

ABSTRACT

**WYATT, JENNIFER LYNNE. Student, Staff Advisor, and Faculty Advisor
Perceptions of Academic Advising. (Under the direction of Don C. Locke.)**

Two historical aims of undergraduate education have been to involve students in the content of learning and to involve students with faculty (Gordon, Habley, & Associates, 2000). Involving students in the content of the learning happens almost automatically during class time, lab meetings, academic clubs, and extracurricular arts events. Actually involving students with faculty has been somewhat more difficult. One method used to engage students with faculty is academic advising.

Academic advising in some form has been a part of higher education in the United States almost since its beginning (Gordon, 1992), but it wasn't until 1979 that the National Academic Advising Association (NACADA) was established. In 1980 the association worked in conjunction with the Council for the Advancement of Standards to set goals for academic advising; however, little research has been done regarding their efficacy. A series of national studies on academic advising, done in 1979, 1983, 1987, 1992, 1998, and in 2003, has been conducted by the American College Testing (ACT) program in collaboration with NACADA. The last five of the national surveys have included a section for the assessment of the goals for advising. One survey was completed for each institution.

These surveys have provided substantial data from many institutions, however, with just one person reporting from each institution, responses may not have been reliable in describing the totality of academic advising at each institution. The majority of respondents were not strictly involved in academic advising but were from academic departments, counseling departments, student affairs, enrollment management, admissions, or some other unit on campus. This raises a question regarding respondents' complete knowledge of and

participation in the entire advising processes/systems at the institutions and, therefore, the accuracy of the reporting of how well the goals are being met. A more accurate picture of how well the goals are being met may come from those on campus who are actually involved in the process of advising. This would include staff advisors and faculty advisors who meet with students in an advising relationship and the students themselves.

This study investigated the self-reported perceptions of how well staff advisors, faculty advisors, and students believed the NACADA goals for academic advising were being met on a public comprehensive university campus. In addition, the study looked at the relationship between student, staff academic advisor, and faculty advisor perceptions of meeting the NACADA goals for academic advising. The results of the survey suggest that while all student means fell above the 3.0 level (on a 1-5 Likert scale instrument), students rated their advisors as being closer to the Adequate rating than the Well rating when reporting how well their advisors were able to meet each goal. Staff and faculty advisors rated themselves higher than students rated them on all scales. Further qualitative research into what occurs during advising would provide a richer view of how the goals were being addressed during advising sessions.

**STUDENT, STAFF ADVISOR, AND FACULTY ADVISOR
PERCEPTIONS OF ACADEMIC ADVISING**

by
JENNIFER LYNNE WYATT

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty of
North Carolina State University
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Education

ADULT AND COMMUNITY COLLEGE EDUCATION

Raleigh

2006

APPROVED BY:

Chair of Advisory Committee

For Savannah and Carolina, my daughters.
I love you both (more than salt)!

BIOGRAPHY

Jennifer Lynne Wyatt, born December 17, 1966, is the daughter of Evelyn H. Wyatt and the late Lonnie W. Wyatt, Jr. She earned a Bachelor of Science degree in psychology from the University of North Carolina – Asheville in 1988 and began teaching adults at Schofield Barracks, Hawaii, in 1989.

Ms. Wyatt continued her work in adult education at Asheville-Buncombe Technical Community College (A-B Tech) in Asheville, North Carolina, in 1995. She taught adult basic skills and GED preparation classes at community centers, alcohol and drug abuse treatment centers, correctional facilities, and on the community college campus. Ms. Wyatt also worked in the administration of the Adult Education program as the assessment/retention specialist.

While working part-time at A-B Tech, Ms. Wyatt attended Western Carolina University, and in 1999 earned a Master of Science degree in community counseling. Her internships were completed at Blue Ridge Substance Abuse Agency and at Caring for Children. After graduation, Ms. Wyatt became the Dean of Academic Affairs at a small proprietary college in Asheville.

In 2002, Ms. Wyatt moved to Boone, North Carolina, to become the Director of Undergraduate Academic Services for the College of Arts and Sciences at Appalachian State University. She is a National Certified Counselor and is a member of the National Academic Advising Association and Pi Gamma Mu, the international honor society in social sciences.

Ms. Wyatt has two children, Savannah and Carolina Parris.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This project would not have been possible without the assistance and support from many people. First, I would like to thank my daughters, Savannah and Carolina, who shared eight of their childhood years with Mommy's masters and doctoral classes. I hope they have learned that anything is possible with hard work. I also express love and appreciation to my sister DeLane Rosenau, who babysat children, listened to my frustrations, and proofread drafts. And to my mother and my father, Evelyn and Lonnie Wyatt, who instilled in me a love of learning and a belief in my abilities, I thank you for your love.

Special thanks to Dr. Don Locke for his continued support of me and all the members of the cohort and for making this process attainable. Appreciation is also extended to other members of my Committee, Drs. Audrey Jaeger, Deborah Luckadoo, and Mark Grimmett for their interest and advice. Special thanks also goes to Dr. Robbie Pittman for his assistance with statistical methods.

I also offer special thanks to members of the Asheville Cohort (cohort number 3 – 2001-2005) who have learned together, laughed together, and even lived together! Your support and your refusal to let me give up are a big reason this project has been completed. My memories of this journey are sweeter because of you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	ix
CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem.....	7
Purpose of the Study and Research Questions.....	8
Hypotheses.....	9
Definitions.....	9
Assumptions of the Study	10
Limitations of the Study.....	10
Significance of the Study	11
CHAPTER 2. LITERATURE REVIEW	12
Academic Advising in the United States	12
Historical Overview	12
The Earliest Years.....	12
The 1860s through the 1950s.....	13
The 1960s and 1970s	16
The 1980s and Forward	19
National Academic Advising Association	22
History.....	22
Goals for Advising and Statement of Core Values.....	24
ACT National Surveys of Academic Advising.....	26
Definitions of Academic Advising	31
Student Development Theory	36
Psychosocial Theory	37
Erikson.....	37
Marcia	39
Chickering.....	39
Identity Development Theory	40
Racial Identity Development	42
People of Color Racial Identity Development	42
Biracial and Multiracial Identity Development	43
White Racial Identity Development.....	45
Sexual Identity Development.....	46
Gender Identity Development.....	47
Ability/Disability and Social Class Identity Development	49
Ability/Disability Identity Development	49
Social Class Identity Development.....	50
Cognitive-Development Theory	50
Piaget.....	51

Perry	51
Kohlberg	53
Gilligan	54
Typology Theory	55
Jung	56
Myers-Briggs	57
Holland.....	58
Person-Environment Theory.....	60
Lewin	61
Sanford.....	62
Astin.....	63
Schlossberg	63
Student, Staff Advisor, and Faculty Advisor Perceptions of Advising	65
Studies of Students.....	65
Studies of Faculty Advisors.....	75
Studies of Comparison among Groups	78
Conclusion	82
CHAPTER 3. METHODOLOGY	84
Research Design.....	84
Participants.....	84
Instruments.....	86
Hypotheses.....	87
Procedures.....	88
Data Analyses	89
CHAPTER 4. DATA ANALYSIS	91
Overview of the Study	91
The Research Site	91
Target Population.....	91
Participants.....	92
Instrument	93
Assumptions of the Study	94
Qualitative Data Analysis	95
Method of Content Analysis	95
Description of Advisor Roles.....	95
Reported Methods Used.....	96
Goal One	96
Students.....	96
Faculty Advisors	97
Staff Advisors	98
Goal Two	99
Students.....	99
Faculty Advisors	101

Staff Advisors	102
Goal Three	103
Students.....	103
Faculty Advisors	104
Staff Advisors	105
Goal Four	106
Students.....	106
Faculty Advisors	108
Staff Advisors	109
Goal Five.....	110
Students.....	110
Faculty Advisors	111
Staff Advisors	112
Goal Six	113
Students.....	113
Faculty Advisors	114
Staff Advisors	115
Goal Seven	116
Students.....	116
Faculty Advisors	117
Staff Advisors	118
Goal Eight	119
Students.....	119
Faculty Advisors	120
Staff Advisors	120
Additional Comments	121
Hypotheses Testing.....	123
Research Question One.....	124
Research Question Two	126
Research Question Three	128
Research Question Four.....	130
Research Question Five	132
Summary of the Findings.....	134
 CHAPTER 5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	135
Introduction.....	135
Overview of the Study, Limitations, and Hypotheses Testing	135
Overview of the Study	135
Limitations of the Study.....	135
Hypotheses Testing.....	137
Research Questions and Hypotheses	137
Research Question One.....	137
Research Question Two	138
Research Question Three	138
Research Question Four.....	139

Research Question Five	139
Advisor Roles.....	140
Advisor Roles for Each Goal	141
Goal One	141
Goal Two	142
Goal Three	142
Goal Four	143
Goal Five.....	144
Goal Six	144
Goal Seven.....	145
Goal Eight.....	145
Key Findings and Conclusions	146
Implications for Practice	150
Recommendations for Future Research.....	153
Summary	154
REFERENCES	155
APPENDICES	174
Appendix A. Permission Statement from North Carolina State University Institutional Review Board for the Use of Human Subjects in Research.....	175
Appendix B. Permission Statement from Appalachian State University Institutional Review Board	177
Appendix C. Appalachian State University Informed Consent Form for Research.....	179
Appendix D. Email Sent to Participants.....	182
Appendix E. Advisee Survey Form	184
Appendix F. Advisor Survey Form.....	187

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1. Number of Responses for Goal One by Advisor Role.....	96
Table 2. Number of Responses for Goal Two by Advisor Role	99
Table 3. Number of Responses for Goal Three by Advisor Role	103
Table 4. Number of Responses for Goal Four by Advisor Role.....	106
Table 5. Number of Responses for Goal Five by Advisor Role	110
Table 6. Number of Responses for Goal Six by Advisor Role	113
Table 7. Number of Responses for Goal Seven by Advisor Role.....	116
Table 8. Number of Responses for Goal Eight by Advisor Role.....	119
Table 9. Analysis of Differences Between Faculty Advisors and Staff Advisors	125
Table 10. Analysis of Differences Between Staff Advisors and Students with Staff Advisors	127
Table 11. Analysis of Differences Between Faculty Advisors and Students with Faculty Advisors	129
Table 12. Analysis of Differences Between All Advisors and All Students	131
Table 13. Analysis of Differences Between Students with Faculty Advisors and Students with Staff Advisors	133

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Two historical aims of undergraduate education have been to involve students in the content of learning and to involve students with faculty (Gordon, Habley, & Associates, 2000). Involving students in the content of learning happens during class time, lab meetings, academic clubs, and extracurricular arts events. Actually involving students with faculty has been somewhat more difficult. One method used to engage students with faculty is academic advising.

Academic advising in some form has been a part of higher education in the United States almost since its beginning (Gordon, 1992). While Lawrence Lowell, President of Harvard College in 1909, is credited with first looking at student development, it was as early as 1820 at Kenyon College in Ohio when students were first paired with advisors (Cook, 1999). In 1876 at John Hopkins University, a program of faculty academic advising was initiated as a way to address the needs of a growing student population; Harvard followed suit in 1888 (Gordon). This “advising” translated more to faculty supervision of students’ studies, living environments and experiences, and religious worship than to student development (Frost, 2000). This type of *in loco parentis* advising began to change in the 1960s as students began participating in civil rights activities and demanding they be treated as adults (Melear, 2003). The movement away from *in loco parentis* was one catalyst for change in this concept of advising. The unique development of higher education and America was another.

Higher education in the United States has developed much as the nation itself has developed, with a focus on “individualism...as opposed to collectivism” (Gordon, 1992, p. 3).

This individualism in education meant the development of an elective system of courses with a variety of majors offered for specialization. There are more choices in majors, minors, and courses than ever before (Habley, 2003). In addition, enrollment has increased dramatically, not only in numbers, but also in diversity (e.g., first generation college students, lower-income families, poorly prepared students, nontraditional students) and needs of students (e.g., students with disabilities, students from minority groups, international students) (El-Khawas, 2003; Frost, 2000; Habley; Thelin, 2003). Institutions tried to meet the many and diverse needs of their students with faculty advisors. However, as enrollments exploded from the 1950s through the 1970s, more demands were put on faculty to meet student service needs than they could meet due to all the other faculty duties (e.g., teaching, research, committee service, public service) expected of them (Gordon). Staff academic advisors were increasingly hired to augment the system of faculty advisors.

The National Academic Advising Association (NACADA) was established in 1979 to promote “quality academic advising on college and university campuses” (NACADA, 1994, para. 1). As the only higher education advising association, NACADA is dedicated to “the support and professional growth of academic advisors and the advising profession” (NACADA, 1992, p. 80). This support and professional growth includes a statement of core values for advising, a research clearinghouse, a consultants bureau, awards programs, research grants, conferences and seminars (NACADA, n.d.a.).

In the 1980s, the number of students looking for higher education declined dramatically (Gordon, 1992). In addition, accountability was demanded by stakeholders (e.g., federal and state governments, accreditation bodies, taxpayers), which led to a greater focus for higher education on retaining students (Nuss, 2003). These retention efforts focused on

creating an environment that emphasized quality learning experiences and student success and satisfaction (Gordon). Studies have shown that involvement with faculty and other students in the university community is one of the vital components of students' retention, satisfaction, and success in higher education (Astin, 1993; Gordon, Habley, & Associates, 2000; Light, 2001a; Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991). Academic advising is the "only structured activity on the campus in which all students have the opportunity for one-to-one interaction with a concerned representative of the institution" (Nutt, n.d., para. 2). In addition to providing a one-on-one relationship with someone on the campus, academic advisors "provide students with the needed connection to the various campus services and supply the essential academic connection between these services and the students" (Nutt, para. 2).

While the importance of academic advising has been established, there is no true consensus as to an operational definition of academic advising. "Academic advising has always been a function in which faculty and students consulted about the students' selection of major and courses and proceeded through the scheduling process"(Gordon, 1992). This prescriptive model reduced advising to the clerical task of registration (Tuttle, 2000).

However, in the 1970s, several theories were espoused that broadened the tasks and outlook involved in academic advising. O'Banion (1972) and Crookston (1972) published now classic articles that encouraged academic advising to move beyond this prescriptive advising model towards a more developmental model. O'Banion defined advising as "a process in which advisor and advisee enter a dynamic relationship respectful of the student's concerns. Ideally, the advisor serves as teacher and guide in an interactive partnership aimed at enhancing the student's self-awareness and fulfillment" (p. 63). This definition led O'Banion to develop five steps that encompassed what he saw as the tasks of advising: 1) an

exploration of life goals; 2) an exploration of vocational goals; 3) student choice of program or major; 4) student course choice; and 5) scheduling courses. These steps were seen as sequential steps through which an advisor and advisee should progress to “help the student choose a program of study [that] will serve him in the development of his total potential” (O’Banion, p. 62).

Crookston (1972) went further, espousing a theory of developmental advising, which described advising as more a function of teaching than of clerical registration. He defined advising as “concerned not only with a specific personal or vocational decision but also with facilitating the student’s rational processes, environmental and interpersonal interactions, behavior awareness, and problem solving, decision making, and evaluation skills” (Crookston, p. 12). In developmental advising “the advisor and the student differentially engage in a series of developmental tasks, the successful completion of which results in varying degrees of learning *by both parties*” (Crookston, p. 13). Developmental advising includes these tenets: advisor and student share responsibility; focus is on potentialities; effort is growth oriented; the advising relationship is based on equal and shared problem solving; and evaluation is a shared process (Crookston). Advisors are expected to understand adolescent and adult development so they are prepared to help their students reach their potential growth (King, 1984).

The national association finally spoke to the definition of advising when it released its statement of core values for advising in 1994. This statement affirms the association’s beliefs about “the importance of education and the understanding of the power of human interaction and its impact on the individual lives and present and future society” (NACADA, 2004a, para. 2). The six core values developed by NACADA provide a “framework against

which those who advise can measure their own performance" (NACADA, 1994, para. 2).

The core values are to be used as reference points rather than as dictates. "Advisors will find some Core Values more important than others, depending on their own philosophies and those of their colleges and universities" (NACADA, para. 3). The Core Values are as follows:

1. Advisors are responsible to the students and individuals they serve.
2. Advisors are responsible for involving others, when appropriate, in the advising process.
3. Advisors are responsible to the college or university in which they work.
4. Advisors are responsible to higher education generally.
5. Advisors are responsible to the community (including the local community, state, and region in which the institution is located).
6. Advisors are responsible to their professional role as advisors and to themselves personally. (NACADA, p. 1-2)

Although NACADA developed a statement of core values in 1994, it was not until 2004 that NACADA created a task force to look into creating a comprehensive definition of academic advising (NACADA, 2004b). In its current state of development, the definition is quite long (1 ½ pages single-spaced) and incorporates four components that are common to all types of advising: 1) academic advising is a multidimensional, intentional process; 2) academic advising is grounded in teaching and learning; 3) academic advising has its own purpose and content; and 4) academic advising has specified outcomes for student learning (NACADA, 2004d). These components are considered to be universal, that is, not dependent

upon the type or size of the institution (NACADA). The definition is steeped in developmental advising theory and in NACADA's core values.

In addition to core values, NACADA has eight goals for academic advising. These goals were created in 1980 by a task force convened by NACADA that was charged with providing information to the Council for the Advancement of Standards (CAS) (Habley, 2000). These goals have been unchanged since 1980:

1. Assisting students in self-understanding and self-acceptance.
2. Assisting students in considering their life goals by relating their interests, skills, abilities, and values to careers, the world of work, and the nature and purpose of higher education.
3. Assisting students in developing an educational plan consistent with their life goals and objectives.
4. Assisting students in developing decision-making skills.
5. Providing accurate information about institutional policies, procedures, resources, and programs.
6. Referring students to other institutional or community support services.
7. Assisting students in evaluating or reevaluating progress toward established goals and educational plans.
8. Providing information about students to the institution, college, academic departments, or some combination thereof. (Habley, p. 40-41)

These goals were used by CAS, which developed the CAS Standards for Academic Advising and the CAS Self-Assessment Guide for Academic Advising (Habley).

Statement of the Problem

The American College Testing (ACT) program, in collaboration with NACADA, has conducted six comprehensive national surveys of academic advising, in 1979, 1983, 1987, 1992, 1998, and in 2003 (Habley, 2004). The first five surveys were sent to roughly 1,000 two-and four-year, public and private institutions, chosen by stratified random sampling, that met the following criteria: accreditation by one of the six regional accrediting bodies and offering either associates' degrees (two-year) or bachelors' degrees (four-year) (Habley). One survey was completed for each institution. The last national survey, done in 2003, included all of the institutions in the U.S. that met the selection criteria, a total of 3,019 institutions (Habley). The goals set by NACADA and CAS have been assessed in the last five of the six national surveys of academic advising conducted by ACT, beginning in 1983. The questions used to assess these goals have remained the same throughout the five surveys so the results from each survey can easily be compared. Respondents were asked to rate how well their institutions' advising systems met the eight goals for most of the students at their school. A 5-point Likert scale (Very Unsatisfactory to Very Satisfactory) was provided. Over the five surveys, the mean for each goal has risen for both two-year and four-year institutions (Habley).

These surveys have provided substantial data from many institutions, however, with just one person reporting from each institution, responses may not have been reliable in describing the totality of academic advising at each institution. The 1987, 1992, and the 2003 surveys included a question regarding the title of the person completing the survey. Almost half of the 2003 surveys were completed by either a Director/Coordinator of Academic Advising (24%) or Vice President/Dean of Academic Affairs (24%) (Habley, 2004). The

other 52% of respondents were from academic departments, counseling departments, student affairs, enrollment management, admissions, or some other unit on campus. While Habley indicated this is a positive sign that those who responded to the survey were familiar with academic advising, only 24% actually had titles of Director/Coordinator of Academic Advising. This raises a question regarding respondents' complete knowledge of and participation in the entire advising processes/systems at the institutions and, therefore, the accuracy of the reporting of how well the goals are being met.

A more accurate picture of how well the goals are being met may come from those on campus who are actually involved in the process of advising. This would include staff advisors and faculty advisors who meet with students in an advising relationship and the students themselves.

Purpose of the Study and Research Questions

The purpose of this study is to investigate the self-reported perceptions of faculty and staff advisors as to how well they are meeting the NACADA goals for advising. In addition, the study will investigate the relationship between student, staff academic advisor, and faculty advisor perceptions of meeting NACADA goals for academic advising. The research questions posed are:

1. Is there a significant difference between faculty advisor perception and staff advisor perception of meeting NACADA goals for advising?
2. Is there a significant difference between staff advisor perception and students with staff advisors perception of meeting NACADA goals for advising?
3. Is there a significant difference between faculty advisor perception and students with faculty advisors perception of meeting NACADA goals for advising?

4. Is there a significant difference between all advisor perceptions and student perceptions of meeting NACADA goals for advising?
5. Is there a significant difference between students with faculty advisors perceptions and students with staff advisors perceptions of meeting NACADA goals for advising?

Hypotheses

H_{Oa} : There will be no difference between faculty advisors and staff advisors reported perceptions of meeting NACADA academic advising goals.

H_{Ob} : There will be no difference between staff advisors and students with staff advisors reported perceptions of meeting NACADA academic advising goals.

H_{Oc} : There will be no difference between faculty advisors and students with faculty advisors reported perceptions of meeting NACADA academic advising goals.

H_{Od} : There will be no difference between all advisor perceptions and student perceptions of meeting NACADA academic advising goals.

H_{Oe} : There will be no difference between students with faculty advisors perceptions and students with staff advisors perceptions of meeting NACADA goals for advising.

Definitions

Academic Advising – “a systematic process based on a close student-advisor relationship intended to aid students in achieving educational, career, and personal goals through the utilization of the full range of institutional and community resources” (Ender, Winston, & Miller, 1984, p. 19). Appalachian State University’s (ASU) statement:

Appalachian views advising students as one of its highest responsibilities and priorities. It seeks to provide every student with assistance in identifying academic

and career interests, developing a realistic and successful academic program, planning an effective career strategy, and addressing personal and social areas of concern. (ASU, 2005d, p. 40)

Faculty Advisor – an employee of an institution of higher education whose primary job task includes teaching and research in a disciplinary field.

In loco parentis – “in the place of the parent” (Melear, 2003, p. 125); like parents, colleges and universities were completely responsible for students’ living environments, courses of study, and even worship requirements.

Staff Advisor – an employee of an institution of higher education whose primary job task is advising students.

Assumptions of the Study

1. Staff and faculty advisors will honestly report their performance in meeting advising goals.
2. Students will honestly report their perceptions of staff and faculty advisors’ performance in meeting advising goals.
3. The instrument used will accurately measure perceptions of meeting the academic advising goals.

Limitations of the Study

1. The findings of this study will be applicable only to the staff and faculty advisors at Appalachian State University.
2. The perceptions of meeting the advising goals are open to participants’ subjectivity.
3. The instrument used is a researcher-developed instrument.

4. The number of staff advisors selected to be a part of this study will be significantly lower than the number of faculty advisors or students due to their overall limited numbers.

Significance of the Study

The NACADA goals for academic advising have been in place since 1980. The research on these goals has been limited to the ACT studies in which one person from each institution is asked to evaluate the entire institution's program of academic advising. A closer look at how staff and faculty advisors themselves feel they are meeting the goals is warranted. In addition, NACADA has just announced it is developing a definition of academic advising and is reviewing the core values. This study may provide some input into these items as well.

Chapter 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Two historical aims of undergraduate education have been to involve students in the content of learning and to involve students with faculty (Frost, 2000). Involving students in the content of learning happens during class time, lab meetings, academic clubs, and extracurricular arts events. Actually involving students with faculty outside the classroom setting has been somewhat more difficult. One method used to engage students with faculty is academic advising.

Academic Advising in the United States

Historical Overview

The Earliest Years

Higher education in the United States has developed much as the nation itself has developed, with a focus on “individualism...as opposed to collectivism” (Gordon, 1992, p. 3), and academic advising in some form has been a part of higher education in the United States almost since its beginning (Gordon). “From the early Colonial colleges to the current era of the multiversity, American higher education has concerned itself with the development of individual students for positions of societal leadership and influence” (Strange, 1999, p. 570). Colonists in the New World believed citizens must be educated in order to fully participate in and build an ideal society (Frost, 2000). This early education system included colleges that would “establish social order in communities, instill civic responsibility in inhabitants, and educate privileged young men” (Frost, pp. 4-5). The focus of the education was on classical works, as well as proper conduct, character development, and civic virtue (Denham, 2002; Strange). These early colleges offered a rigid curriculum with little student

choice of courses. Institutions acted *in loco parentis*: faculty, like parents, were completely responsible for students' living environments, courses of study, and even worship requirements (Frost; Nuss, 2003; Thelin, 2003). In The Yale Report of 1828, the faculty of Yale described their relationships with students as guardians: "When removed from under the roof of their parents, and exposed to the untried scenes of temptation, it is necessary that some faithful and affectionate guardian take them by the hand, and guide their steps" (Committee of the Corporation and the Academical Faculty, 1828, p. 9).

As the colonies moved towards independence, students also began to demand more freedom to make choices in their educations. "In time, reflecting the Jacksonian views of individualism, optimism, and materialism, colleges prepared students to serve not the state, but rather the students' individual aims" (Frost, 2000, p. 5). This individualism led to an increasing estrangement between faculty and students; no longer were faculty and students interacting in class, worship, and extracurricular activities. "At best, historical ideals about the teacher guiding the learner had become obscured; at worst, they had been lost" (Frost, p. 7).

The 1860s through the 1950s

In 1862, Congress passed the Morrill Act, which set up land grant colleges in each state in order to teach practical skills, such as agriculture, forestry, mechanical skills, and teaching, to citizens (Basic Readings in U.S. Democracy: The Morrill Act (1862), n.d.; Cohen & Brawer, 2003). The fundamental concept behind the Morrill Act was a belief in providing a college education for all, not just for the privileged few (Nuss, 2003). An expansion of the Morrill Act was passed in 1890 to include providing publicly funded segregated Black colleges in 17 states. The focus on practical skills led to an enormous

growth in the elective system, so that by the end of the 1800s, more than 50% of all courses offered in America were elective courses (Denham, 2002). The elective system “sent the philosophical message that the college had no authority to prescribe a curriculum” (Denham, p. 8), and it “asserted that all educated men need not know the same things” (Veysey, 1965, p. 305). This meant that, for the first time, students were able to choose courses to complete their educational programs. Academic advising began as faculty members assisted students with these choices, but while students enjoyed this advising, faculty were mostly ineffective advisors (Frost, 2000).

The late 19th century and the early years of the 20th century saw much growth in higher education, not only in numbers of colleges and students, but also in the academic and extracurricular programs offered. Colleges and universities began to work with corporations and industry on research and development (Frost, 2000). The great wealth of early industrial magnates helped fund research at institutions, which, in return, provided data and new processes to improve the balance sheets of the corporations. Faculty began to be hired based upon their research abilities and interests rather than on teaching abilities or interests in order for colleges to attract more funding from industry (Boyle, 2002). Institutions of higher education began to focus on research over instruction, which pulled faculty members farther away from the classroom. This new focus on research increased the distance between faculty and students (Boyle).

