to it.

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |

9. I often get into arguments
with my family and co-workers.

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |

10. I'm pretty good about pacing
myself so as to get things done
on time.

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |

11. When I'm under a great deal
of stress, sometimes I feel like       Strongly      Disagree      Neutral      Agree      Strongly
I'm going to pieces.                    Disagree                                             Agree

12. I don't consider myself
especially 'light-hearted'.             Strongly      Disagree      Neutral      Agree      Strongly
                                        Disagree                                             Agree

13. I am intrigued by the
patterns I find in art and              Strongly      Disagree      Neutral      Agree      Strongly
nature.                                 Disagree                                             Agree

14. Some people think I'm
selfish and egotistical.                Strongly      Disagree      Neutral      Agree      Strongly
                                        Disagree                                             Agree

15. I am not a very
methodical person.                      Strongly      Disagree      Neutral      Agree      Strongly
                                        Disagree                                             Agree

16. I rarely feel
lonely or blue.                         Strongly      Disagree      Neutral      Agree      Strongly
                                        Disagree                                             Agree

17. I really enjoy
talking to people.                      Strongly      Disagree      Neutral      Agree      Strongly
                                        Disagree                                             Agree

18. I believe letting students
hear controversial speakers can         Strongly      Disagree      Neutral      Agree      Strongly
only confuse and mislead them.          Disagree                                             Agree

19. I would rather cooperate
with others than compete                Strongly      Disagree      Neutral      Agree      Strongly
with them.                              Disagree                                             Agree

20. I try to perform all the
tasks assigned to me                    Strongly      Disagree      Neutral      Agree      Strongly
conscientiously.                        Disagree                                             Agree

21. I often feel tense
and jittery.                            Strongly      Disagree      Neutral      Agree      Strongly
                                        Disagree                                             Agree

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 22. | I like to be where the action is. | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| 23. | Poetry has little or no effect on me. | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| 24. | I tend to be cynical and skeptical of others' intentions. | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| 25. | I have a clear set of goals and work toward them in an orderly fashion. | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| 26. | Sometimes I feel completely worthless. | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| 27. | I usually prefer to do things alone. | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| 28. | I often try new and foreign foods. | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| 29. | I believe that most people will take advantage of you if you let them. | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| 30. | I waste a lot of time before settling down to work. | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| 31. | I rarely feel fearful or anxious. | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| 32. | I often feel as if I'm bursting with energy. | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| 33. | I seldom notice the moods or feelings that different environments produce. | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 34. | Most people I know like me. | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| 35. | I work hard to accomplish my goals. | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| 36. | I often get angry at the way people treat me. | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| 37. | I am a cheerful, high-spirited person. | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| 38. | I believe we should look to our religious authorities for decisions on moral issues. | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| 39. | Some people think of me as cold and calculating. | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| 40. | When I make a commitment, I can always be counted on to follow through. | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| 41. | Too often, when things go wrong, I get discouraged and feel like giving up. | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| 42. | I am not a cheerful optimist. | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| 43. | Sometimes when I am reading poetry or looking at a work of art, I feel a chill or wave of excitement. | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| 44. | I'm hard-headed and tough-minded in my attitudes. | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| 45. | Sometimes I'm not as dependable or reliable as I should be. | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |

| 46. | I am seldom sad or depressed. | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| 47. | My life is fast-paced. | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| 48. | I have little interest in speculating on the nature of the universe or the human condition. | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| 49. | I generally try to be thoughtful and considerate. | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| 50. | I am a productive person who always gets the job done. | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| 51. | I often feel helpless and want someone else to solve my problems. | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| 52. | I am a very active person. | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| 53. | I have a lot of intellectual curiosity. | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| 54. | If I don't like people, I let them know it. | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| 55. | I never seem to be able to get organized. | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| 56. | At times I have been so ashamed I just wanted to hide. | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| 57. | I would rather go my own way than be a leader of others. | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| 58. | I often enjoy playing with theories or abstract ideas. | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 59. | If necessary, I am willing to manipulate people to get what I want. | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| 60. | I strive for excellence in everything I do. | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |

**Check the appropriate responses.**

1. Are you a woman or a man?

   ☐ Woman
   ☐ Man

2. What is your age?  (Please specify) _____ years

3. What language from the list below, did you first learn to speak?  (Check one only).

   ☐ English      ☐ Italian       ☐ German       ☐ French
   ☐ Cantonese    ☐ Japanese      ☐ Mandarin     ☐ Vietnamese
   ☐ Hindi        ☐ Punjabi       ☐ Spanish      ☐ Ukrainian
   ☐ Other (Please specify) _____