Also during this period, extracurricular activities, such as athletics, fraternities, sororities, campus newspapers, and other student clubs, became as important to students as the academic climate on campuses (Thelin, 2003). These activities were evidence of students’ desire for development of the whole person, not just of the academic mind (Nuss,

2003). However, more opportunities for students to interact outside the classroom setting led to more distance between faculty and students (Frost, 2000). The field of student affairs and development began when institutions created positions for Deans of Men and Deans of Women to address the estrangement between faculty and students. The focus of these Deans was on student development and discipline (Nuss). More was needed, however, to meet the aim of involving students with faculty.

To begin to close the distance between faculty and students and to address the issues of choosing courses and extracurricular activities from a wide array of electives, faculty were beginning to be expected to advise students on their choices for courses and extracurricular activities. While Lawrence Lowell, President at Harvard College in 1909, is credited with first looking at student advisement, it was really as early as 1820 at Kenyon College in Ohio when students were first paired with advisors (Cook, 1999; Raskin, 1979). In 1876 at Johns Hopkins University, a program of faculty academic advising was initiated as a way to address the needs of a growing student population; Harvard followed suit in 1888 (Goetz, 1996; Gordon, 1992). At Harvard, faculty were in charge of helping students choose programs that best suited students' needs and interests (Goetz). However, much of this early "advising" still translated more to faculty supervision of students' studies, living environments and experiences, and religious worship than to student development (Frost, 2000). Even though this advising was much like parenting, faculty advising was popular with students; by the 1930s, almost all colleges and universities had formal advising programs (Frost, 1991; Raskin).

After World War II, the United States was faced with an enormous number of men and women returning from service to their country to the work force in a declining economy.

In order to prevent another depression, the federal government created the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (the GI Bill), which provided federal funds for returning veterans to attend college. This funding helped over 2.25 million veterans to enroll at 2,000 different colleges (Cook, 1999). This created an overwhelming need for academic advisors, who were faced with new students whose backgrounds and academic preparation could not be assumed to be similar to the traditional college student (Habley, 2003).

The 1960s and 1970s

The bigger impact of this first federal funding came as the money provided to students opened the door to higher education for those who previously had no hope of attending college (Boyle, 2002). The GI Bill "set a precedent for making portable government student aid an entitlement, and it provided a policy tool for increasing diversity of American universities" (Thelin, 2003, p. 14). Due to the combination of the availability of federal funds to students and the increased participation of previously underrepresented populations, the 1960s saw a growth in higher education that was larger than the previous three decades combined (Frost, 2000). Student populations began to include large numbers of first-generation students, lower-income students, students from minority groups, under-prepared students, students with disabilities, international students, and reentry students (Cook, 1999; Gordon, 1992). "Academic advising became an important vehicle for individualizing academic adjustment and planning for these groups" (Gordon, p. 4).

Institutions attempted to meet the diverse needs of these students with faculty advisors. However, as enrollments exploded, more demands were put on faculty to meet student service needs than they could deliver due to all the other faculty duties (e.g., teaching, research, committee service, public service) expected of them (Gordon, 1992).

Colleges and universities began to hire staff advisors to supplement the system of faculty advisors.

Problems accompanied the great growth in higher education during the 1960s. The great influx of money from the federal government in the 1960s and 1970s had a price. Through the early 1970s, more federal oversight led to “volumes of regulations that influence student affairs policies and procedures” (Nuss, 2003, p. 73). These regulations came in the form of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Vocational Education Act, the Higher Education Facilities Act, the Health Professions Act, the Higher Education Act, Title IX, the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act, Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and others (Becker, 2000; Nuss; Thelin, 2003). Colleges and universities were faced with creating new positions and procedures in student development areas to address these regulations.

In addition to the problem of new regulations, large enrollment necessitated using large classes to accommodate the numbers of students, while “faculty and administration haggled over issues such as the efficiency and legitimacy of teaching in large lecture halls as opposed to the value of personalized instruction in small class sections” (Thelin, 2003, p. 15). Large undergraduate enrollments allowed institutions to subsidize new graduate programs and research institutes, although some questioned the cost to the quality of undergraduate programs (Thelin). Students began to feel like a sideline issue rather than a main focus of the institutions.

This “boom in construction and enrollments tended to mask problems and tensions among students that would emerge between 1963 and 1968 and violently erupt between 1968 and 1972” (Thelin, 2003, p. 16). Students began to react to “a deeper sense of impersonalism

invading higher education” (Rentz, 1996, p. 45). Thelin described two sources of undergraduate discontent:

First, discontented students complained of large lecture classes, impersonal registration, crowded student housing, and the psychological distance between faculty and students caused by booming campuses. Second, student concern about external political and societal events – notably the Vietnam War, the draft, the counter-culture movement, and the Civil Rights movement – kindled a visible and eventually widespread student activism. (p. 16)

In response, the notion of the university responsibilities of *in loco parentis* began to change. Students began participating in civil rights activities and demanding they be treated as adults (Melear, 2003). The Supreme Court rendered a series of decisions that forever moved college students into full adulthood with the recognition that “for the most part, persons above the age of eighteen are legally adults and that students at public colleges do not relinquish their fundamental constitutional rights by accepting student status” (Nuss, 2003, p. 74). The role of advisor no longer included parenting duties such as supervising students’ living environments, behaviors, and extracurricular activities.

While parent-like duties were no longer required, faculty, for the most part, however, were not enamored of their role as advisors. Part of this faculty unease could be attributable to a “chasm between the faculty/advisors of the 1950s – who were mostly male, white, and Protestant – and the new students – who were more ethnically diverse” (Winston, 1994, p. 112). This polarization played out in the advising programs as well and was summed up in the 1970 *Handbook of College and University Administration*, which stated: “Students complain that advisors do not know the curriculum and advisors complain that they serve no function

other than that of a clerk who signs cards" (Kenworthy, 1970, p. 2-22). In 1972, two influential articles were published to address advising as an actual developmental process rather just a series of scheduling tasks. O'Banion (1972) described a five step model of advising, and Crookston (1972) described advising as a developmental teaching activity. These two landmark articles provided a template for what advising could become (Habley, 1988).

Towards the end of this turbulent era, the first comprehensive national study of academic advising was done by the American College Testing Program (ACT) with support from the National Academic Advising Association (NACADA) (Carstensen & Silberhorn, 1979). This 1979 study found that advising systems were similar in colleges and universities across the country. Administrators tended to see advising as a low-status information-giving activity rather than a part of the overall developmental process described by O'Banion (1972) and Crookston (1972). Very little evaluation of services was being conducted, and institutions generally had no defining mission or statement of policy regarding advising. The survey found that "all of postsecondary education is communicating an increased interest in the academic advising function" (Habley, 1988, p. 3), but this interest had not yet translated into practice on campuses.

The 1980s and Forward

While the United States overall population growth rate was at an historic low during the 1980s, minority populations continued to grow at a rate two to fourteen times the rate of the non-minority group (Frost, 2000). This population growth in the U.S. minority population was also seen in colleges and universities, with the percentage of students from minority groups rising from 15% in 1972 to 25% in 1995 (Frost). Overall, however, campuses were dealing with declining enrollments and climbing attrition rates (Frost, 1991). Colleges and universities

were “forced to develop measures of productivity that have often been tied to fiscal resources” (Laureano, 2003, p. 3). Stakeholders (e.g., federal and state governments, accreditation bodies, taxpayers) began to call for accountability in the face of higher attrition rates. Demonstrated quality, efficiency, and effectiveness was demanded by stakeholders (Thelin, 2003), which led to a greater focus for higher education on retaining students (Nuss, 2003). Retention became the key issue in measuring efficiency and effectiveness of institutions.

These retention efforts focused on the total educational experience for the student, creating an environment that emphasized quality learning experiences and student success and satisfaction (Gordon, 1992). Several researchers showed that the greater the level of social integration into campus life, the greater the level of subsequent commitment to the institution (i.e., retention) (Astin, 1984; Light, 2001a; Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991, 1995; Schlossberg, 1989; Spady, 1971; Tinto, 1975, 1986). Noel (1985) stated:

It is the people on campus – teachers, advisers, staff members – those who come face-to-face with students each day, who provide the positive growth experiences for students that enable them to identify their goals and talents and learn how to put them to use.... caring attitude of faculty and staff is viewed as the most potent retention force on campus. (pp. 16-17)

Since academic advising is the only structured activity on campus that provides students the opportunity for one-on-one contact with a concerned adult (Nutt, n.d.), administrators looked toward academic advising as the solution. Academic advisors “provide students with the needed connection to the various campus services and supply the essential academic connection between these services and the students” (Nutt, para. 2). Light (2001b) said that “good advising may be the single most underestimated characteristic of a successful college

experience” (para. 5). For many colleges and universities, “retention is a key objective of the advising effort” (Tuttle, 2000, p. 16).

Several important reports were published in the early 1980s. *A Nation at Risk* (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983) investigated the state of decline in the educational system in America. While the primary focus of this report was on K-12 education, the performance of colleges and universities was addressed more fully in a 1984 report by the Study Group on the Conditions of Excellence in American Higher Education that was sponsored by the National Institute of Education (Thelin, 2003). This report, *Involvement in Learning: Realizing the Potential of American Higher Education* (National Institute of Education, 1984), called for increased scrutiny of higher education and reform in the areas that lacked effectiveness. While academic advising had been looked upon as the answer to retention issues and increasing student involvement, this study found advising to be “one of the weakest links in the education of college students” (National Institute of Education, p. 31).

Astin, Korn, and Green (1987) found similar results: only half of the students in their study were satisfied with academic advising. Similarly, in a survey done by NACADA of their members in 1980 (Polson & Cashin, 1981) and in 1985 (Polson & Gordon, 1988), advisors themselves reported feeling that the low status of advising on campuses and the lack of support for advising to be the most pressing issues. In a similar survey of the NACADA membership, Lynch (2002) found that both faculty and staff advisors were least satisfied with their operating budgets. Faculty advisors also expressed lower satisfaction with the adequacy of the advising support staff, the adequacy of advising staff, and professional development resources, while staff advisors expressed lower satisfaction with the extent to which advisor opinions were considered, the adequacy of advising support staff, and the adequacy of the advising staff

(Lynch). These items seemed to corroborate the findings of Polson and Cashin and Polson and Gordon in that advisors felt they had low status and a lack of support for advising on campus.

While research has not shown higher education to be problem-free, “few institutions in our society could have been subjected to the pressures of such rapid expansion and still have contributed as much to individuals and to the Nation” (National Institute of Education, 1984, p. 6). And this expansion continues today. Keller (2001) said “from 1965 to the present, America has absorbed more immigrants, illegal entrants, and aliens than all the other developed countries of the world combined” (p. 223). According to Lovett (2003), the percentage of immigrants will continue to rise, and she predicted that over the next 20 years, more states will have populations with no majority group. Like in the general population, the numbers of diverse populations in colleges and universities continue to grow. “Colleges and universities are admitting the largest and most diverse student population we have ever known” (Lovett, Demographics section, para. 2). Lovett challenged those in higher education to “rethink [the] models of undergraduate and graduate education that we have assumed were universally valid and everlasting” (Lovett, Demographics section, para. 5). This includes academic advising.

National Academic Advising Association

History

A group of professionals in academic advising and student development fields held a national conference in 1977 in Burlington, Vermont (NACADA, 2004c). The conference had a total of 275 professionals in attendance. The next year the conference grew to 310 attendees, who developed an organizational structure and the bylaws for a national association to focus on advising. The National Academic Advising Association (NACADA) was incorporated in May of 1979 to promote “quality academic advising on college and

university campuses" (NACADA, 1994, para. 1). The president at the time, Toni Trombley, told attendees that in order for academic advising to be effective, it must (1) have measurable impact upon students, (2) be recognized within the institution, (3) have well-articulated goals, (4) research, improve and evaluate, (5) discover new methods and improve existing ones, and (6) have central coordination to avoid fragmentation (NACADA, 2004c).

As the only higher education advising association, NACADA is dedicated to "the support and professional growth of academic advisors and the advising profession" (NACADA, 1992, p. 80). The mission of NACADA is to:

1. Champion the educational role of academic advisors to enhance student learning and development in a diverse world
2. Affirm the role of academic advising in student success and persistence, thereby supporting institutional mission and vitality
3. Anticipate the academic advising needs of twenty-first century students, advisors and institutions
4. Advance the body of knowledge on academic advising
5. Foster the talents and contributions of all members and promote the involvement of diverse population. (NACADA, n.d.b, para. 1)

The association has spent the last 25 years focusing on building itself to be a "leader within the global community for the theory, delivery, application, and advancement of academic advising to enhance student learning and development" (NACADA, 2005b, Vision, para. 1). NACADA has held a national conference every year since 1977, and the organization has grown to include 8,200 national and international members (NACADA, 2005a). As a professional organization, it provides members with monthly newsletters, a

professional journal (*NACADA Journal*), regional commissions and conferences, summer institutes and workshops, an established national clearinghouse for academic advising, a monograph series on advising issues, a consultants bureau, institutional memberships, and advising awards and recognition (NACADA, n.d.a).

Goals for Advising and Statement of Core Values

In 1980, NACADA was asked by the Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS) to assist in developing standards for academic advising (Goetz, 1996; Habley, 2004). CAS was established in 1979 “for purposes of developing and promulgating standards of professional practice to guide higher education practitioners and their institutions” (Miller, 2001, p. 1). These standards of practice “enhance the quality of a student’s total learning experience in higher education” (Miller, p. 21). A NACADA task force, convened in 1980, developed a set of goals for advising to provide input to the CAS in developing its national standards (Miller). These standards address the mission, administration, resources, facilities, legal responsibilities, campus/community relations, and ethics for the academic advising field (Goetz; Miller).

The eight goals for advising that were developed by NACADA are as follows:

1. Assisting students in self-understanding and self-acceptance;
2. Assisting students in considering life goals by relating interests, skills, abilities, and values to careers, the world of work, and the nature and purpose of higher education;
3. Assisting students in developing an educational plan consistent with life goals and objectives;
4. Assisting students in developing decision-making skills;

5. Providing accurate information about institutional policies, procedures, resources, and programs;
6. Referring students to other institutional or community support services;
7. Assisting students in evaluating or reevaluating progress toward established goals and educational plans;
8. Providing information about students to the institution, college, and/or academic departments. (Habley, 2004)

In addition to these goals, NACADA developed a Statement of Core Values, which provides a “framework to guide professional practice” (NACADA, 2004a, para. 3). The association qualified this statement by adding:

The Statement of Core Values does not attempt to dictate the manner in or process through which academic advising takes place, nor does it advocate one particular advising philosophy or model over another. Instead, these Core Values are the reference points advisors use to consider their individual philosophies, strengths, and opportunities for professional growth. Furthermore, the Core Values do not carry equal weight. Advisors will find some Core Values more applicable or valuable to their situations than others. Advisors should consider each Core Value with regard to their own values and those of their institutions. (NACADA, Introduction, para. 5)

The Core Values were based upon seven basic beliefs about students: (1) students are a diverse group with varied backgrounds; (2) students hold their own beliefs and opinions; (3) students can be responsible for their own behavior; (4) students can be successful as a result of their individual goals and efforts; (5) students have a desire to learn; (6) students have unique learning needs depending on individual skills, goals, and experiences; and (7)

students use a number of technologies to navigate their worlds (NACADA). “Advisors’ responsibilities to their many constituents form the foundation upon which the Core Values rest” (NACADA, Introduction, para. 6):

1. Advisors are responsible to the individuals they serve.
2. Advisors are responsible for involving others, when appropriate, in the advising process.
3. Advisors are responsible to their institution.
4. Advisors are responsible to higher education.
5. Advisors are responsible to their educational community.
6. Advisors are responsible for their professional practices and for themselves personally.

ACT National Surveys of Academic Advising

One of the most important accomplishments in the evaluation of advising has been the national studies of academic advising (Goetz, 1996). The first study was conducted by the American College Testing (ACT) program in concert with NACADA in 1979. This survey, administered to a stratified random sample of roughly 1,000 institutions of higher education, “provided the higher education community with ‘baseline’ data on academic advising in postsecondary institutions across the country” (Habley, 2004, p. 7). One survey was completed for each institution. Respondents were asked to rate how well their institutions’ advising systems met the eight goals for most of the students at their school. A 5-point Likert scale (Very Unsatisfactory to Very Satisfactory) was provided. Since then, NACADA has replicated the study in 1983, 1987, 1992, 1998, and 2003 (Habley).

In an introduction to the findings of the sixth national survey, Habley (2004) briefly describes the methods and findings of the first five ACT national surveys. This overview provides readers a look at the evolution of the study since its inception.

As reported earlier in this paper, the first study found that advising systems were similar in colleges and universities across the country (Carstensen & Silberhorn, 1979). Institution administrators tended to see advising as a low-status information-giving activity rather than a part of the overall student developmental process described by O'Banion (1972) and Crookston (1972) (Carstensen & Silberhorn). Overall, there had been very little evaluation of services on campuses, and institutions generally had no defining mission or statement of policy regarding advising (Carstensen & Silberhorn). The survey found that "all of postsecondary education is communicating an increased interest in the academic advising function" (Habley, 1988, p. 3), but this interest had not yet translated into practice on campuses.

In 1983 the survey was administered again. This study included data collected from a random sample of 1,095 two-year and four-year public and private institutions. These institutions were the same ones included in the sample for the 1979 study (Habley, 2004). Crockett and Levitz (1983) reported that institutions indicated they were largely successful in meeting the advising goals established by NACADA. A significant increase in the number of institutions (from 26% in 1979 to 63% in 1983) that had developed an institutional statement regarding their advising programs was noted, however, institutions reported a continued lack of program evaluation. Most students were assigned to advisors in the academic units of their expressed major, thus faculty members were the primary advisors on most campuses (Crockett & Levitz). However, 75% of institutions did not consider advising duties or

effectiveness in decisions about tenure and promotion, and only 25% offered in-service workshops for advisors (Crockett & Levitz).

The third national survey was conducted in 1987 (Habley, 2004). The researchers opted to use a different sample ($n = 652$) drawn from a population of 2,606 two-year and four-year public and private institutions (Habley & Crockett, 1988). This time there were modifications made to the survey. First, the advising done in academic departments was separated from the advising done in academic advising centers. This change was made to “obtain a more comprehensive picture of the variety of advising taking place on college and university campuses” (Habley, p. 8). Second, the survey added a section regarding the organizational structure of advising on campuses. These structures were based on those described by Habley (1983). Findings included: (1) developmental advising was not implemented on campuses with any more frequency than it was in the early 1980s: “the means for the eight goals for advising, anchored in the concept of developmental advising, show only minor fluctuations from the 1983 Survey of Academic Advising” (Habley, 2004, p. 8); (2) training of advisors and evaluation of their performances continued to be mostly absent; and (3) overall there was an increase in the improvement of advising systems on campuses, although the increase was very slight (Habley).

The fourth national survey was conducted in 1992 and was basically a replication of the 1987 survey (Habley, 2004). Most of the findings echoed earlier studies, but there were indications that advising was dealing with new problems. First, advising offices reported being in “a state of crisis” (Habley, p. 9) with respect to budget cuts yet increased work load, including increased advisor-student ratios, less contact between students and advisors, and more group advising done out of necessity. Second, advising in four-year institutions was

lagging behind other institutions in all areas of measure, “including little gain in goal achievement and effectiveness” (Habley, p. 9). Third, developmental advising continued its poor track record, and evaluation and training of advisors continued to be sparse. The improvements in advising included the quality of faculty advising, the more widespread acceptance of faculty in advising roles, and more diversity in advisor ranks (Habley).

In 1998, the fifth national survey was conducted. The criteria for inclusion in the population to study included both (a) institutions accredited by one of the six regional accreditation associations and (b) institutions offering an associate’s degree (for two-year institutions) or a bachelor’s degree (for four-year institutions) (Habley & Morales, 1998). A stratified, random sample of 1,395 institutions was chosen; a total of 754 responses were received. Significant modifications in format and in content of the survey were made (Habley & Morales). These changes were made to better represent the changes made in advising and the nature of advising near the end of the 20th century. This made some comparison with earlier studies impossible. Findings from the fifth survey included: (1) increased coordination of advising services within campuses was not in evidence; (2) institutions were using more shared organizational structures for their advising services; (3) more advising centers were being used to deliver advising services, but the continued lack of budgetary and human resources was noted; (4) advising in four-year institutions continued to lag far behind other institutions in all areas of measure (some of this can be blamed on the shrinking resources listed above); (5) goal achievement was somewhat improved, but overall effectiveness remained unchanged (Habley & Morales).

The last ACT national survey was done in 2003 and included only minor changes in content and format (Habley, 2004). A section was added regarding technology in advising

since more and more institutions are relying on technology in their advising. Sampling was also modified. Instead of using a stratified random sample of two-year and four-year public and private institutions as in the past, the sixth study sent surveys to all institutions that met the criteria used for the 1998 study, a total of 3,019 institutions (Habley). A total of 1,421 usable responses were received. Habley reported six major conclusions from the study. First, academic advising seemed to be more visible than ever before with 84% of all campuses having a particular person on campus who has responsibility for academic advising (up from 14% in 1979). Second, advising has become a peripheral function on campuses rather than a part of the hub. Habley warned readers that academic advising must become a part of the central mission of institutions in order for it to become “imbedded in institutional culture” (Habley, p. 94). The third conclusion Habley drew from the data was that institutions recognized that “all facets of advising must be examined within the framework of the institutional mission and the needs of the students it serves” (Habley, p. 95). He stated, “the concept of advising is broadening and practices diversifying” (Habley, p. 95). Fourth, Habley believed that while there had been steady gains in goal achievement, only one goal had a mean that fell above the satisfactory (4.0) level, and the remaining seven goals fell only somewhere between neutral and satisfactory. The fifth conclusion is similar to the fourth. The data showed that there had been steady gains in advising effectiveness, but in this case, no variable achieved a satisfactory (4.0) rating. The last conclusion Habley reported was a lack of consistent use of advising technology across institutions. “In the area of technologies supporting the work of advisors, only 2 (of 10 specific items...) technologies were in place at more than 50% of the campuses...” (Habley, p. 96).

These six national surveys have provided substantial data from institutions, however, with just one person reporting from each institution, reliability may be questionable. One person reporting on a campus-wide activity, especially an activity that may vary tremendously from one academic division to another, may not have described the totality of academic advising at each institution. The 1987, 1992, and the 2003 surveys included a question regarding the title of the person completing the survey. Almost half of the 2003 surveys were completed by either a Director/Coordinator of Academic Advising (24%) or Vice President/Dean of Academic Affairs (24%) (Habley, 2004). The other 52% of respondents were from a variety of areas on campus, including academic departments, counseling departments, student affairs, enrollment management, and admissions. While Habley indicated this was a positive sign that people in various positions were familiar with academic advising, only 24% of those who responded actually had titles of Director/Coordinator of Academic Advising. This raises a question regarding respondents' complete knowledge of and participation in the entire advising processes/systems at the institutions and, therefore, the accuracy of the reporting of how well the goals are being met.

Definitions of Academic Advising

While the importance of developmental academic advising has been established, there is still no true consensus as to an operational definition of academic advising. NACADA, as the only national higher education academic advising association, should lead the way in creating an authoritative definition of advising and has set up a task force that has been working on a comprehensive definition of academic advising (NACADA, 2004b). The task force faces a difficult task reducing the variety of activities performed during academic advising to a definition that will describe all these activities and purposes (Tiberii, Grites, &

Campbell, 2005). Up to now, the organization has opted to provide a *Statement on the Concept of Academic Advising*, but this “definition” is wieldy, covering one and a half pages of single-spaced prose (NACADA, 2004d). The statement acknowledges that advising is “central to achieving the fundamental goals of higher education” (NACADA, para. 1). “Though it may vary from one context to another, academic advising is a multidimensional and intentional process, grounded in teaching and learning, with its own purpose, content, and specified outcomes” (NACADA, para. 1). The statement continues by addressing what each part of the above statement means to the organization.

Traditionally, advising has been defined as a “function in which faculty and students consulted about the students’ selection of major and courses and proceeded through the scheduling process” (Gordon, 1992, p. 5). This prescriptive model reduced advising to the clerical task of registration (Tuttle, 2000). In 1979, Grites defined academic advising as “assisting students to realize the maximum educational benefits available to them by helping them to better understand themselves and to learn to use the resources of an educational institution to meet their special needs and aspirations” (p. 1). Goetz (1996) defined advising as simply the “activity provided by colleges and universities to help their students identify and develop suitable programs of study” (p. 88). However, we have learned that advising is not simply the giving of advice. “Providing advice is a unidirectional relationship in which a person who ‘knows better’ tells another person what to do” (Love, 2003, p. 507).

Articles by O’Banion (1972) and Crookston (1972) broadened the tasks and the outlook of academic advising. These authors’ now classic articles encouraged academic advising to move beyond the prescriptive, advice-giving advising model towards a more developmental model. O’Banion’s definition of advising was that advising is “a process in

which advisor and advisee enter a dynamic relationship respectful of the student's concerns. Ideally, the advisor serves as teacher and guide in an interactive partnership aimed at enhancing the student's self-awareness and fulfillment" (p. 63). This definition led him to develop five steps that encompassed what he saw as the tasks of advising: 1) an exploration of life goals; 2) an exploration of vocational goals; 3) student choice of program or major; 4) student course choice; and 5) scheduling courses. These were sequential steps through which an advisor and advisee must progress to "help the student choose a program of study [that] will serve him in the development of his total potential" (O'Banion, p. 62).

Crookston (1972) went further in his definition and model, defining advising as a developmental process, more a function of teaching than of clerical registration. He saw advising as "concerned not only with a specific personal or vocational decision but also with facilitating the student's rational processes, environmental and interpersonal interactions, behavior awareness, and problem solving, decision making, and evaluation skills" (Crookston, p. 12). In developmental advising "the advisor and the student differentially engage in a series of developmental tasks, the successful completion of which results in varying degrees of learning by both parties" (Crookston, p. 13).

Crookston used McGregor's X and Y theories (Bolman & Deal, 1997) in management to explain across 10 dimensions (abilities, motivation, rewards, maturity, initiative, control, responsibility, learning output, evaluation, and relationship) what he saw as the differences in prescriptive and developmental advising. Prescriptive advising has assumptions about students that are similar to McGregor's Theory X about workers: students are lazy and need prodding; students are immature and irresponsible, so they need close supervision; the rewards for learning are grades, credit, and income; the relationship between

advisor and advisee is one of stature and authority (Crookston). Developmental advising has assumptions about students that are opposite of prescriptive assumptions. Similar to McGregor's Theory Y assumptions about workers, developmental advising assumes: students are active, striving learners; students are capable of self-direction; the rewards of learning are achievement and mastery; the relationship between advisor and advisee is one of trust and is negotiated (Crookston).

Others have also defined advising as a developmental activity. The most commonly accepted and cited definition of developmental academic advising comes from Ender, Winston, and Miller (1984): "academic advising is a systematic process based on a close student-advisor relationship intended to aid students in achieving educational, career, and personal goals through the utilization of the full range of institutional and community resources" (p. 19). A developmental relationship between advisor and advisee focuses on identifying the advisee's life goals, setting up a plan to accomplish these goals, and assisting the advisee in acquiring the skills and attitudes that will bolster intellectual and personal growth (Ender, Winston, & Miller).

The authors, in an earlier work (Ender, Winston, & Miller, 1982), also offered seven principles that "are essential in the advising process if the goal of developmental advising is to be achieved" (Ender, Winston, & Miller, 1984, p. 19). These principles (Ender, Winston, & Miller, 1982) are as follows:

1. Developmental academic advising is a process and a relationship that grow with personal contacts between advisor and student.
2. Human growth is the focus of developmental advising, and the advisor has some responsibility to address the components of growth in the student's experience in

college.

3. Advising is goal related. The student must participate in development of goals, which should include academic, career, and personal development areas.

4. Advising requires a caring human relationship on the parts of both individuals; however, in the advising relationship, the advisor must take responsibility for its initial development.

5. Advisors should be role models for advisees, to demonstrate those behaviors that lead to self-responsibility and self-directiveness.

6. Advising should be the link between academic affairs and student affairs professionals.

7. Advisors should take advantage of all campus and community resources in working with advisees.

These definitions and principles of developmental advising are grand goals. Creamer and Creamer (1994) acknowledged the difficulty in the application of developmental advising: “the translation of theory into practice is more complicated in everyday routines than it appears in conceptual form” (p. 17). The theory is still more of a goal than a realistic description of day-to-day advising. “In the real hours of real days advising often becomes whatever can be done to get through most expediently” (Strommer, 1994, p. 92). Ender (1994) provided seven reasons that developmental advising has not become a common practice in colleges and universities: (a) technology is making person-to-person contact unnecessary; (b) campus administrators lack the commitment to truly implement a developmental advising system; (c) training, evaluation, and rewards are not provided for those who wish to use developmental advising; (d) higher education continues its reliance on

part-time faculty who do not have the time or campus-knowledge to advise; (e) increased responsibilities for faculty members outside normal teaching duties; (f) too many students assigned to academic departments that have not prepared for the great enrollment numbers; and (g) a general depersonalization that permeates campuses today. These challenges will continue unless those in key positions in higher education begin to implement the 30 year old idea of developmental advising (Ender).

Student Development Theory

In order for advisors to fulfill these developmental principles, one necessity is for advisors to have some knowledge of student development theory. “Advisors who give no thought to students’ developmental needs are most likely to practice the same kind of advising they received as undergraduates” (Thomas & Chickering, 1984, p. 91). A basic knowledge of student development theory “distills the phenomenon to its essence and makes systematic observations about apparent relationships or underlying principles. Good theory is also useful in practice; it illuminates complex circumstances and makes puzzling things understandable” (Creamer, 2000, p. 18).

There are several types of student development theories. In this section, an overview of the most widely used theories in student development will be discussed. These theories include psychosocial theories, identity development theories, cognitive-developmental theories, and person-environment theories. Career development theory is not being included in this overview of student development theory since career counseling is viewed by the author as a separate process from academic advising.

Psychosocial Theory

Psychosocial theory focuses on the series of life stages that occur throughout the life cycle (Hurst & Pratt, 1984). These stages are mostly sequential with each stage a separate phase of development that includes tasks to be completed. The focus of the stages is on identity development within the individual (Creamer, 2000). Most of these theories are based upon the work done by Erikson (1968).

Erikson

According to Erikson (1968), development occurs in stages that begin at birth and occur sequentially throughout the lifespan. While not directly tied to biological age, each stage arises due to a combination of biological development and psychological change that brings about a crisis (Erikson). These stages have associated with them developmental tasks that the individual must resolve, for better or worse, before moving on to the next stage. If the task is resolved successfully, the individual has learned new skills and attitudes that will help in future crises and stages. If the individual is unsuccessful in resolving the developmental task, future success in resolving crises will be limited and a negative self-image will be developed (Evans, 2003).

As noted previously, colleges and universities have become more diverse over the years. No longer are most students the traditional 18- to 23-year-olds; students of all ages are participating in higher education. This has broadened the range of stages in which advisors will find students. While Erikson's stages begin at birth, the first applicable life stage for a traditional college student will most likely be identity versus identity confusion, which occurs roughly between the ages of 14 and 22 (Thomas & Chickering, 1984). This stage's developmental task is for the individual to discover the true self. If this crisis is successfully

resolved, the individual will have a strong personal identity and be able to plan for the future (Erikson, 1968). If unsuccessful at establishing an identity, the individual will stay in a state of confusion about the self and be unable to make decisions or choices about vocation, sexual orientation, and his/her role in life in general (Erikson).

The following stage is intimacy versus isolation, which occurs roughly between the ages of 16 and 30 (Thomas & Chickering, 1984). The developmental task for this stage is for the individual to establish a close, committed relationship with another person. Successful completion of this stage provides adults with the ability to form close relationships and share with others. Unsuccessful completion leads to isolation from others and an inability to depend on others (Erikson, 1968).

Advisors who deal with older students may also see students in the next stage of development, generativity versus stagnation, or even the following stage, integrity versus despair (Thomas & Chickering, 1984). Generativity versus stagnation is a crisis in one's perception of one's ability to care for others and to create a living legacy. Positive outcomes include the ability to nurture children and a feeling of assisting future generations in some way. If this stage is not successfully resolved, individuals will stay self-focused and will experience stagnation in later life (Erikson, 1968). Integrity versus despair is the last stage described by Erikson. The crisis involves reviewing one's life to determine if it was lived with integrity, pleasure, and satisfaction or if it was lived with disappointments and failures. The positive outcome of this stage is an acceptance of death; the negative outcome is a fear of death (Erikson).

Marcia

The work of Marcia focuses on development during late adolescence (Evans, 2003). He found that identity in late adolescence was “based on the extent to which the individual (1) had experienced crises related to vocational choice, political values, and/or religion, and (2) made commitments in these areas” (Evans, p. 180). As a result of these two items, Marcia developed four identity states (Creamer, 2000; Hamrick, Evans, & Schuh, 2002). The first resolution, identity diffusion, resulted when a crisis was not experienced or no commitment was made, yet the individual is not concerned about his/her lack of direction. The second resolution, foreclosure, was a result of no crises arising, yet the individual had made commitments based on the commitments of important people in his/her life (Hamrick, Evans, & Schuh). In moratorium, the third possible resolution, the individual is in the midst of the crisis and/or is working on his/her commitment (Hamrick, Evans, & Schuh). The last possible resolution of the crisis and commitment, identity achievement, occurs when the individual experiences the crisis and makes a commitment (Hamrick, Evans, & Schuh). No one resolution is best; nor are the resolutions hierarchical. Marcia’s work allows practitioners to realize that not all students approach crisis resolution the same way and, therefore, different interventions may be necessary to help different students (Evans).

Chickering

Chickering built upon Erikson’s stage of identity versus identity confusion (Hamrick, Evans, & Schuh, 2002). He believed that since the “stabilization of identity was the primary task for adolescents and young adults, it was a logical anchor point” (Chickering & Reisser, 1993, p. 22) for his development framework. His framework, based on a study done in 1969, included seven vectors; these original vectors were revised in 1993 with the help of Reisser

(Chickering & Reisser; Evans, 2003). The 1993 framework is very similar to the original; more recent research led Chickering and Reisser to reorder the vectors and rename a few of them.

Chickering's vectors are "maps to help us determine where students are and which way they are heading" (Chickering & Reisser, 1993, p. 34). Movement along the vectors is sequential (each step moves the individual to higher awareness, complexity, and integration), but individuals move through them at various rates and may, at times, regress to known ground (Chickering & Reisser). The vectors of development are (1) developing competence, (2) managing emotions, (3) moving through autonomy toward interdependence, (4) developing mature interpersonal relationships, (5) establishing identity; (6) developing purpose, and (7) developing integrity (Chickering & Reisser).

Chickering & Reisser (1993) believed that the external environment can play an important role in guiding development through the vectors. "It is clear that educational environments do exist and can be created that influence students in powerful ways" (Chickering & Reisser, p. 265). In addition, they proposed seven key ingredients colleges and universities can use to encourage development of students: institutional objectives, institutional size, student-faculty relationships, curriculum, teaching, friendships and student communities, and student development programs and services (Chickering & Reisser).

Identity Development Theory

Building on the work of Erikson (1968) and Chickering (Chickering & Reisser, 1993), identity theory describes in more detail the development of identity in adolescence. Identity theory asserts that "achieving identity is the culmination of earlier developmental tasks in the life cycle and a building block for later developmental tasks" (McEwen, 2003,

p. 205). Identity has been defined as “the organized set of images, the sense of self, which express who and what we really are” (Widick, Parker, & Knefelkamp, 1978b, p. 2). This sense of self incorporates both a personal identity, which is the characteristics we ascribe to ourselves, and a social identity, which incorporates the roles we play (e.g., daughter/son, wife/husband, friend, coworker) and the categories to which we belong (e.g., race, sex) (Deaux, 1993). The psychosocial theorists described earlier focus on only half of a person’s identity, personal identity development. Social identity also undergoes a developmental process of becoming increasingly complex (McEwen). These theories and models of social identity development have grown from the “sociohistorical and sociopolitical climate of the United States, in which social groups that are not White, heterosexual, male, able-bodied, and of the privileged class have been oppressed” (McEwen, p. 205). Therefore, these theories focus on the development of race, class, gender, and sexuality.

According to Weber (1998), the conceptual framework for understanding the development of race, class, gender, and sexuality has six major themes, and an individual’s social identity development can only be understood within the context of these themes. The six major themes are: (1) contextual – the historical era and the national, geographic, and cultural areas in which the development takes place; (2) socially constructed – social identity develops based on dominant culture and “out of group struggles over socially valued resources” (Weber, p. 18); (3) systems of power relationships – development takes place within power relationships where “one group exerts control over another, securing its position of dominance in the system” (Weber, p. 20); (4) social structural (the macro level of community and society) and social psychological (the individual and his/her experiences); (5) simultaneously expressed – the interrelationships of race, class, gender, and sexuality as a

part of each experience; and (6) interdependence of knowledge and activism – understanding this development requires a knowledge of and activism within the oppression and power relationships (Weber).

Racial Identity Development

“Members of any given cultural group are not all alike” (Locke, 1998, p. 7). This basic tenet is important to remember as any attempt is made to describe the development of individuals by describing overall groups to which the individuals belong. With that caveat, there are several models of social identity development that attempt to describe the development of racial identity.

People of Color Racial Identity Development. Helms (1995) developed a model of racial identity development for people of color based on earlier works by Cross and Atkinson, Morten, and Sue (Helms & Cook, 1999). Helms’ model has “broad applicability and extensive research validating” it (McEwen, 2003, p. 208). According to Helms’ model, there are six identity statuses that are sequential in nature but can be recycled as individuals experience developmental issues. The six statuses (Helms & Cook) are:

1. Conformity. The individual adapts to and internalizes White perspectives of one’s racial group(s). The individual may seem to be assimilated into White culture, preferring White values and depreciating his/her own cultural heritage and members of one’s same group(s). Another possibility is conforming to the dominant culture’s stereotypes of one’s group.
2. Dissonance. The individual realizes the impossibility of becoming a part of White society, which leads to anxiety when one has no positive experiences or knowledge of

one's own group's accomplishments "to replace one's waning idealization of the White group" (Helms & Cook, p. 86).

3. Immersion. The individual fills the gap of knowledge and experiences of one's own group with strong positive information. There is a complete disregard of White culture and complete idealization of one's own culture.
4. Emersion. The individual has complete commitment to one's group and community. This state brings feelings of comfort to the individual as he/she feels a part of the racial group.
5. Internalization. The individual is able to identify with one's own group with a sense of pride. This includes the ability to critically assess one's own group, White people, and society at large.
6. Integrated Awareness. The individual has positive views of one's own group while still being able to recognize and resist prejudice and racism. The individual also feels compassion for and empathy with other oppressed people.

While this model attempts to include African, Latino, Asian, and Native Americans (ALANA), there are separate models that specifically address the racial identity development of Asian Americans (see Kim, 2001; Sodowsky, Kwan, & Pannu, 1995), Latinos (see Bernal & Knight, 1993; Casas & Pytluk, 1995; Ruiz, 1990), and Native Americans (see Horse, 2001).

Biracial and Multiracial Identity Development. As the population of the U.S. continues to diversify, the numbers of biracial and multiracial individuals will continue to rise. These individuals may not identify with one specific racial group (Root, 1996). The basic identity development appears to begin with a realization that one does not fit neatly into

one racial group and is followed by the experience of feeling pressure to choose one racial identity over the other(s) (McEwen, 2003). The individual must ultimately integrate all one's racial identities into an identity that is meaningful (McEwen).

Poston (1990) described a tentative model of Biracial Identity Development based on the work done by Cross. Poston described a five step model of identity development. The first step is Personal Identity in which a child may be aware of race and ethnicity but tends to "have a sense of self that is somewhat independent of his or her ethnic background" (Poston, p. 153). The next step is the Choice of Group Categorization in which a person feels pressure from society to choose an identity. "Biracial individuals have two possible choices at this point. One is to choose a multicultural existence, emphasizing the racial heritage of both parents; the other is to choose one parent's culture or racial heritage as dominant over the other" (Poston, p. 153). However, Poston believed it would be rare for a person to choose a multiracial identity at this point as this choice would require a knowledge of multiple cultures and a level of cognitive development that a young person would not have attained. The third step is Enmeshment/Denial. In this step a feeling of confusion may exist when being forced to choose one identity that is not comprehensive of the individual's background. In addition, "feelings of disloyalty and massive guilt over the rejection of one parent" (Poston, p. 154) can cause feelings of shame and guilt. The fourth step is Appreciation, in which the individual begins to appreciate the plurality of his/her racial background and begins to learn about his/her complete heritage. However, the individual still identifies with one group over another. In the last step, Integration, the individual values and accepts all of his/her racial and ethnic backgrounds.

White Racial Identity Development. White racial identity development has been ignored by theorists in the U.S. as Whites have been seen as the dominant, privileged race, which has “not had to face or name their race and the various characteristics, attributes, privileges, and power associated with it” (McEwen, 2003, p. 210). Helms & Cook (1999) identified two phases in the identity development of Whites. The first phase is the abandonment of racism and includes three status levels, contact, disintegration, and reintegration. The second phase is the development of a nonracist identity, which also includes three status levels, pseudo-independence, immersion/emersion, and autonomy.

According to Helms and Cook (1999), Whites begin their racial identity as they encounter people of color but operate with a cultural-neutral view of the world without any acknowledgement of the benefits of membership in the dominant racial group. When Whites begin to see how people of color are treated differently, they move on to the next status, disintegration. Disintegration status occurs as Whites experience conflict and discomfort when they recognize their dominance in society. They attempt to reduce their discomfort by avoiding people of color and by attempting to persuade others that people of color are not inferior. As Whites begin to acknowledge the existence of White identity and superiority in society, they move into status 3, reintegration. Whites accept the notion that they are superior and have earned their privileges and that people of color must be inferior since they do not have the privileges Whites have. According to Helms and Cook, it is fairly easy for Whites to become stuck at this stage indefinitely, and only if an individual experiences a painful, jarring event will movement to the next phase occur.

The second phase, Development of a Nonracist Identity, begins with status 4, pseudo-independence (Helms & Cook, 1999). Individuals in this status begin to question the notion

that people of color are inferior and begin to accept responsibility for Whites' perpetuation of racism. To address the inequalities, Whites help people of color to change themselves to better fit into White society. Status 5, immersion/emersion, occurs as individuals begin to focus on changing Whites rather than people of color. There is an attempt made to replace racial stereotypes held by other Whites with accurate information about White privilege in society. The final status, autonomy, is described as a "racially transcendent worldview" (McEwen, 2003, p. 212). The White individual has a nonracist White identity and seeks to abolish racial oppression.

Sexual Identity Development

Sexual orientation is a fundamental part of one's identity, yet the development of one's sexual identity is impacted by the culture in which one exists (Broido, 2000). According to Kinsey, Pomeroy, and Martin (1948), sexual orientation can be described along a single behavioral continuum with homosexual and heterosexual orientations at polar ends. More recent theorists have described sexual orientation as a multidimensional identity that includes variables such as sexual attraction, sexual behavior, sexual fantasies, social and emotional preference, self-identification, lifestyle preference, and political identity (Klein, Sepehoff, & Wolf, 1990). These dimensions can be placed on a seven-point scale with primarily homosexual and primarily heterosexual at either end and five stages of bisexuality between them (Keppel & Hamilton, 1998; Klein, Sepehoff, & Wolf). Klein, Sepehoff, and Wolf found that sexual orientation tends to fluctuate over time, moving up or down the scale. In their study, individuals tended to report a movement over time towards the bisexual area of the scale, with heterosexuals moving towards the homosexual orientation end of the scale and homosexuals moving towards heterosexual orientation (Klein, Sepehoff, & Wolf). They

conclude, “Learning takes on a stronger role than genetic and hereditary factors” (Klein, Sepehoff, & Wolf, p. 77).

Cass (1979) offers the most widely cited model in student affairs literature of sexual identity development (McEwen, 2003). This model consists of six stages describing movement from a tentative feeling that one may be gay or lesbian to full acceptance of one’s identity as gay or lesbian (Cass). The first stage, Identity Confusion, is the awareness that one is different from the mainstream heterosexual population. In the second stage, Identity Comparison, the individual accepts the possibility that he/she may be homosexual. Identity Tolerance, stage three, is defined as acquiescence that one is probably gay or lesbian. “The individual tolerates rather than accepts a homosexual identity” (Cass, p. 229). In stage four, Identity Acceptance, the individual begins to associate with other homosexuals and begins to accept the gay or lesbian identity rather than simply tolerating it. The fifth stage, Identity Pride, continues the acceptance theme by evaluating others who are homosexual in a positive light and devaluing the heterosexual culture. The last stage, Identity Synthesis, sees good and bad in others regardless of sexual orientation and is the stage in which the individual fully integrates his/her sexual identity into all aspects of the self (Cass).

Gender Identity Development

Gender identity is defined as “how one views oneself in relation to one’s own gender group, that is, as a woman or a man, and how these views evolve and become more complex over time” (McEwen, 2003, p. 218). Like racial identity development, gender identity development must be considered within the constructs of sociohistorical constructs. Men and women begin their gender identity from different points. As with White racial identity, men’s gender identity development begins from a place of dominance and power, whereas women

begin from a place of oppression (McEwen). “Sexism is at the heart of models concerning the development of gender identity, similar (but not identical) to racism” (McEwen, p. 218). Downing and Roush (1985) and Ossana, Helms, and Leonard (1992) offer models of women’s gender identity.

Downing and Roush (1985) believed that “in contemporary society women share some of the developmental experiences of a minority population” (p. 696). They described a Feminist Identity Development for Women model that encompasses five stages:

Stage 1 – Passive acceptance: unawareness or denial of “the individual, institutional, and cultural prejudice and discrimination against her” (Downing & Roush, p. 698); acceptance of traditional gender roles;

Stage 2 – Revelation: a series of crises leads to questioning traditional roles; feelings of guilt and anger over being participants in their own oppression;

Stage 3 – Embeddedness-emanation: immersion into female culture and support; developing close emotional connections with other women; movement toward an openness to dualistic perspectives;

Stage 4 – Synthesis: “increasingly value the positive aspects of being female...able to integrate these qualities ...into a positive and realistic self-concept” (Downing & Roush, p. 702);

Stage 5 – Active commitment: women take an active part in attempting to create a nonsexist society.

Ossana, Helms, and Leonard (1992) offered a four stage model of womanist identity based on Helms’ work. The first stage is Pre-encounter where women accept the traditional gender roles provided to them by society. They devalue women and hold men in higher

regard. Stage two is the Encounter stage in which women are confronted by new information or experiences that cause them to question the values and beliefs held in the previous stage. Stage three, Immersion-Emersion, is characterized first by idealizing women and devaluing men and later by forming intense affiliations with other women. Stage four, the last stage, is Internalization. In this stage, women assimilate the positive characteristics of womanhood yet do not allow others to define what women should be.

Ability/Disability and Social Class Identity Development

Ability/Disability Identity Development. Only over the last 30 years has there been an acknowledgement of oppression of those with disabilities (McEwen, 2003), yet the variety of conditions experienced by these individuals makes it difficult to develop a single theory or model of identity development. Smart (2001) explained that while there is no one universally accepted categorization of disabilities, there are four broad categories: physical disabilities, intellectual disabilities, cognitive disabilities, and psychiatric disabilities. Physical disabilities include visual impairments, hearing impairments, dual sensory loss (e.g., deaf-blindness), mobility impairments, and health disorders (e.g., hemophilia, seizure disorders, AIDS, diabetes). Intellectual disabilities include the various levels of mental retardation, whereas cognitive disabilities include traumatic brain injury and learning disabilities. The last category, psychiatric disabilities, include mental illness, autism, and substance abuse. All these disabilities can be either congenital or acquired due to accident or disease (McEwen). “For acquired disabilities, age of onset is an important dimension in how the person views and is affected by the disability” (McEwen, p. 220).

Social Class Identity Development. The myth of the “classless society” is alive and well in the U.S. While we Americans acknowledge different levels of socioeconomic status, there is a belief that movement between classes is possible with just a little ambition and determination. Since the beginning of the country, individuals have been exhorted to pull themselves up by their bootstraps. This idea that anyone who works hard and has determination can climb into a higher socioeconomic class has continued to be a fundamental belief in this country, although a disproportionate number of those living in poverty are female-headed households, people of color, the elderly, the disabled, and children (Langston, 1995). This fact belies the “classless society” myth. “If hard work were the sole determinant of your ability to support yourself and your family, surely we’d have a different outcome for many in our society” (Langston, p. 100). However, the experiences we have as members of a particular class continue to strongly influence our economic security, and therefore, the decisions, preferences, and choices we make (Langston). Langston describes class as “more than just the amount of money you have” (p. 101). The class one is born and raised in is compromised of ideas, behaviors, attitudes, values, and language; class is how you think, feel, act, look, dress, talk, move, walk; class is what stores you shop at, restaurants you eat in; class is the schools you attend, the education you attain; class is the very jobs you will work at throughout your adult life. (Langston, p. 102)

Like other social groupings, social class is an important part of one’s social identity.

Cognitive-Development Theory

Cognitive-development theory attempts to describe how people interpret their experiences and how they make meaning out of life (Hamrick, Evans, & Schuh, 2002). These theories approach development by describing a series of irreversible stages in which a person

learns increasingly higher order reasoning (Creamer, 2000). The focus is on how individuals think and make meaning from experience (Hurst & Pratt, 1984). Piaget's work is the foundation for most of the cognitive-developmental theories (Creamer).

Piaget

Piaget's concept of cognitive development is considered to be "the most influential in guiding research and practice" (Aiken, 1998, p. 96) in intelligence. Piaget's work focused primarily on the development of cognition in children. The developmental stages he described begin at birth and end once the child reaches the formal operational stage between the ages of 11 to 15 (Aiken). After this time, people still accumulate knowledge, but higher order cognitive processing "increases no further and may, in fact, decline" (Aiken, p. 97). Piaget's work relied on the concepts of assimilation and accommodation in the process of "integrating new information into current ways of thinking. Development occurs when the cognitive structure is changed" (Creamer, 2000, p. 23).

Perry

Perry built upon Piaget's work with children, focusing instead on intellectual and ethical development of young adults (Chickering & Reisser, 1993; King, 1978). A longitudinal study from the late 1950s and early 1960s is the basis for his nine positions of development (Perry, 1998). The positions are on a continuum that "traces the evolution in students' thinking about the nature of knowledge, truth and values, and the meaning of life and responsibilities" (King, pp. 37-38); each position is a different way of thinking about the self and the world (Chickering & Reisser). As students move through the positions, they experience less of the duality of right versus wrong and more of acceptance of other ideas and values. This movement leads to an increase in tolerance and in developing mature,

interpersonal relationships (Chickering & Reisser).

King (1978) clusters the nine positions into four general categories. The first category (positions 1 and 2) is named Dualism and is described as black-white thinking. Students in this position only see right or wrong with an absolute authority of some kind determining rightness or wrongness. In the next category, Multiplicity (positions 3 and 4), students are able to see things from multiple viewpoints without being able to evaluate the accuracy of the viewpoint. All opinions are seen as valid. The next category (positions 5 and 6) is Relativism, in which all opinions can be justified within context. Students can analytically evaluate multiple viewpoints. Decision-making may become nearly impossible as students can see justification in all points of view. Students “are beginning to realize the need to evolve and endorse their own choices from the multiple ‘truths’ that exist in a relativistic world” (King, p. 39). The last category is Commitment in Relativism (positions 7-9). Students retain the ability to evaluate all points of view, but they are also able to make decisions about these views and accept that diversity, even within themselves, is acceptable. Students who make it to positions 7-9 are able to begin to make “commitments to ideas, values, religious beliefs, careers, and relationships. These are all vital components of identity” (Chickering & Reisser, 1993, p. 8).

Advisors can use knowledge of Perry’s scheme of development by realizing students will be at various positions along the continuum, while acknowledging that no one position is better or worse than another (Thomas & Chickering, 1984). Advisors can better assist students in decision-making skills if advisors understand their students’ levels of intellectual and ethical processing.

Kohlberg

Moral development is “the process by which individuals go about making decisions that affect themselves and others” (Evans, 2003, p. 189). Kohlberg (1985) developed a theory of moral development that focused on moral justice and decision making. The theory offered a six-stage model of the development of moral reasoning in which each stage was qualitatively different from the others (Smith, 1978). Individuals progress through the steps sequentially, although at different rates, and not everyone will reach the highest levels of moral reasoning (Smith).

Kohlberg divided the six stages into three levels: preconventional, conventional, and postconventional. In the preconventional level (stages 1 and 2) the person’s thinking is concrete and focused on how the decision to be made will affect him/her. The conventional level (stages 3 and 4) is involved with maintaining social norms. “The attitude is not only one of *conformity* to personal expectations and social order, but of loyalty to it, of actively *maintaining*, supporting, and justifying the order” (Smith, 1978, p. 55). The last level is the postconventional level and is the highest level of moral decision making. At this level individuals are able to make decisions based on their own beliefs and values “apart from the authority of the groups” (Smith, p. 56).