4. Every person has a different family origin, culture and nationality.  Also, each person may have their own sense of who they are.  To what cultural group do you feel you belong? (Please specify)

   _____(Print)

5.  Were you born in Canada?

    ☐ Yes (if yes skip to question 9)
    ☐ No

> 6.  In which country were you born? (Print)
>
>     _____
>
> 7.  How long have you lived in Canada?
>
>     _____ years _____ months
>
> 8.  Are you an International Student?
>
>     ☐ Yes
>     ☐ No

9.  What Faculty are you now in?

    ☐ Arts
    ☐ Applied Science
    ☐ Science
    ☐ Education
    ☐ Commerce and Business Administration
    ☐ Other (Please specify) _____

10. List here all the subjects you are currently studying (e.g. Psychology, English, Biochemistry)

    1. _____

    2. _____

    3. _____

    4. _____

    5. _____

11. At any time at UBC (so far) have you talked to a: (Circle)

    a) Faculty Academic Adviser                   Yes      No
    b) Departmental Academic Adviser         Yes      No

12. At any time at UBC have you talked about your university life and work to a counsellor or adviser from: (Circle one for each)

    a) International House . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . Yes     No
    b) Career Counselling Office . . . . . . . . . . . Yes     No
    c) Student Health Psychiatrist . . . . . . . . . . Yes     No
    d) Women Students' Office . . . . . . . . . . . Yes     No
    e) The Ombuds Office . . . . . . . . . . . . . . Yes     No
    f) AMS Speakeasy . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . Yes     No
    g) Counselling Services . . . . . . . . . . . . . . Yes     No
    h) Equity Office . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . Yes     No
    i) Legal Clinic . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . Yes     No
    j) First Nations House of Learning . . . . . . . Yes     No
    k) Pacific Spirit . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . Yes     No
    l) Residence/Dorm . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . Yes     No
    m) Other(s) (Please specify) _____ Yes     No

13. What year of University are you in?

    ☐ First Year
    ☐ Second Year
    ☐ Third Year
    ☐ Fourth Year
    ☐ Other (Please specify) _____

14. What grades are you getting at UBC:

| In your worst courses: | In your best courses: |
|---|---|
| ☐ 90's | ☐ 90's |
| ☐ 80's | ☐ 80's |
| ☐ 70's | ☐ 70's |
| ☐ 60's | ☐ 60's |
| ☐ 50's | ☐ 50's |
| ☐ 40's or below | ☐ 40's or below |

## THANK YOU FOR COMPLETING THIS SURVEY.

# Appendix II

## Coding Schedule

### ACADEMIC ADVISING RELATIONSHIP SURVEY (AARS)

1-30  (See Appendix I)    1 = Strongly Disagree
2 = Disagree
3 = Slightly Disagree
4 = Slightly Agree
5 = Agree
6 = Strongly Agree

The recode command was used to reverse responses to items which loaded negatively for the factor analysis - UA8, PD8, IND8, IND1, UA2 and UA7.

### PERSONALITY PROFILE

1-60  (See Appendix I)    1 = Strongly Disagree
2 = Disagree
3 = Neutral
4 = Agree
5 = Strongly Agree

Then the recode command was used to reverse responses for these items: P1, P3, P8, P9, P12, P14, P15, P16, P18, P23, P24, P27, P29, P30, P31, P33, P38, P39, P42, P44, P45, P46, P48, P54, P55, P57, P59.

Then P1, P6, P11, continuing on in intervals of five were added together and divided by twelve to get the Neuroticism score for each respondent. The same process was then done with P2, P7, and so forth for Extroversion; P3, P8, etc. for Openness; P4, P9, etc. for Agreeableness; and, P5, P10, etc. for Conscientiousness.

Neutral (3) was coded for nine or less items that were left blank.

### DEMOGRAPHICS

1-14

1. Are you a man or a woman?

0 = Woman
1 = Man

2. What is your age?

                  __ = Number in years

3. What language from the list below, did you first learn to speak?

The first twelve answers were supplied for them and then an additional box marked "Other (Please specify)" was added to be able to embrace all possible answers which turned out to be 44 in total. Three phases of coding was performed as follows.

*Phase One: High Differentiation*

During this phase a numeric code was assigned to each first language specified:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1 = English | 16 = Taiwanese | 31 = Tamil |
| 2 = Italian | 17 = Tagalog | 32 = Portuguese |
| 3 = German | 18 = Korean | 33 = Urdu |
| 4 = French | 19 = Persian | 34 = Filipino |
| 5 = Cantonese | 20 = Lao | 35 = Marathi |
| 6 = Japanese | 21 = Fujian | 36 = Armenian |
| 7 = Mandarin | 22 = Croatian | 37 = Hungarian |
| 8 = Vietnamese | 23 = Russian | 38 = Farsi |
| 9 = Hindi | 24 = Arabic | 39 = Norwegian |
| 10 = Punjabi | 25 = Swedish | 40 = Chinese Dialect |
| 11 = Spanish | 26 = Thai | 41 = Hebrew |
| 12 = Ukrainian | 27 = (omitted) | 42 = Serbian |
| 13 = Czech | 28 = Finnish | 43 = Greek |
| 14 = Karachi | 29 = Tigrinya | 44 = Dinka |
| 15 = Gujarati | 30 = Polish | |

*Phase Two: Medium Differentiation*

During this phase the 44 categories from Phase 1 were collapsed, using the recode command, into ten to represent the languages spoken in the regions of Europe, the continents of North America and Africa, as well as the Middle East and Asia.

1 = North American (1, 4)
2 = North and North West Europe (3, 25, 28, 39)
3 = North East Europe (12, 13, 22, 23, 30, 37, 42)
4 = South East Europe (2, 43)
5 = South West Europe (11, 32)
6 = Middle Eastern (19, 24, 33, 36, 38, 41)
7 = East Asian (5, 6, 7, 16, 18, 21, 40)
8 = South East Asian (8, 17, 20, 26, 34)
9 = South Asian (9, 10, 14, 15, 31, 35)
10 = African (29, 44)

*Phase Three: Low Differentiation*

In order to compare students culturally by first language the ten codes were then collapsed, using the recode command, into four to compare European, Middle Eastern, Asian, and African languages. During this phase the ten regions were collapsed as follows:

1 = European (1, 2, 3, 4, 5)
2 = Middle Eastern (6)
3 = Asian (7, 8, 9)
4 = African (10)

The low differentiation was used when comparing students' first language.

4. Every person has a different family origin, culture and nationality. Also, each person may have their own sense of who they are. To what cultural group do you feel you belong? _____

*Phase One: High Differentiation*

This open-ended question for respondents' self-defined culture received many unique answers, such as "high flying white guy", which was put under Frivolous (70), to extensive answers such as Pakistani, Kuwaiti, English, Canadian which was put under Pakistani Canadian (17.5). Hence, for answers with more than two combined nationalities the first one and Canadian were combined, or if Canadian was not one of them, just the first country given was coded. During this phase a numeric code was assigned to student's self-defined culture into 103 categories as follows:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1 = Canadian | 28 = Irish | 59=Korean |
| 2 = European Canadian | 29 = French | 60=Chinese |
| 3 = Irish Canadian | 30 = Scottish | 61=Japanese |
| 2.5 = Norwegian Canadian | 31 = German | 62=South Asian |
| 4 = German Canadian | 32 = Ukrainian | 63 = Indian* |
| 5 = Scottish Canadian | 32.5 = Polish | 64 = Vietnamese |
| 6 = English Canadian | 33 = Croatian | 65 = Burman |
| 7 = Dutch Canadian | 33.5 = Czech | 66 = Singaporean |
| 8 = French Canadian | 34 = Hungarian | 67 = Malaysian |
| 9 = Polish Canadian | 35 = Portuguese | 68 = Indonesian |
| 10 = Czech Canadian | 36 = Italian | 69 = Filipino |
| 11 = Croatian Canadian | 37 = Greek | 70 = Frivolous** |
| 11.5 = Serbian Canadian | 38 = Israeli | 71 = Atheist |
| 12 = Estonian Canadian | 39 = Iranian | 72 = Jewish |
| 13 = Ukrainian Canadian | 40 = Persian | 73 = Christian |
| 13.5 = Hungarian Canadian | 41 = Armenian | 73.1 = Catholic |
| 14 = Italian Canadian | 42 = Pakistani | 73.2 = Protestant |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 14.5 = Portuguese Canadian | 43 = Egyptian | 74 = Mennonite |
| 15 = Persian Canadian | 44 = Eurasian | 75 = Muslim |
| 14.6 = Turkish Canadian | 45 = Norwegian Japanese | 75.5 = Sikh |
| 16 = Israeli Canadian | 46 = Italian Japanese | 76 = None |
| 17 = Islamic Muslim Canadian | 47 = White Asian | 77 = Every culture |
| 17.5 = Pakistani Canadian | 48 = English Chinese | 78.5 = North American |
| 18 = Indo Canadian | 49 = Portuguese Chinese | 78 = American |
| 19 = Mexican/Spanish Canadian | 49.5 = Anglo-Indian | 79 = Latin American |
| 20 = Afro-Canadian | 49.6 = Korean Caucasian | 80 = First Nations |
| 21 = Eurasian Canadian | 50 = Asian Canadian | 81 = Africa |
| 22 = European | 51 = Chinese Canadian | 82 = Caribbean |
| 23.5 = Danish | 52 = Korean Canadian | 83 = Jamaican |
| 23 = Finnish | 53 = Japanese Canadian | 84 = New Zealander |
| 24 = Scandinavian | 54 = Filipino Canadian | 84.5 = Russian |
| 24.5 = Norwegian | 55 = Vietnamese Canadian | 85 = Blank - incompletion |
| 25 = Swiss | 56 = Taiwanese Canadian | 86 = Blank due to choice |
| 26 = Dutch | 57 = Asian | 87 = not sure |
| 27 = English | 58 = Taiwanese | 89 = Caucasian |