Kohlberg’s model would have traditional age college students just moving from stage three to stage four with a few moving from the conventional level to postconventional level (Smith, 1978). This movement to higher level reasoning can be facilitated if “the individual encounters more complex moral thought and has opportunities for role-taking” (Widick, Parker, & Knefelkamp, 1978a, p. 30). Developmental academic advising provides the supportive relationship in which advisors can challenge students to begin thinking at higher

levels. In fact, Smith wrote “the college experience may be a very critical period for the development of moral reasoning” (p. 59).

Gilligan

Kohlberg’s theory was developed from his dissertation work with 84 boys ranging in age from 10 to 14 (Kohlberg, 1994). Gilligan (1982) criticized Kohlberg’s theory as ignoring any differences that might exist between men and women in the development of moral reasoning. In her experience women seemed to look at things differently; women seemed to show more concern and responsibility for others than did men (Evans, 2003). This experience and several subsequent studies led her to develop a model of moral development for women (Gilligan). This model consisted of three levels with two transition periods. In the first level, Orientation to Individual Survival, the woman is focused primarily on her own needs and survival without regard for others (Gilligan). The first transition period, From Selfishness to Responsibility, occurs when women begin to look at how their actions and decisions, while still focused on the needs of the self, affect others. Feeling responsible to those outside herself becomes an important part of making moral decisions. This transition period leads to the second level.

In the second level, Goodness as Self-Sacrifice, women look to others for acceptance and affirmation when making moral decisions (Evans, 2003). “The woman at this point validates her claim to social membership through the adoption of societal values” (Gilligan, 1982, p. 79). Women define the self and proclaim their worth “on the basis of the ability to care for and protect others” (Gilligan, p. 79) at the expense of their own needs and desires. The second transition begins as women begin to question the need to always put others before themselves (Evans). In the From Goodness to Truth transition period, women begin to

ask if it is possible to be responsible to themselves and at the same time care for others.

The criterion for judgment thus shifts from goodness to truth when the morality of action is assessed not on the basis of its appearance in the eyes of others, but in terms of the realities of its intentions and consequence. (Gilligan, p. 83)

In the last level, The Morality of Nonviolence, women see themselves as equally important as others when making moral decisions (Evans, 2003). Gilligan (1982) said women work to “be responsible to others and thus to be ‘good’ but also to be responsible to herself and thus to be ‘honest’ and ‘real’” (p. 85).

Gilligan’s model has led to much research in sex differences in moral reasoning (Evans, 2003). According to Evans, evidence from these studies seems to support Gilligan’s idea that moral reasoning is related to sex but is not sex specific: “that is, while both men and women have been found to use both styles [that is, those described by Kohlberg and Gilligan], men use justice and rights arguments more often, while women more frequently base their judgments on responsibility and care” (Evans, p. 191).

Typology Theory

Typology theories are not developmental theories in that they do not attempt to explain behavior in terms of stages of development. Instead, these theories attempt to describe people in terms of type (Evans, 2003). According to these theories, behavior “results from innate differences in mental functioning” (Evans, p. 194) that affect “many aspects of life, such as how people take in and process information, how they learn, and the types of activities that interest them” (Evans, p. 194). Thus, individuals who are alike in their types tend to think, and therefore behave, similarly in similar situations. These types are not classified as good or bad types; rather they all provide unique ways of being (Evans).

Jung

Jung (1962/1923) first divided personality types into two opposite types on a continuum: Extraversion (E) and Introversion (I). He saw these two distinctions as opposites, and “we all swerve rather more towards one side than the other” (Jung, p. 9), although “every individual possesses both mechanisms - extraversion as well as introversion, and only the relative dominance of the one or the other determines the type” (p. 10). In addition to the “two general types” (Jung, p. 412) he first described, Jung further divided types into how they become aware of (or perceive) the world, how they reach conclusions about the world (or make judgments), and how they relate to the world (or make decisions) (Evans, 2003; Jung).

According to Jung (1962/1923), people perceive the world through Sensing (S) or through Intuition (N). Sensing individuals tend to use their five senses to take in information from their environments, whereas Intuiting individuals tend to make sense of their environments indirectly through associations or ideas (Evans, 2003). Sensing individuals describe things in terms of what they see, hear, taste, feel, or smell (Jung). Those individuals who use intuition describe things in terms of meaning, concepts, or symbols (Evans).

Individuals also differ on how they reach conclusions or make judgments about the world. Jung (1962/1923) described the two types as Thinking (T) and Feeling (F). Thinking individuals rely on logic and facts when drawing conclusions. Their judgments are based on linear thought processes (Evans, 2003). Individuals in the Feeling category rely more on personal values or human relationships when making judgments (Evans). Their information processing is more circular in fashion, sprouting one idea from another. Jung said “feeling...is an entirely subjective process, which may be in every respect independent of

external stimuli” (p. 544).

The last types are Judging (J) or Perceiving (P). Judging types are organized planners who are able to make decisions easily and quickly based upon the data they collected (Evans, 2003). Perceiving types prefer to gather abundant information and carefully weigh all options before making a decision (Evans). Jung did not explicitly describe these types; they were implicitly included within the previous types (Evans). Judging and Perceiving types were further developed by Myers (1980).

Meyers-Briggs

At the same time Jung was describing his theory of personality types, Briggs was also studying personality types (Evans, 2003). Briggs began to work with her daughter, Isabel Myers, to test how this personality type theory would work in people. Myers and Briggs extrapolated 16 distinct personality types from Jung’s four basic categories of types (Evans). “Briefly, the theory is that much seemingly chance variation in human behavior is not due to chance; it is in fact the logical result of a few basic, observable differences in mental functioning” (Myers, 1980, p. 1).

According to Myers (1980), the differences concern the “way people *prefer* to use their minds, specifically the way they perceive and the way they make judgments” (p. 1). Myers described perceiving as the “processes of becoming aware of things, people, occurrences, and ideas” (p. 1). Like Jung, Myers believed there were two ways of perceiving. One way is through the five senses (sensing), and the other is through intuition, an “indirect perception by way of the unconscious, incorporating ideas or associations that the unconscious tacks on to perceptions coming from outside” (Myers, p. 2). Myers described judging as the “processes of coming to conclusions about what has been perceived” (p. 1).

The differences in the way people make judgments arise from “the existence of two distinct and sharply contrasting ways of coming to conclusions” (Myers, p. 3). Some people tend to use thinking, “a logical process aimed at an impersonal finding” (Myers, p. 3). Others tend to use feeling, a “bestowing on things, a personal, subjective value” (Myers, p. 3).

Myers (1980) also described differences in the way people deal with the world around them and draw conclusions. People either use a judging attitude, in which they make decisions based on the evidence that is at hand, or they use a perceiving attitude, in which they remain open to new evidence and are open to new developments (Myers). While people tend to favor one attitude over the other, people are able to use both attitudes depending on the situation.

In addition to the sensing-intuition (SN) type, the thinking-feeling (TF) type, and the judging-perceiving (JP) type, Myers also used Jung’s Extraversion-Introversion (EI) preference (Myers, 1980). These four scales can be combined to describe 16 unique personality types (ISTJ, ISFJ, INFJ, INTJ, ISTP, ISFP, INFP, INTP, ESTP, ESFP, ENFP, ENTP, ESTJ, ESFJ, ENFJ, ENTJ) (Myers). Myers did not see one type as better or worse than another; rather “the four processes – sensing, intuition, thinking, and feeling – are gifts that all people are born with. The processes are at each person’s disposal to develop and use in dealing with the present and shaping the future” (Myers, p. 201).

Much work has been done on how Myers-Briggs personality types can explain human behavior (see Bayne, 1988, 1997; Carlson, 1985; Carlson & Levy, 1973; Kiersey & Bates, 1978; Kummerow, 1988; Lawrence, 1986; Thorne, 1987).

Holland

Holland (1985) proposed a theory of type that explained how vocational choices

could be explained as indications of personality type. While Holland focused on career choice, this author includes his work as it is based on types of personality. Holland developed a theory of six personality types: Realistic, Investigative, Social, Conventional, Enterprising, and Artistic (Holland). He believed that “a type is a model against which we can measure the real person” (Holland, p. 2). These types were considered to be the “product of a characteristic interaction among a variety of cultural and personal forces including peers, biological heredity, parents, social class, culture, and the physical environment” (Holland, p. 2). According to Holland, individuals pay attention to and process information in distinctive ways based upon their types.

Realistic types lean toward ordered, systematic activities using tools, machines, and motor skills (Holland, 1985). Realistic individuals value concrete tasks rather than intangible, abstract ideas. Holland described this type as asocial, conforming, frank, genuine, persistent, practical, stubborn, uninsightful, and thrifty.

The Investigative type tends toward scholarly, analytical tasks (Holland, 1985). This type avoids persuasive, social activities and can be described as intellectual, cautious, rational, pessimistic, complex, precise, curious, and reserved (Holland).

The Artistic type is free, expressive, and creative (Evans, 2003). This type enjoys “unsystematized activities that entail the manipulation of physical, verbal, or human materials to create art forms or products” (Holland, 1985, p. 20). Holland describes this type as complicated, impulsive, independent, expressive, idealistic, intuitive, nonconforming, and sensitive.

Social types tend toward interaction with others and dislike the disconnect of working with tools or machines (Holland, 1985). This type of person is usually friendly, cooperative,

and sensitive to others (Evans, 2003). Holland found that this type tended to learn human relations and educational competencies rather easily. He described social types as cooperative, patient, generous, kind, empathic, persuasive, tactful, responsible, and idealistic (Holland).

The Enterprising types tend to be those who prefer manipulating and organizing others (Evans, 2003; Holland, 1985). This type enjoys working with people but in a more supervisory way rather than as a peer as the Social type does. Holland described this type as adventurous, ambitious, domineering, energetic, excitement-seeking, extroverted, optimistic, sociable, talkative, and self-confident.

The last type described by Holland (1985) is the Conventional type. This type tends to prefer ordered activities and structure (Evans, 2003). Conventional types are described as careful, conforming, conscientious, efficient, inflexible, persistent, prudish, orderly, and unimaginative (Holland).

While Holland (1985) focused much of his theory on career choice, his types provide another approach at differentiating individuals based upon psychological type. He also believed that the environment in which individuals are raised and in which they later choose to exist can affect how their personality types manifest. He believed that “if we know a person’s personality pattern and the pattern of his or her environment, we can, in principle, use our knowledge of personality types and environmental models to forecast some of the outcomes” (Holland, p. 4).

Person-Environment Theory

Person-environment theory looks at development as an interdependent system of change in which individuals and the environment interact to shape one another (Hurst &

Pratt, 1984). The basic premise is that individuals “can experience the same environment differently, based on their own level of development” (Chickering & Reisser, 1993, p. 5). Behavior is a “direct function of the relationship between the individual and the environment” (Miller & Winston, 1991, p. 14), and if this is the case, then colleges and universities should work to establish healthy, positive environments to assist in student development.

Lewin

Lewin (1969/1936) presented an equation to demonstrate his understanding of human behavior, $B = f(P \times E)$. In his estimation, behavior (B) was the result of the interaction (f) of the person (P) and his/her environment (E) (Lewin). If advisors want to influence the learning behavior in students, they must first assess what factors characterize the person (e.g., sex, age, educational background, social background, personality, academic preparedness) and what factors characterize the environment (e.g., public or private institution, size, social atmosphere, physical setting, organizational structure) (Hamrick, Evans, & Schuh, 2002). At issue, however, are not just the characteristics of the person and of the environment, but the interaction between these two entities with all their factors. Two students with radically different backgrounds (e.g., one student from a small, supportive school in a rural area and one student from a large, urban high school) who then experience the same institutional environment will not have the same higher education experience due to the interaction between the two factors (Hamrick, Evans, & Schuh).

Sanford

Sanford (1962) conducted a longitudinal study of women at Vassar and determined that the college environment had a significant impact on student development. His basic premise was that

if an institution is a system of subsystems, and if a change in any one of them can change the whole, then it should be possible to make certain modifications in a college program, which would...increase the over-all level of their [the students'] development. (Sanford, 1966, p. 49).

Like other researchers, Sanford felt individuals must experience some sort of dissonance in order for change to occur (Evans, 2003). This dissonance, or challenge, must be balanced with the proper amount of environmental support in order for students to progress in their development (Evans). Without some form of challenge, the individual is too comfortable to make any changes; too much challenge, on the other hand, can cause maladaptive behaviors (such as escaping the challenge, reverting to previous ill-fitting strategies, or ignoring the challenge) (Evans; Hamrick, Evans, & Schuh, 2002). “The institution which would lead an individual toward greater development must, then, present him with strong challenges, appraise accurately his ability to cope with these challenges, and offer him support when they become overwhelming” (Sanford, p. 46). The balance between challenge and support must be appropriate in order for students to feel safe enough to make changes in their lives. Each student has a different capacity for challenge and a different level of need for support. Only by initiating and sustaining a relationship with a student can an advisor learn what that student’s needs and limits are.

Astin

As mentioned earlier in this paper, student retention in and satisfaction with higher education can be attributed in part to students' involvement in campus life (Astin, 1984; Light, 2001a; Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991, 1995; Schlossberg, 1989; Spady, 1971; Tinto, 1975, 1986). This involvement can be in class, in extracurricular activities, in working on campus, in student clubs, or in Greek organizations. Astin said "the amount of student learning and personal development associated with any educational program is directly proportional to the quality and quantity of student involvement in that program" (p. 298).

The quality of the student experience counts almost more than the quantity. Activities that just keep students busy do not lead to the gains in learning and involvement that are seen when students feel a part of the activity (Astin, 1984). To facilitate student learning and development, colleges and universities must provide opportunities for students to get involved on campus, and this involvement must extend beyond the extracurriculars to interactions between students and faculty members. Astin (1993) found a strong positive relationship between student satisfaction and the number of hours per week talking with faculty outside the classroom. Astin and others (Chickering & Reisser, 1993; Light, 2001a; Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991, 1995; Tinto, 1975, 1986) stress the importance of student involvement with faculty members above all else.

Schlossberg

Like Astin (1984), Schlossberg (1989) found that students must be a part of the college campus community in order to succeed. However, Schlossberg suggested a student's sense of belonging and mattering to the institution is crucial. When individuals are in a new environment, they experience a feeling of marginality, that is, a sense that they do not belong

and that they are outside the group in which they would like to belong. This feeling can lead to depression, irritability, and insecurity (Hamrick, Evans, & Schuh, 2002). Prolonged marginality can lead to a feeling of not mattering to the institution and a higher likelihood of dropping out (Roberts, 2003).

Schlossberg (1989) described five components of mattering: attention, importance, ego extension, dependence, and appreciation. These components work together to build an overall feeling of mattering in one's environment. Individuals need to feel that someone else is paying attention to their presence or absence. Further, individuals need to feel they are important to someone else and that someone cares about their well-being. Ego-extension is the feeling that others share in our successes and are saddened by our failures. The component of dependence is the feeling that one is needed by others, that one makes a difference in someone else's life. Appreciation for one's contributions and presence is also important to one's feelings of mattering.

Institutions that focus on mattering and greater student involvement will be successful in creating campuses where students are motivated to learn, where their retention is high, and, ultimately, where their institutional loyalty for the short-and long-term future is ensured. (Schlossberg, p. 14).

Advisors are expected to understand adolescent and adult development so they are prepared to help their students reach their potential growth (King, 1984). "Academic advising based on developmental theory...serves to encourage effectively wholesome development of each student's life in and out of the classroom" (Thomas & Chickering, 1984, pp. 90-91). A familiarity with psychosocial, cognitive-developmental, person-environment, and identity development theories will help advisors better understand how their advisees approach their

educational experiences and their lives in order to help advisees achieve the fullest possible growth (King).

Student, Staff Advisor, and Faculty Advisor Perceptions of Advising

Studies have been conducted to assess the perceptions, attitudes, and satisfaction of the various interested parties on academic advising. The majority of these studies focused on students' expectations and satisfaction as they are the primary users of these services. There have also been several studies of faculty advisor perceptions of the process. Only a few studies have been done to compare the perceptions, attitudes, and satisfaction of staff advisors, faculty advisors, and students. None of the studies have assessed the opinions of these groups as to whether advising is meeting the goals set forth by the CAS Standards for Higher Education and NACADA.

This section will report findings from studies conducted to assess the perceptions, attitudes, and satisfaction of students, of faculty advisors, and of combinations of students, faculty advisors, staff advisors, and administrators. The majority of studies done to assess advising have used student satisfaction ratings as measured by survey instruments (McGillen, 2000). While these studies are a beginning of the research needed in the advising field, the primary challenge facing academic advising research is the development of a significant body of research which enhances our understanding, assists us in planning, and serves as a guide to our decision-making. (Habley, 1986, p. 6)

Studies of Students

Studies of students can be categorized into several themes: (1) student satisfaction with advising, (2) student preference for faculty advisors or staff advisors, (3) student preference for developmental or prescriptive advising, and (4) student attitudes towards

advising as it relates to retention. These studies show that for the most part, whether students meet with staff academic advisors or faculty advisors, are given prescriptive or developmental advising, or are completely satisfied with advising or not, they consistently rate academic advising as one of the most important services offered on campus (Peterson, Wagner, & Lamb, 2001).

Student satisfaction is, by far, the most frequently researched area. In a 1979 study, Wood and Wood investigated student attitudes toward academic advising at a large public university. Surveys were administered to 519 undergraduate education students. The results showed that students rated the most important function of advisors to be assistance with course choice and scheduling. Assistance with choices of majors and minors was the second most important function chosen by students. The study also reported that 64% of students reported their advisors to be effective and helpful, and 65% of students reported their college advising office to be helpful and effective. The authors did not clarify whether the advisors were faculty advisors only, staff advisors only, or a combination of the two. Faculty advisors were given a vote of confidence when 65% of the students disagreed with a suggestion to replace faculty advisors with a centralized advisement office.

Dunker and Belcastro (1994) surveyed 398 community college students to determine their satisfaction with academic advising. All the students in the study had faculty advisors. They found no significant difference between full-time and part-time students' satisfaction of academic advising, however, the more frequently both part-time and full-time students met with their advisors, the higher their satisfaction. In addition, satisfaction was also related to the length of the advising meetings, with full-time students more satisfied with meetings 15 to 30 minutes long and part-time students more satisfied with meetings lasting 30 minutes or longer.

The authors recommended adjusting the length of advising sessions depending upon part-time or full-time status.

In a 1998 study, Gross surveyed 463 sophomores at a medium-sized public university to determine their impressions of academic advising services. This study was done as a follow-up to a 1992 report provided by consultants Noel and Levitz that showed students at the university expressed the need for help in academic planning. Results included students' specified needs for advising, their impressions of advisors, and their levels of satisfaction with advising. The author found these students to be significantly more dissatisfied with their academic advising experiences at this institution than were students from the instrument's national norm study. The author suggested more research was needed to assess advisors' impressions of advising services.

A study was conducted by Lowe and Toney (2000) to examine education students' satisfaction with academic advising with regard to standing (undergraduate or graduate), type of advisor (staff or faculty), and frequency of contact with advisors. A significant relationship was found between satisfaction and the frequency of contact with academic advisors, regardless of the type of advisor or student standing. In addition, the authors investigated retention rates between undergraduate and graduate students and found no significant differences in retention rates. A review of advisor and student perceptions of the duties of advisors revealed some differences. All the advising duties were rated as much more important by the advisors than by the students. These duties included making referrals to other campus offices, establishing a relationship with the advisee, understanding the needs of students, assisting in student orientation, helping students clarify educational and personal

goals, and assisting students in identifying academic problems. The authors suggested further research with students from other fields and with administrators.

Nolden, Kim, and Sedlacek (2000) conducted a phone survey of 63 native seniors at a large university to investigate their experiences with academic services. Students were each asked five questions, including questions regarding their best and worst academic experiences and their best and worst experiences with student services. Responses were recorded and then grouped into categories for analyzing. The most frequently stated best academic experience was students' interactions with faculty members (43%). This response was top for both male and female students. Remarkably, both male and female students pointed to an encounter with a specific faculty member as their worst academic experience. Responses to best and worst student services questions were very individualized. There was no consensus as to the best student service. However, students, male and female, did agree that parking issues were the worst experiences with student services. Academic advising received one vote for best academic experience but 10 votes for worst academic experience. In addition, five students also named academic advising as the worst student services experience. The authors suggest replicating this study at other institutions and including students who are in their first three years of college as well.

Laureano (2003) investigated students' expectations and satisfaction with services offered by the academic advising center at a large public university in Florida. Students expressed satisfaction with advising overall, however, there were some differences found between satisfaction levels of full-time and part-time students. Laureano reported mixed results from year to year; she attributed these fluctuations to the rapidly changing

demographics of the university. One recommendation for further study was to conduct focus group studies to examine specific areas of concern for students from diverse backgrounds.

Overall, students seem to be mostly satisfied with the academic advising provided to them by universities and colleges. This information is beneficial to advisors and the universities for which they work; however, student satisfaction is only one part of the information required for advisors to guide their practice. The type of advising that is being offered to students is also an important factor. The second type of advising research has been in determining student preference for developmental or prescriptive advising.

Herndon, Kaiser, and Creamer (1996) investigated student preferences for advising style in community colleges. The survey included items used to determine what type of advising the students were receiving and to determine what type of advising they would prefer. Overall, students reported receiving much more prescriptive advising than developmental advising, although they reported stronger preferences for developmental advising. These researchers were also interested in differences between full-time and part-time students and between White students and Black students. Results showed that part-time students received more prescriptive advising than full-time students. Race appeared to make a difference in the amount of advising each group received. White students enrolled in college transfer majors received significantly more advising than did Black students enrolled in the same majors. The authors interpreted this to mean White students were more proactive in seeking out advising since the type of advising all students were receiving (prescriptive) relies on students to initiate contact with advisors. The authors suggested institutions make greater efforts to reach out to students in minority groups to ensure they are receiving

adequate advising. Future research into the effects of matching students with advisors by race and gender was suggested.

A 1996 study by Broadbridge in the United Kingdom found that students preferred developmental advising over traditional prescriptive advising. The author used group discussions to gather data from 40 final-year students from 14 different degree programs who had been advised by faculty members from their major academic departments. The students expressed a strong preference for a long-term developmental relationship with one advisor that progressed throughout their academic careers. Broadbridge found:

The strength of the academic advising relationship depended on the nature of the individual relationship between adviser and student. Both adviser and student must understand the purpose of the scheme, believe in its importance, and be willing to participate in it fully. (Conclusion section, para. 5)

The author suggested conducting similar studies with students at first-year, sophomore, and junior levels and conducting similar studies to determine the attitudes and preferences of academic advisors and administrators.

Alexitch (1997) studied the relationship between students' characteristics (e.g., gender, educational orientation) and the advising they preferred and received from faculty advisors. A total of 81 junior and senior undergraduate students at a Canadian university completed the survey. The researcher found that students preferred developmental advising over prescriptive advising, with females much more likely to prefer developmental advising than males. Like in the Herndon, Kaiser, and Creamer (1996) study, however, students reported receiving much more prescriptive advising than developmental advising. Educational orientation (the extent to which a student is learning and grade oriented) was

also a factor in student preference for developmental advising, with students who were more learning oriented preferring a more developmental approach to advising.

Hartsell (1999) studied students' preferences for prescriptive or developmental advising in relation to the amount of career decidedness they exhibited. The author found that career decidedness alone was not a predictor of a student's preference for prescriptive or developmental advising; however, some subgroups of students did show preferences. For young (18-22 years old) female students and older (28+ years old) students, their preferences for developmental advising increased as career indecision increased. The author found that for students in technical programs, the inverse was true: as career indecision increased, their preferences for developmental advising decreased. The author suggested this difference for students in technical programs may be related to the short window of time in which they must make a career decision. Unlike college transfer students who understand they have two years of education before they must decide on a major, technical students begin their major programs right away. These students may feel more pressed to make a decision; thus, a prescriptive advising experience where someone will act as the leader is more desirable.

Smith (2002) conducted a qualitative study of first-year students' perceptions of academic advising. He held four focus group meetings with a total of 34 first-year students at a medium sized public university. Each group was asked the same set of questions that focused on students' advising experiences and preferences. Smith found that unlike most studies that focus on sophomore, junior, and/or senior students, these first-year students expressed preferences for prescriptive advising. The author offered a possible interpretation in the students' past experience with guidance personnel in high school creating expectations for college advising. In high school, guidance personnel are much more prescriptive in

providing applications, deadlines, and lists of things for students to accomplish. First-year college students may have expectations that college advising will be similar. “For these students, the advisor can play an important role in helping them understand the new academic environment and support new ways of thinking” (Smith, p. 46).

These studies show that students prefer a more developmental approach to advising over a prescriptive approach. Unfortunately, these studies also show that most students are receiving prescriptive advising. One possible reason for this discrepancy is that faculty advisors have not been trained to advise (Habley, 2004; see also Dillon & Fisher, 2000; Kelly, 1995; Templeton, Skaggs, & Johnson, 2002), yet 95% of campuses use faculty advisors in at least some of their departments (Habley). In addition, anecdotal evidence shows that developmental advising is a time consuming process, and advisors, who have large case loads (Habley), are not able to provide this type of advising to most students.

Another group of research studies has been focused on student preference for faculty advisors or staff advisors. A large, national study was completed by Habley (1994) who reviewed the survey responses of 58,696 students at 110 colleges and universities who completed the *ACT Survey of Academic Advising* between 1989 and 1993. These students came from two-year and four-year public and private institutions. The survey included a section to identify what students saw as needs for academic advising and a section for students to rate their satisfaction with their advisors’ performance. Habley found that regardless whether faculty advisors or staff advisors were used, students have generally positive views of their advisors. In addition, on specific advising tasks, students rated both types of advisors very similarly. The author noted that these findings were similar for the

40,000 students who completed the same survey during the period of 1985 to 1988. Habley's conclusion was that it "is not who advises but rather how well advising is done" (p. 30).

Others have also looked at preferences towards faculty or staff advisors. Miville & Sedlacek (1995) investigated students' satisfaction with and use of faculty advisors in the engineering department and of staff advisors in the central advising office of the college of engineering. The authors surveyed 157 engineering students at a large university and found students used faculty advisors more than they used the staff advisors. In addition, students used the two types of advisors for the same services (e.g., course selection, registration issues), creating a great duplication of services. Overall, students underused all advising services. The authors suggested future research to determine which needs can be met by faculty advisors or by central office staff advisors.

Belcheir (1999) found that students preferred the advising they received from staff advisors over that received from faculty members. In this study, a little more than 18% of students felt the advising they received from faculty met their needs exceptionally well or more than adequately, compared to 33% of students who felt staff advisors did. However, while students appreciated the staff advisors for their more proactive approach (e.g., calling students to set appointments, checking in with students regarding their progress), students also appreciated the personal relationships they formed with faculty members through advising.