\* (Indian, Sikh, East Indian, Hindus, Punjabi)
\*\* (anything other than ethnicity or religion, ie. trash, high-flying white guy, etc.)
note: numerical values containing .5 were included into the list, at its most appropriate spot, at a later time.

*Phase Two: Medium Differentiation*

Using the recode command in SPSS the 103 codes were then collapsed into 25 to produce more distinct regions of North America, Europe, Asia, other countries and categories as follows:

1 = North American (1, 78, 78.5)
2 = North and North West European Canadian (2-8)
3 = North East European Canadian (9, 10, 12, 13, 13.5)
4 = South East European Canadian  (11, 11.5, 14)
5 = South West European Canadian  (14.5)
6 = Middle Eastern Canadian (14.6-17)
7 = South Asian Canadian  (17.5, 18)
8 = Asian Canadian  (50-56)
9 = European, North and North West European (22-31)
10 = North East European (32, 32.5, 34)
11 = South West European (35)
12 = South East European  (33, 33.5, 36, 37)
13 = Middle Eastern  (38-41, 43) ·
14 = Other (44-49.6, 71-77, 89)
15 = Asian and East Asian (57-61)

16 = South Asian (42, 62, 63)
17 = South East Asian (64-69)
18 = Frivolous (70)
19 = Latin American (79)
20 = First Nations (80)
21 = Latin cultures (79, 83, 82)
22 = African (81)
23 = New Zealand (84)
24 = blank due to incompletion (85)
25 = blank due to choice (86)

*Phase Three: Low Differentiation*

During this phase the 25 codes were collapsed using the SPSS recode command into four codes as to represent continental regions. Asian Canadian was made a separate code since most crosscultural interaction to occur at UBC for adviser/advisee relationships may be western versus eastern. Hence, this study was interested to see if Asian Canadians would score closer to the North American or Asian group on the analysis.

1 = North American (1-6)
2 = Asian Canadian (7-8)
3 = European (9-12)
3 = Asian (15-17)
4 = Other (13, 14, 18-25)

Although there was some analysis based on the more differentiated categorisations of "culture" it was the "low" differentiation schema that was deployed to examine adviser/advisee relationships. Also, Other was not included in the analysis.

5. Were you born in Canada?

0= No
1= Yes

6. In which country were you born?

*Phase One: High Differentiation*

During this phase a numeric code was assigned to each respondent. There were 42 categories such as:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 0 = Canada | 15 = Korea | 30 = Hokkian/Chinese |
| 1 = Britain | 16 = Malaysia | 31 = Austria |
| 2 = Brunei | 17 = Philippines | 32 = Eritirea/Ethiopia |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 3 = Burma | 18 = Poland | 33 = Trinidad |
| 4 = China | 19 = Scotland | 34 = New Zealand |
| 5 = Czech Rep. | 20 = Taiwan | 35 = South America |
| 6 = El Salvador | 21 = Vietnam | 36 = Brazil |
| 7 = Fiji | 22 = Singapore | 37 = Belgium |
| 8 = Germany | 23 = France | 38 = UAE (United Arabic Emirates) |
| 9 = Hong Kong | 24 = U.S.A. | 39 = Chile |
| 10 = India | 25 = Indonesia | 40 = Peru |
| 11 = Iran | 26 = Australia | 41 = Israel |
| 12 = Jamaica | 27 = Ukraine | 42 = Norway |
| 13 = Japan | 28 = Egypt | |
| 14 = Kenya | 29 = Switzerland | |

*Phase Two: Medium Differentiation*

During this phase the 42 categories from Phase 1 were collapsed into eleven to put countries into regions of continents, such as Western Europe and Eastern Europe. They are as follows:

1 = Canada/U.S.A (0, 24)
2 = West Europe (1, 8, 19, 23, 29, 31, 37, 42, 43)
3 = East Europe (5, 18, 27)
4 = Middle East (11, 28, 38, 41)
5 = India (10)
6 = East Asia (4, 9, 13, 15, 20, 30)
7 = South East Asia (2, 3, 16, 17, 22, 21, 25)
8 = Africa (14, 32)
10 = South Pacific (7, 26, 34)
11 = Latin America (6, 12, 33, 35, 36, 39, 40)

*Phase Three: Low Differentiation*

During this phase the ten codes were collapsed, using the recode command, to represent a stronger divide between eastern and western countries, and others, as follows:

1 = West (1, 2, 3)
2 = Middle East (4)
3 = East (5, 6, 7)
4 = Other (8, 9, 10)

The categories from low differentiation were used for analysis.
7. How long have you lived in Canada?

_____ = in months  (accept "all my life" = 0)

Later recoded into Time Here Variable:

> 0 or >60 = 0 (5 years or more)
> 1-59 = 1 (less than 5 years)

8. Are you an International Student?

> 0 = No
> 1 = Yes

9. What Faculty are you now in?

> 1 = Arts
> 2 = Applied Science
> 3 = Science
> 4 = Education
> 5 = Commerce and Business Administration

Other (Please specify). Answers given were:

> 6 = Law
> 7 = Agriculture
> 8 = Family and Natural Science
> 9 = Graduate Studies
> 10 = Home Economics
> 11 = Intercultural Communication
> 12 = Music
> 13 = Nursing
> 14 = Ritsumeikan Program
> 15 = Human Kinetics
> 16 = Pharmacy
> 18 = Forestry
> 19 = Unclassified

Only the one's having more than fifteen respondents in them were recoded: ie., Agriculture = 6, Human Kinetics = 7, and Pharmacy =8.

10. List here all the subjects you are currently studying (e.g. Psychology, English, Biochemistry)
Each subject listed was given made its own variable and then coded as follows:

> 0 = No
> 1 = Yes

11. At any time at UBC (so far) have you talked to a:

a) Faculty Academic Adviser    b) Departmental Academic Adviser

$$0 = No$$
$$1 = Yes$$

12. At any time at UBC have you talked about your university life and work to a counsellor or adviser from: (Circle one for each)

   a) International House          b) Career Counselling Office
   c) Student Health Psychiatrist  d) Women Students' Office
   e) The Ombuds Office           f) AMS Speakeasy
   g) Counselling Services        h) Equity Office
   i) Legal Clinic                j) First Nations House of Learning
   k) Pacific Spirit              l) Residence/Dorm

$$0 = No$$
$$1 = Yes$$

m) Other(s) - each answer provided was given a number from 1 to 15 answers provided were: spouse, family members, friends, financial aid officer, tuition fee payment clerk, liaison officer, international exchange program's adviser, church, Colour Connected Against Racism (CCAR), professors, graduate supervisor, classmates, a coach, other departments or other faculty.

13. What year of University are you in?

$$1 = First Year$$
$$2 = Second Year$$
$$3 = Third Year$$
$$4 = Fourth Year$$

Other  - additional answers given were Diploma Program, First Year Education, Masters, Law, and Twelve Month Education; they were all recoded as 5 for Fifth Year. Unclassified Year, and Audit were recoded as 1 for First Year. Sixth Year was coded as 6, and Seventh Year as 7.

14. What grades are you getting at UBC:

| In your worst courses: | In your best courses: |
|---|---|
| 90 = 90's | 90 = 90's |
| 80 = 80's | 80 = 80's |
| 70 = 70's | 70 = 70's |
| 60 = 60's | 60 = 60's |
| 50 = 50's | 50 = 50's |
| 40 = 40's | |

## Appendix III

## Overhead of Instructions for Participants

This is an anonymous survey for my Master's thesis in Education.

Read the brief paragraph, then quickly respond to all statements

accurately & honesty.  Raise your hand & I will collect them when you've

finished.


Note:  it doesn't matter whether or not you've spoken with an Academic
Adviser.  The questions are based on "assumptions" of how you "would"
feel.