Boyle (2002) conducted research to determine 422 students' impressions of faculty advisor efficacy versus staff advisor efficacy at a public university. Students' impressions of academic advising were analyzed using student demographic data. The author reported a significant interaction between students' class standings (first-year, sophomore, junior,

senior) and impressions of advising. First-year students had much more favorable impressions of staff advisors than did upper classmen who had more favorable impressions of faculty advisors. In addition, Boyle found that students who remained with their staff advisors for longer than six months had less favorable impressions of them than did those who remained with staff advisors for shorter periods of time.

Overall, these studies support Habley's (1994) finding that students appreciate both faculty advisors and staff advisors. Each type of advisor has unique perspectives and information that can be shared with students, depending upon where the student is in his/her academic career.

Other important research has been done to determine if there is a relationship between academic advising and retention or persistence. Homer (1997) investigated the relationship of student attitudes towards academic advising to student persistence and academic success. The study of 222 students found that student persistence was related to advisor impressions and assistance and that quality advisement may be a significant factor in students persisting from one semester to the next.

Peterson, Wagner, and Lamb (2001) conducted a telephone survey of 146 students from a large public university who did not return for spring semester to obtain these students' perceptions of various services at the institution. The major finding of the study was that 48% of those who had not returned for the spring semester had the intention of returning to the institution later the same year. The other finding was that advising was the only factor in the study that directly influenced students' perceptions of the university as a whole. The authors did not attempt to measure the quality or quantity of advising the non-returning students may have received; they only wanted the students' perceptions of services.

Knedlik (2003) compared levels of student satisfaction with developmental advising with retention levels at a rural two-campus community college. No relationship was found between overall levels of satisfaction with advising and retention levels. The author also looked at any possible relationships between age and satisfaction, age and retention, gender and satisfaction, and gender and retention but found no significant differences. The only statistically significant findings were found for students living in residence halls. Those students living on campus had both higher levels of satisfaction with advising and had higher rates of retention. In addition, Knedlik found that those students who did not attend extracurricular activities and did not interact with faculty outside the classroom had levels of satisfaction with advising at least one standard deviation below the mean. Some recommendations for future research included studying how to better orient new students to college, how to improve services for nontraditional (adult) students, and how to move advisors from a focus on prescriptive advising to more developmental advising.

These studies, for the most part, have not shown a strong relationship between advising and retention; however, these studies did show that students see advising as an important service provided by the university and that this service can color the way students see the university as a whole.

Studies of Faculty Advisors

Other studies have focused on the opinions, attitudes, and practices of faculty advisors. The majority of these studies used survey instruments for data collection. Overall, faculty ranked themselves as being effective, helpful advisors, although there were complaints with the lack of reward and recognition and with the absence of consideration of advising duties on decisions of promotion and tenure.

In one early study, Bossenmaier (1978) investigated the attitudes of nursing faculty towards academic advising. One section of the survey asked about the characteristics that were deemed necessary for advisors. A great majority of respondents listed knowledge of the curriculum and university and helping skills. Less than half, however, listed availability to students as an important characteristic. Only about one half of the faculty expressed a willingness to provide academic advising, and those who were interested in advising felt they should be given a reduced teaching load. The author interpreted this to mean faculty saw advising as a time-consuming activity. She suggested that colleges and universities provide reduced teaching loads for faculty who advise to compensate for the increased work load.

Other studies have focused on determining what it was that faculty advisors were doing in their advising. Frost (1990) studied the advising practices and attitudes of faculty members who were identified as developmental advisors by students' responses to the Academic Advising Inventory. These developmental advisors were surveyed to identify the specific advising activities they performed that were associated with developmental advising. These advisors involved students in college experiences and resources, explored factors that contribute to students' successes, demonstrated interest in students' academic and extracurricular activities, and encouraged students to participate in decision making.

In another study, Templeton, Skaggs, and Johnson (2002) examined the perceptions of 71 faculty advisors on student advising at a private university. Faculty reported advising a mean of 29 students each semester spending approximately 37 hours per semester on advising, but faculty also reported advising students who were not assigned to their case loads. The primary duty of advising was reported to be assistance with course selection. Faculty members also believed information on careers should be included in advising;

however, faculty spent only 17% of their advising time on career issues. The most “disconcerting” (p. 9) finding was that less than half of the faculty advisors had received any training for advising, and nearly half (42.5%) said training would not be helpful. Suggestions for further research include investigating faculty understanding of advising responsibilities and the way advisees are assigned to advisors.

One study examined perspectives of faculty advisors on faculty-student advising interactions (Dillon & Fisher, 2000). Fifty faculty members at a medium-sized university were surveyed, and additionally, 20 of those surveyed participated in one of two focus groups. The results showed that faculty advisors believed advising to be a priority job duty for them. They also reported spending enough time with students in advising sessions to make them productive meetings for both faculty and students. However, faculty did not believe administrators take advising duties into consideration in promotion and tenure decisions. Suggestions for improving advising included assigning advising duties only to those faculty who want to advise, rewarding those who choose to do advising with lighter teaching loads, factoring advising into promotion and tenure decisions, and providing more training for advising. A few suggested hiring professional advisors to eliminate the need for faculty advising altogether. Dillon and Fisher recommended future studies look for possible differences in opinions between new advisors (5 years of experience or less) and more seasoned advisors. In addition, they recommended comparing advisor and student perspectives on what items, duties, or characteristics of advisors detract from or enhance advising.

Studies of Comparison among Groups

Studies of combinations of students, staff advisors, and faculty advisors have provided information about the same advising situations from the different perspectives of providers and end users. These studies can offer layered insight into what is happening in advising.

Like the studies on students alone, research on combined groups has looked at satisfaction with the advising process. Kramer, Arrington, and Chynoweth (1985) conducted a study to compare student, faculty, and administrator perceptions of advising by faculty and by academic advising centers. Faculty reported they were providing much better advising than students reported they were receiving, and students reported being much more satisfied with their experiences with staff advisors in the advising center. Students, faculty, and administrators agreed that the advising center should be a place to get information on policies and procedures and graduation requirements. Career and academic major decisions were seen to be best discussed with faculty advisors. The authors suggested that more training for faculty and students in the specific duties and expectations for faculty advising was needed.

Saving and Keim (1998) studied the perceptions of students and staff advisors of advising at two universities. Survey results showed that academic advisors at both universities believed they advised well, enjoyed advising, had good interpersonal skills, and provided accurate information and advising. The only difference found between the two groups of advisors was that those at University I felt they had enough time for all their students, whereas advisors at University II felt rushed. Students from University I rated their advisors higher than students at University II rated their advisors. Saving and Keim noted, however, that neither group of students rated their advisors high enough for them to be considered developmental

advisors. A comparison of advisor perceptions and student perceptions revealed that advisors rated themselves higher than the students did in all areas.

Much of the research has focused on the needs of the students and the tasks provided by advisors. In 1983, Larsen and Brown investigated student and faculty expectations of academic advising at several Midwestern universities. Faculty and students agreed that advisors should provide assistance with personal issues (if only with referrals to other offices on campus), provide information about financial aid, provide assistance gaining part-time work on campus, and provide guidance in course selection and academic programming. Students and faculty differed in their expectation of who should initiate contact for advising, with students expecting faculty to initiate contact and faculty expecting students to do so.

In a study of student and faculty perceptions of advising, Eddy and Essarum (1989) found that while students and faculty viewed the advising process similarly, the two groups differed on what they saw as the needs to be addressed in advising. Both groups agreed that personal counseling should not be a part of advising. Students listed the top three goals (in order) for advising as (1) to provide personal references for employment or graduate school, (2) to assist students in obtaining part-time work (paid or unpaid) that would enhance their academic and career goals, and (3) to assist students in career planning. Faculty listed the top four (there was a tie for number three) goals (in order) for advising as (1) to assist students with career planning, (2) to help students explore graduate school possibilities, (3) to assist students in selecting a major, and (4) to inform students of employment possibilities after graduation. The authors suggested more studies that compared student and faculty perceptions of advising.

Kopera (1998) conducted a qualitative study of faculty advisors and staff advisors to explore and describe how they spent their time and what they did. The author found that both types of advisors used developmental advising in both their approaches and tasks. Tasks described included helping students plan their programs of study, providing information, solving problems, and advocating for their advisees. Advisors reported they enjoyed their jobs but felt they were unappreciated and unrecognized on campus.

A 1999 study by Smerglia and Bouchet investigated the expectations of advising by 159 students and 26 faculty members in the sociology department of a large state university. All advising was done by three faculty members in this department who had some release time to compensate for the time involved with advising. The two groups agreed that tasks normally believed to be a part of advising (e.g., selecting courses, planning academic programs, explaining university policy and procedure) are the responsibility of the advisor. However, more students than faculty believed advisors should assist students with future planning (e.g., career and job market information, graduate school requirements) and with help with campus resources (e.g., referrals to other offices, reminding students of deadlines).

Fewer studies have looked at the preference for or the providing of prescriptive or developmental advising. As noted earlier, research on students seems to show their preference for a more developmental approach (Alexitch, 1997; Broadbridge, 1996; Hartsell, 1999; Herndon, Kaiser, & Creamer, 1996; Smith, 2002), but prescriptive advising seems to be the type of advising they are receiving (Alexitch; Herndon, Kaiser, & Creamer).

In a study to look at this issue from a variety of perspectives, Wood (2002) investigated the type of advising done at a major state university. She compared the survey responses of full-time staff advisors in a centralized advising unit, full-time departmental

advisors in academic units, part-time faculty advisors, and students to determine whether staff advisors or faculty advisors provided developmental or prescriptive advising. Wood found that while all advisor types tended to use prescriptive advising methods most often, full-time departmental advisors were more likely to use developmental advising than were the full-time advisors in the central advising unit. When comparing full-time advisors, regardless of location, and part-time faculty advisors, the full-time advisors used more developmental advising. Results from the student surveys indicated the departmental advisors were more helpful than advisors in the central advising unit. The author suggested this finding was due to the relationship built with a member of the department of the student's major where advising case loads are lower.

According to Habley (1986) "the primary challenge facing academic advising research is the development of a significant body of research which enhances our understanding, assists us in planning, and serves as a guide to our decision-making" (p. 6). The research described in this chapter shows the type of research that has been done in the field. These findings have provided insight into how students and advisors view advising and how satisfied they are with what is happening during advising. What still seems to be missing is the type of research Habley saw as vital, that is, research that can assist advisors in planning and in decision-making. Since NACADA, a group of professional advisors (both faculty and staff), has published goals for advising, advisors in the field should be able to rely on them to guide their practice. However, this researcher could find scant research that addressed the goals set forth by the national association. The ACT national surveys were the only research that directly addressed these goals, and these surveys were answered by one person, who may or may not be working in advising, on each campus surveyed. This

important piece of information must be reviewed in order to justify (or negate) its validity.

Conclusion

Academic advising has been a part of higher education in the United States almost since its beginnings in the colonies. The evolution of advising has brought it from the parental duties of *in loco parentis* to a relationship where students and faculty must “recognize that they are partners in learning” (Frost & Brown-Wheeler, 2003, p. 243). Advising has become a formalized type of teaching offered to students to assist them in developing fully into learners and thinkers and to assist students in becoming “involved in their own choices” (Frost & Brown-Wheeler, p. 242).

As the only national association exclusively for academic advising, NACADA must become the leader in defining academic advising, developing measurable goals for advising, and emphasizing research in the field. NACADA’s work with the Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS) in developing standards for academic advising demonstrates its preeminence in the field. The CAS standards are used nationwide for “purposes of developing and promulgating standards of professional practice to guide higher education practitioners and their institutions” (Miller, 2001, p. 1). These standards of practice “enhance the quality of a student’s total learning experience in higher education” (Miller, p. 21). Since 1980, these goals for academic advising have existed, yet very little research has been done to verify or justify their existence.

As we move into the 21st century, academic advising research must become a priority if advising is to grow into a true professional field (McGillin, 2000). McGillin exhorted those in the advising field to participate in the building of a foundation of research. She specified what she saw as the immediate areas in need of research. First, researchers must focus on

generating a theory of academic advising to better “conceptualize the multidimensional nature of advising encounters” (McGillin, p. 374). Second, there must be research to study what it is advisors do, relying not on student surveys of satisfaction but on observation and reflection. These studies must look at advising longitudinally and must “move beyond single-campus, single-program investigations” (McGillen, p. 374). Third, the connection between retention and advising must be linked more strongly and documented well (McGillen). Fourth, research must begin to focus on the providers, not just on the recipients of advising. Many more studies have been conducted on student opinions, perceptions, and satisfaction than on those of the advisors, whether staff or faculty advisors. This research should answer questions about the differences between what professional advisors do and what faculty advisors do, how reward structures affect advisors and advising, and how effective advisor training is. Fifth, McGillen encouraged those in the advising field to join with other disciplines in research. This collaboration will help bring advising into the national discourse on higher education. Her last recommendation was for advising researchers to join with discipline-based researchers to create more effective partnerships between professional advisors and advisors in specific disciplines. This type of focused research will help to raise the status of advising to that of a central function of higher education, not just a peripheral service (Habley, 2004).

Chapter 3

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to investigate student, staff advisor, and faculty advisor perceptions of meeting the NACADA goals for advising. The purpose of this chapter is to describe the research project, to include a description of the participants, the test instrument, hypotheses, data collection procedures, and statistical analysis.

Research Design

The research design was an ex post facto study to determine the self-reported perceptions of faculty and staff advisors at a comprehensive four-year public university in Western North Carolina as to how well they are meeting the NACADA goals for advising. In addition, the study investigated the relationship between student, staff academic advisor, and faculty advisor perceptions of meeting these goals. The study also provided participants the opportunity to list specific methods used to meet the goals, and content analysis was used to analyze these qualitative data.

Participants

This study was conducted at Appalachian State University (ASU), a member of the 16 campus University of North Carolina system. It is a four-year public comprehensive university located in rural Western North Carolina. Appalachian began as Watauga Academy in 1899 with 53 students enrolled to learn to be teachers, who were much needed in the rural mountain area (ASU, 2005d). The academy first received state funds in 1903 and was renamed Appalachian Training School for Teachers. That fall the school enrolled 325 students (ASU). The institution continued to grow and evolve. In 1929, the school became a four-year, degree granting institution and was renamed Appalachian State Teachers' College,

and in 1967 the college became Appalachian State University, a multipurpose regional university (ASU).

Appalachian has approximately 14,650 students (ASU, 2005b), of which 12,980 are undergraduates. The university is a traditional residential institution where 93% of the undergraduates attend full time (ASU), and the mean age of students is 21.5 years (ASU, 2005a). The undergraduate student body is approximately 50.1% male and 49.8% female and is 90.9% Caucasian (ASU, 2005b). The five-year graduation rate for the 1999 cohort of full-time, first-time students is 59.8 (ASU, 2005c). The retention rate from year one to year two for 2003 is 84.2% (ASU).

All first year students enter into the General College where they are advised by staff advisors until they declare a major (ASU, 2005d). Students may not declare majors until they have completed 30 semester hours and both first year English courses. After declaring their majors, students are advised in their major departments by faculty advisors. In the College of Arts and Sciences, all students are required to be advised each semester prior to preregistration.

The population used in this study consisted of staff advisors in the General Studies Academic Advising Center, faculty advisors in the College of Arts and Sciences, and students who received advising from either of the advisor groups above. Participation was voluntary.

Staff advisors are employees of the university who have backgrounds and masters degree training in student development or counseling and are hired to do advising full time. Faculty advisors are employees of the university who primarily are responsible to teach, do research, and do community service. Their backgrounds and training are in their respective

academic disciplines, and no student development training is required. Academic advising is a requirement for faculty members; however, there is no structure on campus to include these duties as a part of tenure and promotion review.

Instruments

The researcher developed a survey that used a Likert scale to measure participants' perceptions of how each NACADA goal had been met. Two forms were created: one for advisors and one for advisees (See Appendices E and F for instruments). Each of the eight goals for academic advising was listed with a Likert scale from one to five (1=Very Poorly, 2=Poorly, 3=Adequate, 4=Well, 5=Very Well) for rating how well advisors believed they met each goal or how well students believed their advisors met each goal. In addition to the numerical data, respondents were asked to provide three methods used to meet each goal.

The instrument developed for this study matches the goals section of the ACT instrument used in the six national surveys on academic advising. On both instruments, each goal for advising was listed with a five-point Likert scale to measure respondents' perceptions of how well the advisors meet the goal (Habley, 2004). This part of the instrument is identical to the goals section of the ACT instrument used in the six national surveys on academic advising. While there are no data on the reliability or validity of the ACT national survey, it has been used six times with similar results. Based on the similarity of the instrument in this study to the ACT survey, the study instrument is assumed to be a reliable measure.

In addition to the numerical data, respondents were asked to provide three methods used to meet each goal. The researcher added this task to the survey in the hopes that participants would reflect on what had actually happened in their advising experiences and

that their rating on the Likert scale would be more reflective of their experiences rather than a perfunctory rating. In addition, the lists of methods used may provide some insight into what actually happens within an advising interaction. McGilllin (2000) stated that in order for advising to grow into a professional field, some research needs to be done to study what advisors do by relying on observation or reflection. This section of the survey instrument allows for reflection, not only on the part of the advisors, but also for students. The addition of a qualitative section should not negate the reliability stated previously.

According to Gall, Borg, and Gall (1996), a pilot study using two or three participants is sufficient for pilot testing. The instrument was reviewed by a staff advisor and a faculty advisor for clearness of wording and procedures, as well as for face validity.

Hypotheses

H_{Oa} : There will be no difference between staff advisors and faculty advisors reported perceptions of meeting NACADA academic advising goals.

H_{Ob} : There will be no difference between staff advisors and students with staff advisors reported perceptions of meeting NACADA academic advising goals.

H_{Oc} : There will be no difference between faculty advisors and students with faculty advisors reported perceptions of meeting NACADA academic advising goals.

H_{Od} : There will be no difference between all advisor perceptions and all student perceptions of meeting NACADA academic advising goals.

H_{Oe} : There will be no difference between students with faculty advisors perceptions and students with staff advisors perceptions of meeting NACADA goals for advising.

Procedures

Written permission from Institutional Review Boards of Appalachian State University and North Carolina State University was obtained before beginning the study (see Appendices A and B). Informed consent from students and advisors was obtained (see Appendix C for Informed Consent document). Measures were taken to protect the confidentiality of all participants.

One group of students ($n = 2,680$) was made up of all active students who had not yet declared their majors during the spring 2005 term. These students received advising from the staff advisors in the General Studies advising center. The other group of students ($n = 2,869$) was made up of students who are assigned to the College of Arts and Sciences for advising by faculty. All 21 staff advisors in the General Studies advising center were selected, and all faculty advisors in the College of Arts and Sciences ($n = 217$) were selected.

On April 25, 2005, the researcher emailed (See Appendix D) the informed consent document and surveys to on-campus email addresses of all selected students, staff advisors, and faculty advisors. In an attempt to increase response rates to the survey, a \$50 gift card to Amazon.com was offered to a participant from each group (students, staff advisors, faculty advisors) whose name will be randomly drawn from all participants who return completed surveys. Instructions for email submission were given. Some problems arose with the email response button on the survey, so the researcher also gave instructions for submitting via campus mail.

Due to low response, the researcher sent the email survey requests to students, faculty and staff an additional four times, in early May, early July, late August, and mid-September. In addition, announcements were made at various committee meetings on campus, including

the April and August meetings of the Department Chair Council of the College of Arts & Sciences, the April, August, and September meetings of the University Advising Committee meeting, and the kick-off meeting to Freshman & Transfer Orientation in August. Several department chairs also made announcements at their August faculty meetings reminding faculty to remind students to complete the survey. Unfortunately, the response rate remained low.

Data Analyses

The data gathered from the surveys included Likert scale items and written responses for the methods used. Descriptive statistics and frequency distributions were used to analyze the data. In addition, the nominal data were treated as interval data, as was the data from the ACT Sixth National Study (Habley, 2004), in order to make comparisons of the findings in this study to the national data. The significance level was set at .05 ($p < .05$). Univariate analysis of variance (F) was used to test the relationship between groups.

As part of the survey, respondents were asked to provide three methods used to meet each goal. Content analysis was used to analyze the data collected. Content analyses “involve collecting data on various aspects of the messages encoded in the communication product” (Gall, Borg, & Gall, 1996, p. 357) and “coding of the document’s messages into categories” (Gall, Borg, & Gall, p. 359). After coding the data into these categories, analysis can be done by counting the frequencies of the occurrences for each category.

The researcher first grouped all responses together by participant groups (i.e., students, staff advisors, and faculty advisors). For each goal, the researcher listed all reported methods used. After reviewing these lists, the researcher noticed several themes of advisor roles in the data. The roles were similar to those developed by Winston and Sandor (2002) in

their Academic Advising Inventory. Winston and Sandor named five scales that described activities performed by advisors: (1) Personal Development and Interpersonal Relationships; (2) Exploring Institutional Policies; (3) Registration and Class Scheduling; (4) Teaching Personal Skills; and (5) Academic Courses and Majors. The researcher in this study developed the following six roles: Communicator, Referral Maker, Information Provider, Teacher, Scheduler, and Nurturer. Each method listed by a survey respondent was placed into one of the six broad advisor roles, and the total number of responses per role was reported.

Using both quantitative and qualitative data allows for triangulation of the data (Brannen, 2004; Eisenhardt, K. M., 2002; Richards, 2005). The quantitative data in this study seemed to support the qualitative responses. Students reported that their advisors met the goals adequately to well (3.25 to 3.85) and also listed methods that seemed appropriate for meeting the goals. Faculty advisor (2.78 to 4.01) and staff advisor (3.40 to 4.60) quantitative data also seemed to support the qualitative responses.

Chapter 4

DATA ANALYSIS

Overview of the Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate the self-reported perceptions of faculty and staff advisors as to how well they are meeting the NACADA goals for advising and to investigate the relationship between student, staff academic advisor, and faculty advisor perceptions of meeting NACADA goals for academic advising. Data were collected from staff advisors, faculty advisors, and students from a comprehensive state university. The degree of satisfaction was measured by a survey developed by the researcher. This chapter provides an overview of the study, the results of the data analyses, and a summary of the findings.

The Research Site

All research was conducted at Appalachian State University, a member of the 16 campus University of North Carolina system. The university is a traditional residential institution that has approximately 12,980 undergraduate students (ASU, 2005b).

Target Population

The target populations for this study consisted of 21 staff advisors in the General Studies Academic Advising Center, 217 faculty advisors in the College of Arts and Sciences, and 5,549 students (all enrolled students who received advising from staff advisors [$n = 2,680$] and all enrolled students who received advising from College of Arts and Sciences faculty members [$n = 2,869$]). Participation was voluntary.

Participants

There were four groups of participants. A total of 51 faculty advisors (51% female and 49% male) from the College of Arts and Sciences returned a completed survey, for a return rate of 23.5%. These advisors had from 1 to 37 years ($M = 11.31$, $SD = 9.43$) of advising experience and advised 3 to 50 advisees ($M = 16.06$, $SD = 11.46$).

A total of five staff advisors from the General Studies Academic Advising Center returned a survey for a return rate of 23.8%. Of the completed surveys received, 100% were from females; however, there are only two male staff advisors at the University so this percentage is not unexpected. The staff advisors had from 3 to 18 years of advising experience ($M = 8.4$, $SD = 6.76$) and had an advising caseload of 30 to 350 advisees ($M = 214$, $SD = 153.51$).

Staff advisors are employees of the university who have backgrounds and masters degree training in student development or counseling and are hired to do advising full time. Faculty advisors are employees of the university who primarily are responsible to teach, do research, and do community service. Their backgrounds and training are in their respective academic disciplines, and no student development training is required. Academic advising is a requirement for faculty members; however, there is no structure on campus to include these duties as a part of tenure and promotion review.

A total of 5,549 students were sent an email invitation to complete the survey. Only 122 students actually returned completed surveys, which was a return rate of only 2.1%. Of the 122 students, 11 did not provide information regarding their sex. Of the remaining 111, 71 were female (63.9%) and 40 were male (36%). The students ranged in age from 17 to 75 years old ($M = 21.86$, $SD = 7.55$, $Mdn = 21.00$). The number of traditional aged students (17-

22 years old) was 102 or 83.6% of the sample. Similar to the overall ASU undergraduate student population, which is 90.9% Caucasian (ASU, 2005b), the sample was 86.9% White, 7.4% African American, 1.6% Hispanic, .8% Asian, and .8% Other, with 2.5% not reporting. Most of the students were native North Carolinians (86.9%) with the remaining coming from Florida, Georgia, Indiana, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, Vermont, and Texas.

Almost half of the students (59 or 48.4%) reported meeting with their advisors once per semester. The remaining students met with their advisors twice per semester (26.2%), three times or more per semester (18%), once per year (6.6%), or never (.8%). The mean cumulative GPA reported by students was 3.19, $SD = .55$.

Instrument

The researcher developed a survey that used a Likert scale to measure participants' perceptions of how each NACADA goal had been met. Two forms were created: one for advisors and one for advisees (See Appendices E and F for instruments). Each of the eight goals for academic advising was listed with a Likert scale from one to five (1=Very Poorly, 2=Poorly, 3=Adequate, 4=Well, 5=Very Well) for rating how well advisors believed they met each goal or how well students believed their advisors met each goal. This part of the instrument is identical to the goals section of the ACT instrument used in the six national surveys on academic advising. On both instruments, each goal for advising was listed with a five-point Likert scale to measure respondents' perceptions of how well the advisors meet the goal (Habley, 2004). Based on this similarity, the study instrument is assumed to be a reliable measure.

In addition to the numerical data, respondents were asked to provide three methods used to meet each goal. The researcher added this task to the survey in the hopes that participants would reflect on what had actually happened in their advising experiences and that their rating on the Likert scale would be more reflective of their experiences rather than a perfunctory rating. In addition, the lists of methods used may provide some insight into what actually happens within an advising interaction. McGillin (2000) stated that in order for advising to grow into a professional field, some research needs to be done to study what advisors do by relying on observation or reflection. This section of the survey instrument allows for reflection, not only on the part of the advisors, but also for students. The addition of a qualitative section should not negate the reliability stated previously.

Using both quantitative and qualitative data allows for triangulation of the data (Brannen, 2004; Eisenhardt, K. M., 2002; Richards, 2005). The quantitative data in this study seemed to support the qualitative responses. Students reported that their advisors met the goals adequately to well (3.25 to 3.85) and also listed methods that seemed appropriate for meeting the goals. Faculty advisor (2.78 to 4.01) and staff advisor (3.40 to 4.60) quantitative data also seemed to support the qualitative responses.

Assumptions of the Study

1. Staff and faculty advisors will honestly report their performance in meeting advising goals.
2. Students will honestly report their perceptions of staff and faculty advisors' performance in meeting advising goals.
3. The instrument used will accurately measure perceptions of meeting the academic advising goals.

Qualitative Data Analysis

Method of Content Analysis

As part of the survey, respondents were asked to provide three methods used to meet each goal. Content analysis was used to analyze the data collected. The researcher first grouped all responses together by participant groups (i.e., students, staff advisors, and faculty advisors). For each goal, the researcher listed all reported methods used. After reviewing these lists, the researcher noticed several themes of advisor roles in the data. The roles were similar to those developed by Winston and Sandor (2002) in their Academic Advising Inventory. Winston and Sandor named five scales that described activities performed by advisors: (1) Personal Development and Interpersonal Relationships; (2) Exploring Institutional Policies; (3) Registration and Class Scheduling; (4) Teaching Personal Skills; and (5) Academic Courses and Majors. The researcher in this study developed the following six roles: Communicator, Referral Maker, Information Provider, Teacher, Scheduler, and Nurturer. Each method listed by a survey respondent was placed into one of the six broad advisor roles, and the total number of responses per role was reported.

Description of Advisor Roles

The methods used by advisors were separated into tasks performed while functioning in advisor roles: Communicator, Information Provider, Nurturer, Referral Maker, Scheduler, and Teacher. When in the Communicator role, advisors talk and listen to advisees, they ask open ended questions of advisees and explore student interests, and they maintain contact through email, phone calls, and letters. The Information Provider role is one in which the advisor gives needed information to students. This information may be about university policies and procedures, careers and majors, or tasks the advisee needs to accomplish. The

Nurturer role is one in which the advisor encourages, supports, and provides a caring, positive relationship with students. The Referral Maker role involves the advisor referring students to other resources on-campus, in the community, on-line, or in printed material. In the Scheduler role, the advisor meets with students to act as a clerk for registration for classes, getting students into classes, and making four year graduation plans. In the Teacher role, the advisor attempts to provide experiences, assignments, and tasks for the advisee to complete in order to learn something. These roles seem to encompass the varied tasks done by advisors.

Reported Methods Used

Goal One: Assisting students in self-understanding and self-acceptance

Table 1
Number of Responses for Goal One by Advisor Role

Group	Communicator	Referral Maker	Information Provider	Teacher	Scheduler	Nurturer
Students	49	10	33	8	23	52
Faculty Advisors	60	6	11	2	0	15
Staff Advisors	8	3	0	4	0	1

Students. For Goal 1, students listed methods used by advisors acting in all six roles. The number of responses that could be categorized in each role is: Nurturer – 52; Communicator – 49; Information Provider – 33; Scheduler – 23; Referral Maker – 10; Teacher – 8. Students reported advisors were acting as (a) Nurturer: “was there when I needed her,” “is genuinely interested in my goals,” “shows compassion,” “reassuring me that I can do the hard classes,” “treats all students equally,” (b) Communicator: “she asked me how I felt I was doing,” “asking about your interests and passions,” “conversation,” “constant

questioning: asks how semester is going; how classes going,” (c) Information Providers: “she made a to do check list,” “making extra sheets of information,” “discussed major and other options,” “giving advice,” “guidance sheets,” (d) Scheduler: “contacted by phone,” “availability,” “looks at my checksheet,” “visits,” (e) Referral Maker: “encouraged me to talk to professors,” “getting you involved in extracurricular activities,” “telling about services to help,” (f) Teacher: “giving personal experience,” “stories of other successful students,” “offering classes and class activities,” “giving special tasks.”

One student felt strongly that this goal should not be a part of academic advising: “Self understanding and self acceptance??? I would prefer if academic advisors had NO responsibility for this.” Others (10 total responses) simply did not see the use for this goal in advising: “I’ve never had to speak with my advisor about this topic”; “my advisor did not help me in discovering self-understanding and self acceptance. We were on a strictly formal basis.”

Faculty Advisors. For Goal 1, faculty advisors listed methods from all roles except Scheduler. Like the students, the faculty believed the Communicator and Nurturer roles were of most importance for this goal; however, faculty had more Communicator responses than Nurturer responses, which is opposite from the students. As Communicators (60 responses), they said: “ask open-ended questions”; “talk about interests”; “I try to get the student talking about campus life and any problems they might have”; “ask about pressures from parents”; “listen to them and consider that they have good reasons for their actions, no matter if they seem like bad reasons to me”; “ask questions about the student’s worldview.” As Nurturers (15 responses), faculty said they use methods like “communicate respect and high regard,” “affirm a student’s feelings,” “caring attitude,” “reassurance and humor,” “honest assessment

of their strengths and weaknesses,” and “positive reinforcement.” The remaining three roles had fewer responses. In the Information Provider (11 responses), faculty said they “offer advice”; “reviewing the university bulletin with students”; “reviewing appropriate major checksheets”; “tell them what opportunities are available for people like them”; “suggested readings/books/websites, or campus talks.” In the Referral Maker role, they said: “making referrals”; “recommendation of other campus resources”; “referral to counseling center”; “refer to counseling center, if needed.” The last role with listed methods, Teacher, included these remarks: “administer and discuss Myers-Briggs,” “personal inventories.”

Faculty advisors (5 responses) also had concerns that this goal was overreaching for academic advisors: “I guess I don’t see that helping them become self-accepting is my job. I am not a psychological counselor and I take that boundary very seriously”; “I have to say I just don’t consider this part of my ‘advising’ duties; sounds more like a counseling situation”; “I was never told that this was a part of my job as an academic advisor.” Others (4 responses) simply responded that “I don’t do this.”

Staff Advisors. For Goal 1, staff advisors listed methods from the Communicator, Referral Maker, Teacher, and Nurturer roles (leaving out the Information Provider and Scheduler roles). Like faculty advisors, the staff advisors listed activities in the Communicator role most often; however, unlike students and faculty advisors who listed Nurturer role activities in one of the top spots, staff advisors ranked their role as Teacher second (4 responses), followed by Referral Maker (3 responses) and, lastly, Nurturer (only 1 response). As Communicators (8 responses), they said: “discussions with the student,” “ask the student to talk about themselves/their goals/plans/thoughts about their career,” “one-on-one advising,” “asking provocative questions.” In Teacher role (4 responses), they listed the

following: “modeling acceptance,” “providing students with a copy of their College Student Inventory results,” “ask students to reflect on their own self (development motivation).” As Referral Makers (3 responses), they said: “referrals to other areas such as counseling or wellness,” “referrals to student organizations,” “self-exploration referrals (Peer Career, helpful websites, Life & Career Planning class).”

One interesting finding was that staff advisors made no negative comments and no responses that a particular goal was not in the job description for advisors. In addition, all five staff advisors responded to all eight goals with at least two methods they used to meet the particular goal.

Goal Two: Assisting students in considering life goals by relating interests, skills, abilities, and values to careers, the world of work, and the nature and purpose of higher education

Table 2
Number of Responses for Goal Two by Advisor Role

Group	Communicator	Referral Maker	Information Provider	Teacher	Scheduler	Nurturer
Students	65	15	53	18	26	15
Faculty Advisors	65	17	18	11	0	0
Staff Advisors	7	6	1	3	0	0

Students. For Goal 2, students listed methods used by advisors acting in all six roles. In the Communicator role (65 responses), students said: “she learned that I liked to plan things out”; “asking questions”; “inquiring about goals”; “discussion”; “she asked me about my hobbies and interests, then she would relate my hobbies to what type of career I would like”; “listening”; “asking me the importance of education”; “gives opportunity to question decisions”; “discusses interests and how they relate to sociology”; “discussed future plans

with me.” The next most frequently reported role played by their advisors was the Information Provider Role (53 responses): “he can make sensible matches between interests and majors,” “many materials on course descriptions,” “discusses abilities needed for different fields,” “offering suggestions,” “looked over grad school,” “showing applications of what I learned from university education,” “gave me a list of companies to apply to for jobs post-grad,” “gave me information,” “tells us what we need to do,” “uses the undergrad bulletin to relate courses to careers.” In the Scheduler role (26 responses), advisors assisted students in many ways: “plan for my major,” “telling me specific classes to sign up for,” “flexible hours in office,” “gets me in the classes that are best for me,” “gave me a broad class schedule at first so I could find what I was good at,” “availability,” “helps choose classes based on interests.” The remaining roles had similar numbers of responses. Students said their advisors acted as (a) Teachers (18 responses): “gives examples,” “used self assessment activities to help me,” “gave me a personality test,” “surveys,” “teaches me about it in learning skills,” “she made me come prepared with a list of what I wanted to take,” (b) Referral Makers (15 responses): “suggesting speaking with the career development center,” “making sure students know all the available resources,” “peer career,” “computer stuff,” “groups I could join,” “points me to other services,” “tells me books to read about career,” (c) Nurturer (15 responses): “encourages,” “has my best interests in mind,” “listening to students,” “hopeful,” “establishing a close personal yet professional relationship with me,” “taking interest in life as a whole not just as a student.”

Students also had some negative comments to make in this area (9 responses): “She has never done this with me”; “both of my advisors neglected this aspect almost completely,

any input was extremely limited"; "wasn't able to relate to me in any way"; "never happened"; "never received any assistance in this area."

Faculty Advisors. For Goal 2, faculty advisors listed methods from the Communicator, Information Provider, Referral Maker, and Teacher roles. Like the students, the Communicator role had the most responses (65). Faculty listed: "basic listening skills," "talk about interests," "ask about major and minor," "talk to them about what part of their courses they like best," "talk to them about my own experiences that are applicable to what they are considering," "inquire about their professional goals," "we talk regularly," "conversations," "probative questioning," "informed listening," "clarification," "discuss how specific content and skills learned in courses could be potentially used in a career," "talk about what to expect." The next highest number of responses was for the Information Provider role: "suggesting alternatives," "let them know how much schooling will be required for what they want to do," "making connections," "make sure they know what opportunities are possible in the profession that allows them their preferred lifestyle," "see if students' career choices fit their abilities," "information from the literature about jobs," "emphasize how important their performance here is in helping them reach their goals."

The role of Referral Maker had a similar number of responses (17) that listed: "referrals to various on and off-campus resources," "career counseling," "matching/pairing students with faculty members with similar interests," "refer students to informative career websites," "recommending internship opportunities," "provide the name of people they should consider contacting," "referral to career center." Faculty listed methods used while in the Teacher role least often (11 responses): "researching areas of interest," "conduct skill/knowledge/abilities assessment," "having students volunteer in area of interest," "have

students write a goal prospectus of where they wish to be 10 years from now,” “use of interest inventories,” “providing clear assessment of their strengths and weaknesses and appropriate remedies.”

Only two faculty advisors had concerns about Goal 2: “I lack the time to do this adequately and our students are ill-prepared to answer related questions,” and “I have been given no formal instruction or guidelines for this as an academic advisor.”

Staff Advisors. Staff advisors listed method from all roles except Scheduler and Nurturer. Like students and faculty advisors, staff advisors also listed more methods used in the Communicator role than in any other role: Communicator – 7; Referral Maker – 6; Teacher – 3; Information Provider – 1. Staff advisors reported the following methods used when acting as Communicators: “discussions,” “lots of exploration – discussion of different majors/job possibilities,” “one-on-one advising,” “asking questions about what they like to do/want to do.” As Referral Makers, advisors used the following methods: “referrals to career related support services”; “encouraging the student to seek out the services of Peer Career, Major Advisor, Faculty”; “referrals to Peer Career”; “referring to Peer Career for corroboration and more information.” In the Teacher role, advisors listed: “ask them to do job shadows, internships, volunteer work in the area of interest”; “encourage interest through exploration through coursework and campus involvement.” The only method listed for Information Provider was “introducing them to majors they may not be aware of.”

Goal Three: Assisting students in developing an educational plan consistent with life goals and objectives

Table 3
Number of Responses for Goal Three by Advisor Role

Group	Communicator	Referral Maker	Information Provider	Teacher	Scheduler	Nurturer
Students	50	10	25	15	62	12
Faculty Advisors	47	11	24	5	17	0
<u>Staff Advisors</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>1</u>

Students. For Goal 3, students listed methods used by advisors acting in all six roles. The number of responses that could be categorized in each role includes: Scheduler – 62; Communicator – 50; Information Provider – 25; Teacher – 15; Nurturer – 12; Referral Maker – 10. Students reported advisors were acting as (a) Schedulers: “placed me in my classes I needed along with classes that benefited me in the long run,” “helped to set up my schedule to aid me in completing things,” “meets with students to analyze their goals and courses needed to obtain them,” “very good about checksheets,” “helping me work my schedule around my job,” “keeps track of intended final destination,” “going over transcripts,” “alters schedule when needed,” “filling out paperwork,” (b) Communicator: “she helped me find what I really would like and enjoy and want to be involved in later in my college career,” “listening,” “going our of her way to answer my questions,” “asking about family background,” “explaining different directions I could consider taking according to my major,” “conversations,” “asks me what I want to do,” (c) Information Provider: “his know [sic] of the majors and what interests they fulfill allow him to do this successfully,” “displays different options that exist,” “helps students understand what they must to do complete

degree," "supplying information useful in obtaining these goals," "showed me classes that are good for my career," "gave me advice," (d) Teacher: "educate," "each semester we write goals," "has me plan," "mentor assignments," "asks students to assess their values and compare that with the job they plan to pursue," (e) Nurturer: "sensitivity," "encouraged grad school," "helpful," "supportive," "understands," "cooperation," "influences person to go for best," (f) Referral Maker: "points in the right direction," "referring me if he is unsure of an answer," "self assessment test," "career planning is available on campus," "suggest other people I could speak to," "career interest website."

Three students had negative comments: "If my memory serves me correctly, I was never asked my life goals or objectives"; "gave me incorrect information on which classes to take"; "I don't know what I'm going to do; I don't even know what classes to take."

Faculty Advisors. For Goal 3, faculty advisors listed methods from all roles except Nurturer, and no negative comments were made. Unlike students, who listed more Scheduler role duties than other role duties, the faculty advisors provided the most responses for the Communicator role (47): "asking questions," "listening," "talk about goals," "talk about grad school," "conversation during required advising meetings each semester," "talking to them from my knowledge base about their subjects and related careers," "conversing with them to clarify their options," "listen in order to separate their goals from others (their parents and peers)." Faculty advisors also listed more methods that fit the Information Provider role (24 responses) more often than the Scheduler role: "talk about other options with their degree," "look at future potential of field," "consider alternatives they never previously thought possible," "working with students to understand how different programs of study will assist them in meeting those goals and objectives," "offer advice," "explaining major and other

classes,” “exploring choices.” The Scheduler role (17 responses) was the third most frequently mentioned: “rechecking of designed course plan,” “get them into the appropriate track,” “following prescribed curricula,” “develop program of study,” “develop a specific course/experiential plan,” “course planning,” “following the college and departmental checksheets,” “re-evaluate to see if recommendations are still consistent,” “help them figure out what they need to do in order to complete their degree.” Faculty advisors also function as Referral Makers (11 responses): “encourage them to investigate web cites [sic] that are active in their major area,” “encourage them to talk to someone who is presently working in their field,” “directing toward resources,” “referring them to campus career resources,” “Peer Career.” The Teacher role had the least number of responses (5) of those roles that had responses: “assessing their work,” “asking students to prepare various planning materials prior to our meetings,” “measuring stated goals against academic performance.”

Staff Advisors. For Goal 3, staff advisors listed methods from all six roles, but the order was very different from the students’ responses and the faculty advisors’ responses. While the latter groups placed Teacher and Referral Maker as the least used methods, staff advisors placed them in the top two used methods. The number of responses for each role was: Referral Maker – 4; Teacher – 3; Scheduler – 3; Information Provider – 1; Nurturer – 1. As Referral Makers, staff advisors listed these methods: “referrals to career areas for further exploration,” “encourage/sometimes require student to seek the advice of a departmental advisor,” “referring them to Peer Career for more information,” “look at all the information they have collected from Peer Career.” In the Teacher role, they listed the following: “personal exploration”; “placement test results”; “participation activities such as job shadowing, internships, campus clubs.” As Schedulers, they said: “help students prepare four

year plan,” “meet with the student regularly to develop a plan of action.” In the Communicator role, staff advisors included the following: “discussions about their goals and objectives,” “one-to-one advising.” The last two roles had only one comment for each: Information Provider – “providing information about degree requirements” and Nurturer – “getting to know the student on a deeper level than just filling in requirements on the checksheet.”

Goal Four: Assisting students in developing decision-making skills

Table 4
Number of Responses for Goal Four by Advisor Role

Group	Communicator	Referral Maker	Information Provider	Teacher	Scheduler	Nurturer
Students	25	7	30	52	0	9
Faculty Advisors	15	5	13	33	0	0
Staff Advisors	4	1	1	6	0	2

Students. For Goal 4, students listed methods used by advisors acting in all roles except Scheduler. The Teacher role had a total of 52 responses, outnumbering the next role by 22 responses. Students said advisors in the Teacher role used the following methods: “she made me come prepared with a list of what I wanted to take”; “encourages students to ask for help with problems”; “she took the time to answer any questions”; “gave us choices, ex: order we took the classes, which professors”; “made me choose what to take”; “leaves a lot of the work up to the student in deciding his/her major based on interests, but helps along the way”; “I was always allowed to follow my own initiative”; “she taught me ways that I could narrow down my choices”; “teaching”; “helping with time management”; “talked about how

we decide future"; "leadership training"; "gave me two sides for every choice"; "giving me a deadline to choose a concentration"; "did not make the decision for me."

The next most frequently listed role, Information Provider (30 responses), students said: "provided necessary information to make informed decisions." "fully explaining the available options," "she would not tell me whether courses were 'good' or 'bad' but made me choose," "give different time offerings for courses and let me pick according to my schedule," "showing alternative methods," "providing text information," "handouts," "tells me to study," "gave me advice."

The next most frequently reported role played by their advisors was the Communicator (25 responses): "provided feedback," "ask questions," "listened to my view on my choices for courses," "available," "talking," "listening," "counseling," "asked me what I thought of the information," "outspokenness," "talking about consequences." The remaining roles had far fewer methods listed. The students listed only 9 responses for the Nurturer Role: "encourages me to branch out," "encouragement to try something new even if not familiar," "encourage positive reinforcements in my choices," "she told me that choosing a career was a big and hard decision," "helpful," "nice," "very encouraging." Only 7 methods were listed for Referral Maker: "read all these handouts," "helps me find resources," "assisting in finding literature and people who also will encourage my decision," "she encouraged me to go to Peer Career," "computer stuff."

Several students commented that this goal was unnecessary: "I needed no help in this area"; "this is not relevant, as I already had solid decision-making skills before meeting my advisor"; "I do not think that I meet with my advisor enough to have him impact my decision making skills"; "I've never had to speak with my advisor on this topic." Other students said

this topic was never broached by their advisors: “never been brought about,” “haven’t discussed this,” “never had any help,” “this has never been discussed by my advisor,” “was never addressed.” Two students had negative comments: “she is not helpful in that matter,” “she’s very unhelpful.”

Faculty Advisors. For Goal 4, faculty advisors ranked the roles in similar fashion to the students. The most frequently listed methods fell under the Teacher role (33 responses): “write out plans”; “use decision matrix”; “select and evaluate plan”; “modeling the process”; “giving ‘assignments’ to explore options”; “I try not to rescue: that is, they have to come prepared and if they don’t I ask them to go away and think then come back”; “sometimes I make them go write a paragraph or a page on why they’re doing what they’re doing, so they can decide better what makes sense to them”; “require them to come to their final decisions and then personally record/submit those decisions in a formal manner (contract, course plan, etc.”); “homework” (i.e., provided tasks to do that will help them in their planning); “mock scenarios”; “analytic exercise”; “diagnostic/problem-solving strategies”; “values clarification.”

Like the students, the number of responses for the second and third place roles was close in number, but the order for the two groups was reversed for faculty when compared to students. For faculty, the second highest number of responses was for the Communicator role (15 responses), and the third highest number of responses was for the Information Provider role (13 responses). In the Communicator role, faculty listed: “discussing their options,” “talk to them about balancing their schedules in term of workload,” “discussing their decisions,” “questioning,” “reasoning,” “asking open-ended questions,” “talking with students about the qualities of a good decision.” Methods used in the Information Provider

role included: “show what needs to be done,” “help students see what they can and cannot control,” “provide information,” “insure students have relevant information for decisions,” “lay out the options.” The only other role for which faculty provided responses was the Referral Maker role (5 responses): “referrals,” “giving them references for information that would be useful,” “providing information as to where relevant material can be found,” “referral to the counseling center.”

Eight faculty responded with a variety of comments meaning “I don’t do this” or “this is not my job. I am not a therapist or life-skills counselor.”

Staff Advisors. Like students and faculty advisors, staff advisors provided the most methods used under the Teacher role (6 responses): “provide situations in which they have to make decisions,” “challenge students to look at decisions from a variety of perspectives,” “have students write pros/cons and potential outcomes of various choices,” “may use ‘role play’ to go through some decisions they have made or need to make.” Also like faculty advisors, staff advisors ranked the Communicator role in the second spot with 4 responses: “discussions about decision-making,” “discuss decisions made and consequences they experienced,” “one-to-one advising.” The remaining three roles with methods listed included (a) Nurturer (2 responses): “balancing challenges and support,” “not doing everything for them,” (b) Referral Maker (1 response): “referring to other campus resources for more information,” and (c) Information Provider (1 response): “acquainting them with printed resources so they can find information needed for decisions.”

Goal Five: Providing accurate information about institutional policies, procedures, resources, and programs

Table 5
Number of Responses for Goal Five by Advisor Role

Group	Communicator	Referral Maker	Information Provider	Teacher	Scheduler	Nurturer
Students	45	21	89	0	0	0
Faculty Advisors	11	13	93	0	0	0
<u>Staff Advisors</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>

Students. For Goal 5, students overwhelmingly listed methods used in the Information Provider role (89 responses), with twice as many responses as the next role. Students listed the following methods used by advisors in Information Provider role: “always very informed on all questions that come,” “giving me options for different field study courses and more hands on courses that pertain to me,” “department checklist,” “clearly states the requirements to graduate,” “online papers,” “provides numerous pamphlets and brochures about events and opportunities in the community as well as a bulletin board of research opportunities,” “provided information,” “giving lists of things I need to accomplish,” “gives examples,” “informs us of rules.” The next most frequent listed methods were in the Communicator role (45 responses): “emailed me,” “listen,” “discussed at orientation,” “makes phone calls,” “keeps in touch,” “meetings,” “talking with me,” “If anyone had any questions she would take time to answer them,” “discussed programs.” The only other role with methods listed by students was the Referral Maker role (21 responses): “she gave contacts for further questions”; “showed me where information could be found about institutional policies”; “she has contacted many different offices on my behalf”; “told me about the different resources

available to me through peer career, career development"; "computer stuff"; "telling about services."

For Goal 5, seven students said this topic was "never mentioned" or "rarely discussed," and four students had negative comments to make: "she doesn't help me whatsoever. I don't know why I have to go see her, or why she works there"; "my first advisor left me clueless"; "I was told I had all my designators and in fact I didn't and had to pick up a class"; "she told me this one time that I could not drop a class that I was failing and I ended up getting a bad grade in there. When I got done and failed she tried to say that I should have dropped it."

Faculty Advisors. Like the students, faculty advisors mainly listed methods used in the role of Information Provider (93 responses). The methods listed by faculty advisors as Information Providers included both providing information to the students and finding information for themselves to use as advisors. The methods for providing information to students included: "place courses required as needed," "carefully explain the core curriculum requirements," "explain the use and importance of designators," "suggest policies potentially applicable to student (e.g., grade repeat)," "explaining 'insider information' that might be confusing or unfamiliar," "remind advisees to read the Bulletin," "I keep a bulletin board for campus events," "researching for students," "help them find accurate information on ASU website," "I direct some students toward GRE study guides and tell them about grad school funding," "ensuring that student has hard copies of necessary forms," "give student handbook," "look on computer", "providing solutions to every administrative problem."

Other methods used included those advisors use to keep themselves informed: "use department advising procedures," "look on computer," "look in catalogue," "reading emails

sent through advising and departmental correspondence,” “attend advising workshops,” “read advising literature,” “I call someone who knows more than I do to answer the question,” “website research,” “consult with the dean’s office,” “familiarizing and re-familiarizing myself with those policies and procedures.”

Like the students, the number of responses for the second and third place roles was close in number, but the order for the two groups was reversed for faculty when compared to students. For faculty, the second highest number of responses was for the Referral Maker role (13 responses), and the third highest number of responses was for the Communicator role (11 responses). In the Referral Maker role, faculty listed: “directing them toward resources,” “refer students to these programs when they have specific problems,” “urge them to speak to key people in their area of interest.” In the Communicator role, faculty listed: “ask questions about use of resources”; “helping them think through options”; “we meet regularly”; “exchange email”; “conversation”; “accessibility at all times by email, phone, open door.” The remaining three roles had no methods listed by faculty advisors.

Two faculty advisors admitted that they “just don’t have the time or energy to learn all that is necessary to accomplish this in any truly adequate way” or are “not very up to date on resources and programs.” Two others believe this is not “my job to present it all to every advisee.”

Staff Advisors. Staff advisors, like the students and faculty advisors, listed methods used in the Information Provider role most frequently (9 responses): “keep up to date on AP&P [Academic Policies & Procedures committee] changes”; “keep supply of materials provided by areas to give to students as questions arise”; “I try to stay informed by keeping up with pertinent emails, flyers, announcements”; “attend training sessions”; “providing

printed information such as the General Bulletin or the General Studies Planner”; “telling them about policies that may affect their particular situation.” The next two roles are in the same order as the students ranked them, Communicator (5 responses) and Referral Maker (2 responses). The methods used for the Communicator role include “email communication at various deadline times,” “call on my colleagues,” “one-on-one advising,” “small group advising,” and the methods used for the Referral Maker role included “referrals during office visits,” “referring to appropriate places on campus.” No methods were listed for the Scheduler, Teacher, or Nurturer roles.

Goal Six: Referring students to other institutional or community support services;

Table 6
Number of Responses for Goal Six by Advisor Role

Group	Communicator	Referral Maker	Information Provider	Teacher	Scheduler	Nurturer
Students	14	51	20	0	0	0
Faculty Advisors	0	49	44	0	0	0
Staff Advisors	5	5	5	0	0	0

Students. When listing methods used by advisors for Goal 6, students only referred to three roles. The most frequent methods listed corresponded to the Referral Maker role (51 responses): “career center referred”; “told about the Study Abroad opportunities afforded me as a student”; “referring someone to the Peer Career Center”; “encouraged the study labs”; “if having trouble, encouraged tutor assistance”; “referred me to the senior graduation check department”; “referred me to ASU’s Career development center”; “discussing learning disability services”; “suggested good eating facilities on and off campus”; “tells about internship opportunities”; “tells about programs related to major in community”; “student

support services"; "job fair." Students then most frequently listed methods used by advisors in the Information Provider role (20 responses): "makes a list of questions for professors in the departments," "post resources on bulletin boards," "giving advice based on personal experience," "she assisted me in looking at minors," "lists all possibilities." The last role described by students is the Communicator role: "advising," "counseling," "office always open," "provided necessary information for courses needed," "she would tell us about when we graduate."

Fifteen students commented that this goal was "never discussed" or it "never came up." Two students had negative comments about their experiences with advising for this goal: "since she doesn't know what to tell me she sends me around campus to try to find people who can," and "my advisor could do a better job referring me to other community support services but does a good job otherwise."

Faculty Advisors. Like students, faculty advisors primarily listed methods used in the Referral Maker role (49 responses): "tell them about resources," "the counseling center if I notice emotional difficulties," "suggesting other resources during advising conversations," "email referral to specific service," "mainly career development and psychological counseling are the services that come up," "internships," "internet resources," "poorly performing students are directed to the LAP [Learning Assistance Program] office or the writing center," "identify office that can supply information." Using methods in the role of Information Provider came in a close second with faculty advisors (44 responses). The Information Provider methods listed fell into two distinct categories, giving information to students and getting information for themselves. The methods used when providing information to students included "tell them about previous student teachers they can talk to,"

“keeping students aware,” “give students ideas,” “keep a file of brochures from Student Services and others in case I need the info,” “website searches,” “pre-registration advising sessions.” In addition, faculty advisors listed methods they used to keep themselves informed of resources: “check web pages,” “looking up university and community resource guides,” “I am aware of campus services,” “I ask colleagues for information on programs I don’t know about,” “being aware of opportunities,” “read University literature,” “contact with individuals providing direct services.”

One faculty advisor conveyed frustration that he/she is not “in a position to require a ‘follow-up’ so I have not known this to be successful. When students are in denial of their problems, there is little I can do.” Another believed this was “encroaching into ‘counseling’ territory,” and one just simply said “never do this.”

Staff Advisors. Staff advisors reported using an equal number of methods for each of three roles: Communicator (5 responses), Referral Maker (5 responses), and Information Provider (5 responses). As Communicator, they listed the following methods used: “during one-on-one appointments,” “via email responding to student questions,” “occasionally making phone calls to facilitate contact.” They also use referrals: “physically take them to the service area to be seen”; “suggest to a student to use tutoring or Peer Career or Financial Aid, etc.”; “suggest that a student call a faculty member or the counseling center”; “mentioning the support every time I see them.” Staff advisors, unlike faculty advisors, focused their Information Provider methods on providing information to students rather than on how they keep themselves informed: “give them literature about the service”; “discuss the services”; “orientation information”; “providing printed information”; “telling them hours, locations, service offered.”

Goal Seven: Assisting students in evaluating or reevaluating progress toward established goals and educational plans

Table 7
Number of Responses for Goal Seven by Advisor Role

Group	Communicator	Referral Maker	Information Provider	Teacher	Scheduler	Nurturer
Students	42	0	9	0	49	8
Faculty Advisors	32	9	0	12	36	0
<u>Staff Advisors</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>0</u>

Students. For Goal 7, students listed methods used by advisors acting in four of the six roles, although two roles were used much more than the others. The number of responses that could be categorized in each role is: Scheduler – 49; Communicator – 42; Information Provider – 9; Nurturer – 8. Students reported advisors were acting primarily as Schedulers when addressing this goal: “worked hard at finding a course open for me to take,” “keeping good paperwork on students,” “reviewing old advising times,” “she used a checksheet to keep track,” “worked with student to devise plan to obtain goals,” “he was good at following up and checking on your progress,” “graduation check,” “my course plans were always checked against the major requirements,” “progress reports,” “re-evaluate academic success at every meeting,” “we have a four year plan.” Students also reported many methods used by advisors acting in the Communicator role: “listen”; “talking about goals”; “discuss academic progress”; “questions goals, intentions, etc.”; “offered input and opinions with the education goals the student set.” In addition to these roles, students reported their advisors acting as Information Providers: “lots of material on hand – course descriptions, major requirements”; “informing me of all the little things not written that I need to take care of”; “showed how

courses would help me reach my goal”; “showed different paths I could take to get to my goal.” A few methods listed also corresponded to the Nurturer role: “always encouraging and in support of my education,” “he lets me know I have the potential,” “encourages personal growth and hope for the future.”

For Goal 7, six students commented that they “never received assistance here.” Two students were dissatisfied with their advisors’ abilities to meet this goal: “she has never sat down and talked to me about my progress and about what I wanted to do with my life and college career,” and “I recently found out the major of classes I was taking had nothing to do with my major, even though she told me they were necessary, now I’m a year behind.”

Faculty Advisors. For Goal 7, faculty advisors saw themselves primarily as Schedulers (36 responses) and Communicators (32 responses), which was similar to how students saw them. As Schedulers, faculty advisors listed these methods: “go over courses taken,” “keeping their checksheets up to date,” “I map out the remaining terms and the courses needed,” “go over grades,” “reviewing student’s folder,” “look at GPA and performance,” “review requirements during every advising session,” “recommended course loads for four year plan.” As Communicators, faculty advisors used these methods: “let student talk about goals”; “ask questions (assess goals, compare to previously reported information)”; “listening”; “face-to-face meetings”; “if they aren’t doing well (grades) I ask them why and listen to what they say”; “ask about current interests each time I advise”; “continuous conversation devoted to progress and to changing plans.” In addition to these roles, faculty advisors listed methods used when acting as Teachers (12 responses) and Referral Makers (9 responses). Methods used as Teachers included “sharing other’s experience or my own if appropriate,” “have them write out their goals and objectives so that

they can articulate them to themselves better,” “homework,” “working closely with majors to build their skills.” As Referral Makers, faculty advisors listed the following methods: “leading them to places that have career information,” “make referrals,” “directing toward resources,” “reference to departmental guidelines,” “consult with colleagues,” “suggest student use the career counseling center.”

Only two faculty advisors felt this was not a valid goal for advising: “If they don’t ask, I have no way of knowing there is a problem,” and “again, limited time and energy to commit, this really has to be the student’s responsibility. I can provide a sounding board and give feedback but not much more.”

Staff Advisors. For Goal 7, staff advisors listed methods used in all roles except Nurturer. In the Communicator role (5 responses), staff advisors used: “individual meetings”; “at each individual appointment”; “frequent meets with students, particularly those in trouble”; “one-on-one advising.” The next most frequently reported role played by staff advisors was the Scheduler role (3 responses): “providing printed checksheets and/or four year plans for specific majors”; “predicting GPA or needed GPA”; “anticipating time to graduation, hours needed, etc.” The remaining roles had similar numbers of responses. Students said their advisors acted as (a) Teachers (2 responses): “responding to negative Academic Progress Reports provided by faculty,” “at times we have to do a ‘reality check’ which generally would be during a meeting,” (b) Referral Makers (1 response): “refer students to discuss goals with major academic department advisor,” and (c) Information Provider (1 response): “prerequisites and sequencing of classes.”

Goal Eight: Providing information about students to the institution, college, and/or academic departments

Table 8
Number of Responses for Goal Eight by Advisor Role

Group	Communicator	Referral Maker	Information Provider	Teacher	Scheduler	Nurturer
Students	16	15	26	0	10	0
Faculty Advisors	0	0	54	0	0	0
<u>Staff Advisors</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>

Students. Students listed methods used by advisors in four roles: Information Provider (26 responses), Communicator (16 responses), Referral Maker (15 responses), and Scheduler (10 responses). The methods used as Information Provider include: “gives brochures and pamphlets to students,” “post resources on bulletin boards,” “confirmed information on student was correct,” “always ready to answer questions,” “provided information about how to declare my minor and reaffirm my major,” “good working knowledge of the academic procedures,” “gave me information on all departments.” Students listed methods used by advisors acting as Communicators: “meetings, phone calls, and emails”; “open communication”; “talking with me”; “contact kept.” Students reported that advisors also used methods as Referral Makers: “job fair,” “refers me to the right places,” “telling us where to go,” “I have been referred to a department,” “referred me to the ASU Career Development Center,” “gave numbers of people in other departments,” “she would point us in the right direction.” As Schedulers, advisors assisted students by: “providing research opportunities,” “keeps records,” “fills out forms,” “writing recommendations with interest.”

Nine students reported that they did not believe this had happened, and two students reported negative experiences: “she isn’t helpful,” and “terrible: when I declared majors, they lost my file so that now the general advising nor the English department has it. Very unhelpful at times with this. Felt brushed off.”

Faculty Advisors. For Goal 8, faculty advisors saw themselves as Information Providers only (54 responses): “if someone requests information and it doesn’t violate someone’s privacy, I provide it”; “fill out progress reports”; “written comments in students’ files”; “I clearly mark checksheets in the student’s file”; “reports to the department chair”; “direct colleague consultation”; “complete information requested by university officials”; “sending emails to athletics advising, LAP [Learning Assistance Program], and others”; “nominate students for awards and opportunities.”

Many faculty advisors (11 responses) seemed to be concerned and confused by this question. Confusion as to the type of information to be provided and to whom it should be provided, as well as concern for privacy issues, prompted several comments: “This question isn’t clear to me”; “Is this my job? Isn’t [sic] there privacy issues at stake? Or are you talking about writing recommendations and networking. This is very unclear”; “This question is unclear. I am not sure under what circumstances it would be necessary to ‘provide’ information and to whom”; “unless release, do not provide student information beyond the departments”; “not sure what you mean here. Student information is private.”

Staff Advisors. Unlike faculty advisors, staff advisors seemed to understand the intent of the question. Their reported methods used fell under the Information Provider (7 responses) and Communicator (6 responses) roles. As Information Providers, they listed: “reports”; “share evaluation results from Orientation Advising exit surveys, and program

evaluations”; “we do provide general statistics in the form of an annual report”; “sometimes letting departments know about interested students”; “formal responses.” Methods used as Communicators included “email,” “telephone calls,” “meet with academic departments to education about students and curriculum change consequences,” “each advisor maintains a liaison relationship with several departments.”

Additional Comments

The qualitative data provided by these comments gave a richer view of what advisors were doing to specifically address each goal. In addition to the listing of methods used for each goal, the survey provided an opportunity to make additional comments about advising.

Students, faculty advisors, and staff advisors all acknowledged feeling a lack of time to accomplish the various tasks described in this survey. Some students said their advising sessions were rushed and that advisors were lacking time to do a thorough job of advising. One student wrote, “I really do most of my own class choice. I simply rely on the checksheet for my major. Advisors seem to be overworked and sometimes untrained. Much easier to just pick your own classes online.” “Both of my advisors were very nice and seem to be great professors, but my advising appointments never exceeded 10 minutes. We were simply in a rush.”

Faculty advisors, too, feel the time pinch: “Even with all the time I have spent advising, most of the session is taken up with piecing together the different sheets of core curriculum, counseling report, etc, so that the kinds of questions in this survey become secondary. If the process were more streamlined in terms of requirements and ease of seeing what has been completed, there would be more time for the above issues. I say this even though I give students all the time they need--about 1/2 hour apiece or more with problems.”

Another wrote, “advising correctly takes an enormous amount of time. It is yet another task that eats into time that should be used for class preparation and research. There must be a better way.”

Staff advisors also complained of heavy case loads and the lack of time: “Due to large case loads and time constraints, I don't feel that I have adequate time to accomplish the last two goals well. We are striving to improve these areas by seeking ways to reduce caseloads and improve communication with academic departments.” Another echoed this concern: “The large case loads of General Studies Academic Advisors usually translate into little, if any, time to work with students on developmental issues and/or career exploration. Out of necessity, the focus tends to be on academics. Thankfully, there are offices such as Peer Career and the Counseling Center that focus on other issues. Academic Advisors at Appalachian are quick to refer students to these offices when a need is perceived.”

In addition to a lack of time for advising, faculty advisors feel inadequate due to a lack of training. “Advising is a very important yet complex task. When I began advising I felt VERY poorly trained and equipped. The training sessions seemed to be for updates to long time advisors rather than new faculty. The web sites are getting better but are still difficult to get quick information to answer questions on the spot. Advising time comes at a very hectic time of the semester and so feels more like a burden than a service.” Another wrote, “These are worthy goals but a lack of time and proper training prevent me from accomplishing them.”

Students also feel that advisors are ill-equipped to do more than assist with registration: “She just guides me and keeps me on track”; “The only thing I take away from my advisor meeting is my registration code”; “My advisor was average in letting me know

how many hours I needed to graduate, but she was poor in suggesting courses, or what would fit my interests. She made me come with a list of what to take. My suggestions: make advisors have monthly meetings and update them about policy changes and required information. I need guidance in what to take, what would best suit my needs, and I did not get that because I was asked to come with a list of what to take already. I was not guided in my career path. I was merely informed of how many hours I had left"; "I don't really feel like I have gotten to know my advisor well, and I mainly just rely on her to tell me what classes to take. Other than that, she is not a big help." Even those advisors who believe themselves to be good advisors feel the effects of poor or little training: "I am sometimes amazed at the lazy approach to advising some of my departmental colleagues have, which includes being ignorant of the rules, requirements, and procedures. This is unfair to students. Some of my colleagues make little or no effort to do a good job, and then the rest of us have to undo their damage."

There was some good news. One student wrote of a positive advising relationship: "B.D. (advisor) makes a student want to learn, grow and become a positive influence both in America and globally. She encourages thinking and doing outside of our own little world." In addition, for one advisor, this survey provided time for reflection on his/her advising, : "I feel like I'm a pretty good advisor, but this survey is making me wonder if I am not.... I think the thing I do best is to show them I care."

Hypotheses Testing

The study compared the responses between groups concerning the meeting of the academic advising goals developed by NACADA. The following null hypotheses for the five

research questions were tested using univariate analysis of variance (F-ratio scores). The null hypotheses were tested at the .05 alpha level.

Research Question One

Research Question One investigated the relationship between faculty advisor perception and staff advisor perception of meeting NACADA goals for advising. The null hypothesis (H_{Oa}) stated that there would be no difference between faculty advisors and staff advisors reported perceptions of meeting NACADA academic advising goals.

As seen in Table 9, the preliminary analyses for Goals 1, 2, 5, 7, and 8 showed no significant difference between the two groups (Goal 1: $F(1, 54) = 2.622, p = .11$; Goal 2: $F(1, 54) = 1.108, p = .297$; Goal 5: $F(1, 55) = .651, p = .204$; Goal 7: $F(1, 55) = .256, p = .615$; Goal 8: $F(1, 55) = .009, p = .924$). Therefore, the null hypothesis was retained for these goals.

For the remaining goals (3, 4, and 6), preliminary analyses showed differences between faculty and staff advisors' perceptions of how well they were meeting advising s. For Goal 3, faculty advisors reported a mean of 3.68, $SD = .91$, and staff advisors reported a mean of 4.60, $SD = .54$ ($F(1, 54) = 4.846$) with a significance level of .032 which is below the required level of significance ($p < .05$). For Goal 4, faculty advisors reported a mean of 2.78, $SD = 1.09$, and staff advisors reported a mean of 3.80, $SD = .44$ ($F(1, 54) = 4.221$) with $p = .045$. For Goal 6, faculty advisors reported a mean of 3.31, $SD = 1.08$, and staff advisors reported a mean of 4.60, $SD = .54$ ($F(1, 55) = 6.760$) with $p = .012$. For these three goals, the null hypothesis was rejected.

Table 9

Analysis of Differences Between Faculty Advisors and Staff Advisors

Group	N	M	SD	F-value	p-value	eta square
Goal 1 Assisting Students in Self-Understanding and Self-Acceptance						
Faculty Advisor	50	3.40	1.06	2.622	.111	.047
Staff Advisor	5	4.20	.83			
Goal 2 – Assisting Students in Considering Life Goals						
Faculty Advisor	50	3.80	.80	1.108	.297	.020
Staff Advisor	5	4.20	.83			
Goal 3 – Assisting Students in Developing an Educational Plan						
Faculty Advisor	50	3.68	.91	4.846	.032*	.084
Staff Advisor	5	4.60	.54			
Goal 4 Assisting Students in Developing Decision Making Skills						
Faculty Advisor	50	2.78	1.09	4.221	.045*	.074
Staff Advisor	5	3.80	.44			
Goal 5 - Providing Accurate Information						
Faculty Advisor	51	4.01	.98	1.651	.204	.030
Staff Advisor	5	4.60	.54			
Goal 6 - Referring Students to Other Institutional or Community Support Services						
Faculty Advisor	51	3.31	1.08	6.76	.012*	.111
Staff Advisor	5	4.60	.54			
Goal 7 - Assisting Students in Evaluating or Reevaluating Progress Toward Goals						
Faculty Advisor	51	3.76	.97	.256	.615	.005
Staff Advisor	5	4.00	1.22			
Goal 8 - Providing Information about Students to the Institution/College/Academic Departments						
Faculty Advisor	51	3.35	1.03	.009	.924	.000
Staff Advisor	5	3.40	1.14			

* $p < .05$

Research Question Two

Research Question Two investigated the relationship between staff advisor perception and students advised by staff advisors perception of meeting NACADA goals for advising. The null hypothesis (H_{Ob}) stated that there would be no difference between staff advisors and students with staff advisors in reported perceptions of meeting NACADA academic advising goals.

As seen in Table 10, the preliminary analyses for all goals except Goal 6 showed no significant difference between the two groups (Goal 1: $F(1, 47) = 2.522, p = .11$; Goal 2: $F(1, 48) = .609, p = .439$; Goal 3: $F(1, 47) = 2.234, p = .142$; Goal 4: $F(1, 47) = .482, p = .010$; Goal 5: $F(1, 48) = 2.952, p = .092$; Goal 7: $F(1, 48) = .203, p = .654$; Goal 8: $F(1, 45) = .064, p = .802$). Therefore, the null hypothesis was retained for these goals.

For Goal 6, preliminary analysis showed a difference between staff advisors and students perceptions of how well the advisors were meeting advising goals. Staff advisors reported a mean of 4.60, $SD = .54$, and students reported a mean of 3.42, $SD = 1.03$, ($F(1, 46) = 6.066$) with a significance level of .018, which is below the required level of significance ($p < .05$). For this goal, the null hypothesis was rejected.

Table 10

Analysis of Differences Between Staff Advisors and Students with Staff Advisors

Group	N	M	SD	F-value	p-value	eta square
Goal 1 Assisting Students in Self-Understanding and Self-Acceptance						
Staff Advisors	5	4.20	.83	2.522	.119	.052
Students	43	3.58	.82			
Goal 2 – Assisting Students in Considering Life Goals						
Staff Advisors	5	4.20	.83	.609	.439	.013
Students	44	3.84	.98			
Goal 3 – Assisting Students in Developing an Educational Plan						
Staff Advisors	5	4.60	.54	2.234	.142	.046
Students	43	4.00	.87			
Goal 4 - Assisting Students in Developing Decision-making Skills						
Staff Advisors	5	3.80	.44	.482	.491	.010
Students	43	3.48	.98			
Goal 5 - Providing Accurate Information						
Staff Advisors	5	4.60	.54	2.952	.092	.059
Students	44	3.77	1.05			
Goal 6 - Referring Students to Other Institutional or Community Support Services						
Staff Advisors	5	4.60	.54	6.066	.018*	.119
Students	42	3.42	1.03			
Goal 7 - Assisting Students in Evaluating or Reevaluating Progress Toward Goals						
Staff Advisors	5	4.00	1.22	.203	.654	.004
Students	44	3.77	1.05			
Goal 8 - Providing Information about Students to the Institution/College/Academic Departments						
Staff Advisors	5	3.40	1.14	.064	.802	.001
Students	41	3.53	1.14			

* $p < .05$

Research Question Three

Research Question Three investigated the relationship between faculty advisor perception and students advised by faculty advisors perception of meeting NACADA goals for advising. The null hypothesis (H_{0c}) stated that there would be no difference between faculty advisors and students with faculty advisors reported perceptions of meeting NACADA academic advising goals.

As seen in Table 11, the preliminary analyses for Goals 1, 3, 5, 6, 7, and 8 showed no significant difference between the two groups (Goal 1: $F(1, 119) = .084, p = .772$; Goal 3: $F(1, 121) = .365, p = .547$; Goal 5: $F(1, 122) = 1.171, p = .281$; Goal 6: $F(1, 119) = 1.031, p = .312$; Goal 7: $F(1, 120) = .603, p = .439$; Goal 8: $F(1, 121) = .020, p = .888$). Therefore, the null hypothesis was retained for these goals.

For the remaining goals (2 and 4), preliminary analyses showed differences between faculty advisors and students perceptions of how well the faculty advisors were meeting advising goals. For Goal 2, faculty advisors reported a mean of 3.40, $SD = 1.13$, and students reported a mean of 3.80, $SD = .80$ ($F(1, 121) = 4.531$) with a significance level of .035, which is below the required level of significance ($p < .05$). For Goal 4, faculty advisors reported a mean of 3.19, $SD = 1.01$, and students reported a mean of 2.78, $SD = .1.09$ ($F(1, 121) = 4.613$) with $p = .034$. For these two goals, the null hypothesis was rejected.

Table 11

Analysis of Differences Between Faculty Advisors and Students with Faculty Advisors

Group	N	M	SD	F-value	p-value	eta square
Goal 1 Assisting Students in Self-Understanding and Self-Acceptance						
Faculty Advisors	50	3.40	1.06	.084	.772	.001
Students	70	3.34	1.06			
Goal 2 – Assisting Students in Considering Life Goals						
Faculty Advisors	50	3.80	.80	4.531	.035*	.036
Students	72	3.40	1.13			
Goal 3 – Assisting Students in Developing an Educational Plan						
Faculty Advisors	50	3.68	.91	.365	.547	.003
Students	72	3.56	1.04			
Goal 4 - Assisting Students in Developing Decision-making Skills						
Faculty Advisors	50	2.78	1.09	4.613	.034*	.037
Students	72	3.19	1.01			
Goal 5 - Providing Accurate Information						
Faculty Advisors	51	4.01	.98	1.171	.281	.010
Students	72	3.34	1.02			
Goal 6 - Referring Students to Other Institutional or Community Support Services						
Faculty Advisors	51	3.31	1.08	1.031	.312	.009
Students	69	3.10	1.16			
Goal 7 - Assisting Students in Evaluating or Reevaluating Progress Toward Goals						
Faculty Advisors	51	3.76	.97	.603	.439	.005
Students	70	3.61	1.10			
Goal 8 - Providing Information about Students to the Institution/College/Academic Departments						
Faculty Advisors	51	3.35	1.03	.020	.888	.000
Students	71	3.32	1.16			

*p < .05

Research Question Four

Research Question Four investigated the relationship between all advisors' perceptions and students' perceptions of meeting NACADA goals for advising. The null hypothesis (H_{0d}) stated that there would be no difference between all advisors' perceptions and students' perceptions of meeting NACADA academic advising goals.

As seen in Table 12, the preliminary analyses for all goals except Goal 4 showed no significant difference between the two groups (Goal 1: $F(1, 172) = .000, p = .991$; Goal 2: $F(1, 175) = 1.824, p = .179$; Goal 3: $F(1, 174) = .005, p = .943$; Goal 5: $F(1, 176) = 1.794, p = .182$; Goal 6: $F(1, 171) = .924, p = .338$; Goal 7: $F(1, 174) = .174, p = .678$; Goal 8: $F(1, 172) = .229, p = .633$). Therefore, the null hypothesis was retained for these goals.

Preliminary analysis for Goal 4 showed a difference between advisor and student perceptions of how well the advising goals were being met. Advisors reported a mean of 2.87, $SD = 1.08$, and students reported a mean of 3.35, $SD = 1.02$ ($F(1, 174) = 7.847$) with a significance level of .006, which is below the required level of significance ($p < .05$). For this goal, the null hypothesis was rejected.

Table 12

Analysis of Differences Between All Advisors and All Students

Group	N	M	SD	F-value	p-value	eta square
Goal 1 Assisting Students in Self-Understanding and Self-Acceptance						
Advisors	55	3.47	1.06	.000	.991	.000
Students	118	3.47	.99			
Goal 2 – Assisting Students in Considering Life Goals						
Advisors	55	3.83	.81	1.824	.179	.010
Students	121	3.61	1.10			
Goal 3 – Assisting Students in Developing an Educational Plan						
Advisors	55	3.76	.92	.005	.943	.000
Students	120	3.77	1.00			
Goal 4 - Assisting Students in Developing Decision-making Skills						
Advisors	55	2.87	1.08	7.847	.006*	.043
Students	120	3.35	1.02			
Goal 5 - Providing Accurate Information						
Advisors	56	4.07	.96	1.794	.182	.010
Students	121	3.85	1.03			
Goal 6 - Referring Students to Other Institutional or Community Support Services						
Advisors	56	3.42	1.10	.924	.338	.005
Students	116	3.25	1.15			
Goal 7 - Assisting Students in Evaluating or Reevaluating Progress Toward Goals						
Advisors	56	3.78	.98	.174	.678	.001
Students	119	3.71	1.09			
Goal 8 - Providing Information about Students to the Institution/College/Academic Departments						
Advisors	56	3.35	1.03	.229	.633	.001
Students	117	3.44	1.16			

* $p < .05$

Research Question Five

Research Question Five investigated the relationship between the perceptions of students with faculty advisors and students with staff advisors. The null hypothesis (H_{0e}) stated that there would be no difference between students with faculty advisors and students with staff advisors reported perceptions of meeting NACADA academic advising goals.

As seen in Table 13, the preliminary analyses for Goals 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8 showed no significant difference between the two groups (Goal 1: $F(1, 112) = 1.584, p = .211$; Goal 4: $F(1, 114) = 2.305, p = .132$; Goal 5: $F(1, 115) = .056, p = .814$; Goal 6: $F(1, 110) = 2.230, p = .138$; Goal 7: $F(1, 113) = .574, p = .450$; Goal 8: $F(1, 111) = .875, p = .352$). Therefore, the null hypothesis was retained for these goals.

For the remaining goals (2 and 3), preliminary analyses showed differences between perceptions of students with faculty advisors and students with staff advisors of how well their advisors were meeting advising goals. For Goal 2, students with faculty advisors reported a mean of 3.40, $SD = 1.13$, and students with staff advisors reported a mean of 3.84, $SD = .98$ ($F(1, 115) = 4.487$) with a significance level of .036, which is below the required level of significance ($p < .05$). For Goal 2, students with faculty advisors reported a mean of 3.56, $SD = 1.04$, and students with staff advisors reported a mean of 4.00, $SD = .87$ ($F(1, 114) = 5.413$) with $p = .025$. For these two goals, the null hypothesis was rejected.

Table 13

Analysis of Differences Between Students with Faculty Advisors and Students with Staff Advisors

Group	N	M	SD	F-value	p-value	eta square
Goal 1 Assisting Students in Self-Understanding and Self-Acceptance						
Faculty Advisor	70	3.34	1.06	1.584	.211	.014
Staff Advisor	43	3.58	.82			
Goal 2 – Assisting Students in Considering Life Goals						
Faculty Advisor	72	3.40	1.13	4.487	.036*	.038
Staff Advisor	44	3.84	.98			
Goal 3 – Assisting Students in Developing an Educational Plan						
Faculty Advisor	72	3.56	1.04	5.143	.025*	.044
Staff Advisor	43	4.00	.87			
Goal 4 - Assisting Students in Developing Decision-making Skills						
Faculty Advisor	72	3.19	1.01	2.305	.132	.020
Staff Advisor	43	3.48	.98			
Goal 5 - Providing Accurate Information						
Faculty Advisor	72	3.81	1.02	.056	.814	.000
Staff Advisor	44	3.77	1.05			
Goal 6 - Referring Students to Other Institutional or Community Support Services						
Faculty Advisor	69	3.10	1.16	2.23	.138	.020
Staff Advisor	42	3.42	1.03			
Goal 7 - Assisting Students in Evaluating or Reevaluating Progress Toward Goals						
Faculty Advisor	70	3.61	1.10	.574	.450	.005
Staff Advisor	44	3.77	1.05			
Goal 8 - Providing Information about Students to the Institution/College/Academic Departments						
Faculty Advisor	71	3.32	1.16	.875	.352	.008
Staff Advisor	41	3.53	1.14			

*p < .05

Summary of the Findings

This ex post facto study investigated the self-reported perceptions of faculty and staff advisors as to how well they are meeting the NACADA goals for advising. The study also investigated the relationship between student, staff academic advisor, and faculty advisor perceptions of meeting these goals. Both quantitative and qualitative data were gathered with a survey of students, faculty advisors, and staff advisors.

Content analysis was used to analyze the qualitative data. The researcher first grouped all responses together by participant groups (i.e., students, staff advisors, and faculty advisors). For each goal, the researcher listed all reported methods used. The researcher noticed several themes of advisor roles in the data and developed the following six roles used by advisors when advising students: Communicator, Referral Maker, Information Provider, Teacher, Scheduler, and Nurturer. Each method listed by a survey respondent was then placed into one of the six broad advisor roles. The number of responses reported by students, faculty advisors, and staff advisors that fit each role was presented in tables.

Chapter 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to investigate the self-reported perceptions of faculty and staff advisors as to how well they are meeting the NACADA goals for advising and to investigate the relationship between student, staff academic advisor, and faculty advisor perceptions of meeting NACADA goals for academic advising. Data were collected from staff advisors, faculty advisors, and students at a comprehensive state university. The degree of satisfaction was measured by a survey developed by the researcher. This chapter provides an overview of the study, key findings, implications for practice, and recommendations for further research.

Overview of the Study, Limitations, and Hypotheses Testing

Overview of the Study

This ex post facto study investigated the self-reported perceptions of faculty and staff advisors as to how well they are meeting the NACADA goals for advising. The study also investigated the relationship between student, staff academic advisor, and faculty advisor perceptions of meeting these goals. Both quantitative and qualitative data were gathered with a survey of students, faculty advisors, and staff advisors. Five research questions were posed.

Limitations of the Study

As listed in a previous chapter, there are some limitations to this study. The findings are applicable only to the staff and faculty advisors at Appalachian State University. The perceptions of meeting the advising goals are open to participants' subjectivity. Students, faculty advisors, and staff advisors have different experiences in their advising sessions

based upon the status of their positions and their stage of development. The differences affect the perceptions of the participants.

The instrument used is a researcher-developed instrument. While it is similar in structure to the ACT national surveys, it does have the additional task of having respondents list three methods used by advisors to meet each goal. While there are no data on the reliability or validity of the ACT national survey, it has been used six times with similar results. Based on the similarity of the instrument in this study to the ACT survey, the study instrument is assumed to be a reliable measure.

The major limitation of the study is the low number of participants. The number of staff advisors selected to be a part of this study was significantly lower than the number of faculty advisors or students due to their overall limited numbers on this particular campus. In addition, the low response rate for the student groups is of concern. A total of 5,549 students received five separate requests to participate in the study; however, only 122 actually returned completed surveys, which was a return rate of only 2.1%. This response rate is very low and may affect the findings discussed in this chapter.

Gall, Borg, and Gall (1996) acknowledge that due to informed consent rules, some of those who are targeted for participation in a study may choose not to participate, therefore, those who do participate become “volunteers.” According to Rosenthal and Rosnow (1975), volunteer subjects may be different from the target population. Volunteers tend to be female, to have a greater need for social approval, and to be more sociable. These factors may have an impact on these research findings, in that those who have a greater need for social approval may rate their advisors higher than those who do not. In addition, people who are

more sociable may have more interactions with their advisors and those interactions may have been of a higher quality if these subjects are more sociable.

Hypotheses Testing

The data gathered from the surveys included Likert scale items and written responses for the methods used. Descriptive statistics and frequency distributions were used to analyze the data. In addition, the nominal data were treated as interval data, as was the data from the ACT Sixth National Study (Habley, 2004), in order to make comparisons of the findings in this study to the national data. The significance level was set at .05 ($p < .05$). Univariate analysis of variance (F) was used to test the relationship between groups.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

Research Question One

Is there a significant difference between faculty advisor perception and staff perception of meeting NACADA goals for advising?

H_{Oa} : There will be no difference between faculty advisors and staff advisors reported perceptions of meeting NACADA academic advising goals.

Research question one investigated the differences between the perceptions of faculty advisors and staff advisors regarding their ability to meet the NACADA goals for advising. The analyses for Goals 1, 2, 5, 7, and 8 showed no significant difference between the two groups at the $p < .05$ level. Therefore, the null hypothesis was retained for these goals.

For the remaining goals (3, 4, and 6), however, analyses showed differences between faculty and staff advisors. For all these goals, staff advisors rated themselves higher than faculty advisors rated themselves. For these three goals, the null hypothesis was rejected.

Research Question Two

Is there a significant difference between staff advisor perception and students with staff advisors perception of meeting NACADA goals for advising?

H_{Ob} : There will be no difference between staff advisors and students with staff advisors reported perceptions of meeting NACADA academic advising goals.

Research question two investigated the differences between the perceptions of staff advisors and students with staff advisors regarding the advisors' ability to meet the NACADA goals for advising. The analyses for all goals except Goal 6 showed no significant difference between the two groups; therefore, the null hypothesis was retained for these goals. For Goal 6, analysis showed a difference between staff advisors and students with staff advisors perceptions of how well advisors are referring students to resources, with staff advisors rating themselves higher than the students rated them. For this goal, the null hypothesis was rejected.

Research Question Three

Is there a significant difference between faculty advisor perception and students with faculty advisors perception of meeting NACADA goals for advising?

H_{Oc} : There will be no difference between faculty advisors and students with faculty advisors reported perceptions of meeting NACADA academic advising goals.

Research question three investigated the differences between the perceptions of faculty advisors and of students with faculty advisors regarding the advisors' ability to meet the NACADA goals for advising. The preliminary analyses for Goals 1, 3, 5, 6, 7, and 8 showed no significant difference between the two groups; therefore, the null hypothesis was retained for these goals. For the remaining goals (2 and 4), analyses showed differences between

faculty advisors and students perceptions. For Goal 2, assisting students with life goals, faculty rated themselves higher than students rated them. Conversely, for Goal 4, assisting students with decision making, students rated the faculty advisors higher than the faculty advisors rated themselves. For these two goals, the null hypothesis was rejected.

Research Question Four

Is there a significant difference between all advisor perceptions and student perceptions of meeting NACADA goals for advising?

H_{0d} : There will be no difference between all advisor perceptions and student perceptions of meeting NACADA academic advising goals.

Research question four investigated the differences between the perceptions of all advisors and of students regarding the advisors ability to meet the NACADA goals for advising. The analyses for all goals except Goal 4 showed no significant difference between the two groups; therefore, the null hypothesis was retained for these goals. Analysis for Goal 4, assisting students with decision making skills, showed that students rated advisors higher than advisors rated themselves. For this goal, the null hypothesis was rejected.

Research Question Five

Is there a significant difference between students with faculty advisors perceptions and students with staff advisors perceptions of meeting NACADA goals for advising?

H_{0e} : There will be no difference between students with faculty advisors perceptions and students with staff advisors perceptions of meeting NACADA goals for advising.

Research question five investigated the differences between the perceptions of students with faculty advisors and of students with staff advisors regarding the advisors' ability to meet the NACADA goals for advising. The analyses for Goals 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8

showed no significant difference between the two groups; therefore, the null hypothesis was retained for these goals. For the remaining goals (2 and 3), students with staff advisors rated their advisors higher than students with faculty advisors rated their advisors. So for these two goals, the null hypothesis was rejected.

Advisor Roles

As part of the survey, respondents were asked to provide three methods used to meet each goal. Content analysis was used to analyze the data collected. Content analyses “involve collecting data on various aspects of the messages encoded in the communication product” (Gall, Borg, & Gall, 1996, p. 357) and “coding of the document’s messages into categories” (Gall, Borg, & Gall, p. 359). After coding the data into these categories, analysis can be done by counting the frequencies of the occurrences for each category.

The researcher first grouped all responses together by participant groups (i.e., students, staff advisors, and faculty advisors). For each goal, the researcher listed all reported methods used. After reviewing these lists, the researcher noticed several themes of advisor roles in the data. The roles were similar to those developed by Winston and Sandor (2002) in their Academic Advising Inventory. Winston and Sandor named five scales that described activities performed by advisors: (1) Personal Development and Interpersonal Relationships; (2) Exploring Institutional Policies; (3) Registration and Class Scheduling; (4) Teaching Personal Skills; and (5) Academic Courses and Majors. The researcher in this study developed the following six roles: Communicator, Referral Maker, Information Provider, Teacher, Scheduler, and Nurturer. Each method listed by a survey respondent was placed into one of the six broad advisor roles, and the total number of responses per role was reported. A description of these advisor roles can be found in chapter four.

Advisor Roles for Each Goal

Goal One: Assisting students in self-understanding and self acceptance

It became clear that all groups believed communication is necessary between advisor and student when working toward personal goals. All three groups (students, staff advisors, and faculty advisors) placed Communicator within the top two roles for this goal. Both staff and faculty advisors ranked Communicator as their number one role, while students placed it second. The Nurturer role was most important to students, who reported that their advisors cared about how they were doing in class and on campus and were genuinely interested in them. Faculty also believed the Nurturer role was important, ranking it as second most important. Staff advisors, however, ranked the Nurturer role fourth (with two additional roles getting 0 responses). Staff advisors ranked the Teacher role in second place, unlike both faculty advisors and students who ranked the Teacher role in last place. Staff advisors seem to see their job to be less about nurturing students and more about teaching them by modeling and communicating.

A few faculty and students commented that they did not believe academic advising should include this goal. The comments seemed to point to a distinction these participants were making between academic advising and counseling, seeing academic advising as less personal: “we [my advisor and I] were on a strictly formal basis,” and “I guess I don’t see that helping them become self-accepting is my job. I am not a psychological counselor and I take that boundary very seriously.” This differentiation between advising and counseling was also found by Eddy and Essrum (1989) who reported in their study that students and faculty advisors believed personal counseling should not be a part of advising.

Goal Two: Assisting students in considering life goals by relating interests, skills, abilities, and values to careers, the world of work, and the nature and purpose of higher education

Responses to Goal 2 showed that all three groups believed the Communicator role to be the most important one. Many participants from all groups listed methods such as asking questions, listening, and discussing as the primary methods used to meet this goal. Students and faculty advisors reported the Information Provider role to be in the second most often used role. It appeared students tend to rely on advisors for information about majors, careers, and skills needed for those specific careers. Faculty advisors seemed ready to provide this type of information to their advisees, whereas, staff advisors reported they were more likely to act in the Referral Maker role, which they ranked in a close second to the Communicator role. They showed a strong reliance on other campus programs that are especially trained to provide career counseling and interest, skills, and abilities assessment to students. This difference may be that faculty advisors are dealing with students who have already declared their majors (within the faculty advisors' disciplines), and, therefore, they feel more comfortable providing information relative to their fields. Staff advisors, on the other hand, deal more with students who are undecided, who need more information about many fields which can best be provided by special resource offices.

Goal Three: Assisting students in developing an educational plan

consistent with life goals and objectives

Goal 3 showed varied responses from the three groups of participants. While students and faculty advisors ranked Communicator, Scheduler, and Information Provider in one of the first three most frequently used roles, staff advisors ranked Referral Maker, Teacher, and Scheduler in their top three. Students ranked the Scheduler role as being used most often,

faculty advisors ranked the Communicator role as being used most often, and staff advisors ranked the Referral Maker role as being used most often. Even in the second and third ranking roles, the groups varied in their rankings: students listed Communicator and Information Provider; faculty advisors listed Information Provider and Scheduler; and staff advisors listed Teacher and Scheduler. In developing an educational plan, faculty advisors reported they provide information and communicate with students about requirements, and students reported they communicate with advisors who assist them with scheduling. Similar to their reported methods used for Goal 2, staff advisors were more likely to refer students to other resources for assistance. This may be for similar reasons, that is, not being as familiar with the hundreds of majors and careers from which their students may choose.

Goal Four: Assisting students in developing decision-making skills

For Goal 4, all three participant groups ranked the Teacher role in the first spot. The Communicator role came in second spot for both types of advisors and in third spot for students, just below the Information Provider role. The methods listed seemed to indicate that advisors expected students to take an active role in learning these skills. Students said their advisors “made me come prepared with a list of what I wanted to take” and “leaves a lot of work up to the student.” Advisors also listed “homework” as an important part of meeting this goal: “giving ‘assignments’ to explore options,” “make them go write a paragraph or a page on why they’re doing what they’re doing,” “have students write pros/cons and potential outcomes of various choices.” In addition to assigning tasks for students to complete, advisors reported using communication skills (questioning, talking, listening) to assist students in developing these skills.

Some faculty responded with a variety of comments with the theme of “I don’t do this,” or “this is not my job. I am not a life-skills counselor.” Some students also believed this was not a necessary part of academic advising: “I needed no help in this area,” and “I do not think that I meet with my advisor enough to have him impact my decision making skills.”

*Goal Five: Providing accurate information about
institutional policies, procedures, resources, and programs*

For Goal 5, all three groups of participants reported only using the Information Provider, Communicator, and Referral Maker roles. As the goal is to provide accurate information, the Information Provider role was ranked in the first spot by all three groups by a wide margin over the second placed roles. Each advisor group listed methods they used to both provide information to students and to find information for themselves to ensure the information they provided was accurate.

Some faculty advisors appeared overwhelmed with the idea that they should be a resource for all the policies, procedures, and other resources on campus, reporting they “just don’t have the time or energy to learn all that is necessary to accomplish this in any truly adequate way.” Students also reported this lack of knowledge on the part of their advisors: “she doesn’t help me whatsoever,” “my first advisor left me clueless,” and “I was told I had all my designators and in fact I didn’t and had to pick up a class.”

Goal Six: Referring students to other institutional or community support services

For Goal 6, the only roles that were reportedly used were the Information Provider, Communicator, and Referral Maker roles. The staff advisors reported using each role equally, while the faculty advisors and students both listed the Referral Maker role first and

the Information Provider second. Students ranked the Communicator role third, while faculty advisors didn't list any methods they used as communicators.

A few students reported that this "never came up" in their advising sessions; two had negative comments to make about being given incorrect information, and one felt that her advisor "doesn't know what to tell me [so] she sends me around campus to try to find people who can."

Goal Seven: Assisting students in evaluating or reevaluating

progress toward established goals and educational plan

It became clear that all believed the Communicator and Scheduler roles were most important when evaluating or reevaluating education goals and plans. All three groups ranked both of these roles within the top two roles for this goal. Both students and faculty advisors ranked Scheduler as number one role, while staff advisors placed it second. The Teacher role was listed third, and the Referral Maker role was listed fourth for both types of advisors. However, students did not provide any methods their advisors used that would fall into the Teacher or Referral Maker categories. Students listed methods used by their advisors acting in the Information Provider and Nurturer roles. There seems to be a disconnect between what advisors are doing and what students perceive they are doing when working to meet this goal.

Goal Eight: Providing information about students to the

institution, college, and/or academic departments

All three groups ranked the Information Provider role in first place. Faculty advisors did not list methods used in any other role, and staff advisors listed additional methods listed

only in the Communicator role. Students also reported that their advisors worked as Communicators, but also reported some Referral Maker role behaviors.

Some faculty advisors were concerned and confused by this question. Confusion as to the type of information to be provided and to whom it should be provided, as well as concern for privacy issues, prompted several comments such as: "Is this my job? Isn't [sic] there privacy issues at stake? Or are you talking about writing recommendations and networking. This is very unclear."

Key Findings and Conclusions

The purpose of this study was to investigate the self-reported perceptions of faculty and staff advisors as to how well they are meeting the NACADA goals for advising. In addition, the study looked at the relationship between student, staff advisor, and faculty advisor perceptions of meeting NACADA goals for advising. The data indicated that overall, faculty advisors and staff advisors believe they are meeting the goals fairly well.

The NACADA goals for academic advising have been in place since 1980. The research on these goals has been limited to the ACT national academic advising studies in which one person from each institution was asked to evaluate the entire institution's program of academic advising. This study seems to affirm the findings from Crockett and Levitz (1983), Habley (1993, 2004), Habley and Crockett (1988), and Habley and Morales (1998) who found that the goals developed by NACADA were being met.

In this study staff advisors rated themselves higher on all eight goals than faculty advisors rated themselves (Research Question 1). All faculty advisor ratings fell between 2.78 and 4.01 on a Likert scale of 1-5. Four of the ten ratings fell above 3.50 with the highest score (4.01) being given for Goal 5, providing accurate information, just as in the latest

national ACT survey (Habley, 2004). Staff advisor ratings fell between 3.40 and 4.60 on a Likert scale of 1 to 5. The lowest rating (3.40) was for Goal 8, providing information about students to the institution, and the highest rating (4.60) was given to three goals: Goal 3, assisting students in developing an educational plan; Goal 5, providing accurate information; and Goal 6, referring students to other institutional or community support services. That Goal 5 (providing accurate information) was rated highest by both faculty and staff advisors is interesting in that it is the only goal in which the mean student rating (3.77) was lower than both mean advisor group ratings (faculty – 4.01; staff – 4.60). This paradox may be because any incorrect information given to students may have consequences on their progress toward graduation, and thus, is remembered more easily by students than by advisors.

The issues regarding time constraints and other responsibilities may explain part of the difference between these groups. While both advisor groups mentioned a lack of time to spend with individual advisees, faculty advisors are pulled in more directions (i.e., teaching, research, service) than staff advisors whose primary responsibility is advising. Therefore, faculty advisors may feel they do not meet the goals to the extent that they might if advising was their primary mission. One faculty advisor wrote, “Advising correctly takes an enormous amount of time. It is yet another task that eats into time that should be used for class preparation and research. There must be a better way.”

Training and background may also be a part of the explanation for the difference between staff advisors and faculty advisors self perceptions. Staff advisors at Appalachian State University have master’s degrees in student development, counseling, psychology, or another closely related field. Their educational preparation has included information about student development, thus developmental advising is less of an alien concept for them than it

may be for faculty members whose higher education has focused on a particular academic discipline and probably did not include any student development theory. Golde and Dore (2001) found that only 26.8% of doctoral students felt they had been prepared by their doctoral program to advise undergraduate students.

Staff advisors rated themselves higher on seven of the goals than students who had staff advisors rated their advisors (Research Question 2). The only goal for which students rated their advisors higher than the advisors rated themselves was Goal 8, providing information about students to the institution. This goal was probably rated lower by staff advisors who must follow the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act law regarding the release of student information. Advisors would recognize the limitations of sharing information and, therefore, rate themselves lower on this goal.

The trend to rate themselves higher than students rated them was also seen in the faculty advisors' ratings (Research Question 3). Faculty rated themselves higher on seven of the goals. The only goal for which students rated their faculty advisors higher than the advisors rated themselves was Goal 4, assisting students in developing decision-making skills. For faculty advisors, this goal had the lowest mean score (2.78). In addition, faculty members wrote more negative responses for Goal 4 than for any other goal (e.g., "this is not my job. I am not a therapist or life-skills counselor"). In the latest national survey, Habley (2004) also reported the lowest score was for Goal 4 (3.27). Some of the comments written by students showed that they believed they did not need assistance in this area: "I needed no help in this area" and "this is not relevant, as I already had solid decision-making skills before meeting my advisor." It may be that advisors are picking up on this student belief that assistance with decision-making is not needed and, therefore, are not including it in their

advising. Another explanation may be the lack of understanding by faculty advisors of student development theory. Developmental theory explains that, while 18-22 year olds look like adults, they may still be dealing with developmental issues of youth. Erikson's theory (1968) describes people this age as in the identity versus identity confusion stage, in which the individual is still trying to find the true self. Chickering and Reisser (1993) describe the vectors of developing competence and moving through autonomy toward interdependence. If these theories hold true, students do need help with skills like decision-making.

When looking at all advisors compared to all students (Research Question 4), advisors again rated themselves higher on five of the eight goals. Students rated their advisors higher than the advisors rated themselves on three goals: Goal 3, assisting students in developing an educational plan; Goal 4, assisting students in developing decision-making skills; and Goal 8, providing information about students to the institution. That advisors in this study repeatedly rated themselves higher than students rated them was not surprising. Other researchers (Kramer, Arrington, and Chynoweth, 1985; Saving and Keim, 1998; Stickle, 1982; and Wood and Wood, 1989) also found that advisors rated themselves as better advisors than students rated them.

When comparing student groups, the data showed that overall students with staff advisors were more satisfied with their advisors than were students with faculty advisors (Research Question 5). Other researchers have also reported this finding (Belcheir, 1999). Students with faculty advisors rated their advisors higher than students with staff advisors rated their advisors for only one goal, Goal 5, providing accurate information. The staff advisors were rated higher by their students in meeting all other goals. These lower ratings for faculty advisors may be a reflection of the problems with lack of time and training in

policies and procedures that faculty advisors pointed out. Additionally, since faculty members, for the most part, are not educated in student development theory, they may not fully recognize the need for the developmental advising tasks. That the one truly prescriptive advising goal was rated higher for faculty advisors than for staff advisors may indicate faculty advisors' willingness to learn and provide the information needed for registration-type issues, leaving the more developmental issues out of their advising.

One interesting finding was that staff advisors made no negative comments about any goal and made no responses that a particular goal was not in the job description for advisors. In addition, all five staff advisors responded to all eight goals with at least two methods they used to meet the particular goal. Faculty advisors, on the other hand, reported that some of the goals should not be required of academic advisors, and quite a few faculty advisors said they "never do this" or left the methods section blank for one or more goals. This difference is probably due to the difference in training and backgrounds mentioned earlier in this chapter. A lack of training for faculty advisors is evident when reviewing the developmental goals for advising.

Implications for Practice

O'Banion (1972) and Crookston (1972) broadened the tasks and the outlook of academic advising. These authors' now classic articles encouraged academic advising to move beyond the prescriptive, advice-giving advising model towards a more developmental model. O'Banion's definition of advising was that advising is "a process in which advisor and advisee enter a dynamic relationship respectful of the student's concerns. Ideally, the advisor serves as teacher and guide in an interactive partnership aimed at enhancing the student's self-awareness and fulfillment" (p. 63). Crookston went further in his definition and

model, defining advising as a developmental process, more a function of teaching than of clerical registration. He saw advising as “concerned not only with a specific personal or vocational decision but also with facilitating the student’s rational processes, environmental and interpersonal interactions, behavior awareness, and problem solving, decision making, and evaluation skills” (Crookston, p. 12). In developmental advising “the advisor and the student differentially engage in a series of developmental tasks, the successful completion of which results in varying degrees of learning by both parties” (Crookston, p. 13).

The goals developed by NACADA provide a developmental focus for academic advising. Advising is not simply the “activity provided by colleges and universities to help their students identify and develop suitable programs of study,” (Goetz, 1996, p. 88). According to Grites (1979) advising should assist students in realizing the “maximum educational benefits available to them by helping them to better understand themselves and to learn to use the resources of an educational institution to meet their special needs and aspirations,” (p. 1). This focus on developmental advising seems to be the goal in theory, but this study showed that in practice, advisors reported their highest scores in areas of the prescriptive duties of advising such as Goal 5, providing accurate information; Goal 3, assisting students in developing an educational plan; and Goal 7, assisting students in evaluating or reevaluating progress towards goals. Faculty advisor comments tended to show that they did not have the time or interest in providing a broad range of advising that would be considered developmental in nature.

Staff advisors reported higher scores overall than did the faculty advisors. While the developmental tasks did receive some lower scores than the prescriptive tasks, six of the eight goals were ranked above the 4.0 level. As all staff advisors reported at least two

methods they used to meet each goal, overall this may indicate a wider range of methods to use to address each goal during advising than do the faculty members.

Student reports were similar to faculty reports. The more developmental tasks of Goals 1, 2, and 4 were given lower scores than the more prescriptive tasks of Goals 5 and 7. While all student means fell above the 3.0 level, none was higher than 3.61. In other words, on the 1-5 Likert scale instrument, students rated their advisors as being closer to the Adequate rating than the Well rating when reporting how well their advisors were able to meet each goal.

One implication of this study is that advisor training in awareness of the developmental goals for advising is necessary for advisors, especially faculty advisors. Staff advisors appear to be more open to providing a variety of advising tasks. Several faculty members questioned their responsibility for meeting the more developmental goals of assisting students with Goal 1, self-understanding and self-acceptance, and Goal 4, decision making skills. This replicates the five ACT national surveys of academic advising, in which the lowest scores reported were for Goals 1 and 4. Crockett and Levitz (1983) found that 75% of institutions provided no training for advisors. This has only slightly improved over the last 20 years: Habley (2004) found that 52% of all institutions still do not mandate or offer training for advisors.

Assessment of advising performance and a reward structure may be one way to increase faculty willingness to provide more comprehensive advising. According to Habley (2004), only 38% of all institutions evaluate faculty advisors in all departments, and more than half (51%) have no recognition, reward, or compensation for faculty advisors. Providing

training, requiring evaluation, and rewarding good advising may be a necessary step to improve advising at all institutions.

Recommendations for Further Research

Due to the academic advising organizational structure at Appalachian State University, the pool of staff advisors was small. Therefore, it is recommended that a study be conducted with a larger sample of staff advisors. This would provide more data to use when comparing them to faculty advisors which may lead to different results.

Qualitative studies should be conducted to ascertain what activities are actually being done during advising sessions. McGillen (2000) also recommended further research be done based on observation of what happens during advising sessions. This would provide a richer picture of what it is that academic advisors actually do and how students respond to the activities and the advising relationship. This could contribute to the information needed by those who are working to develop a definition of advising.

Additional research at a variety of institutions (e.g., community colleges, technical schools, private institutions) could provide information about how advising is done in other environments. Most of the research found by this researcher (and reported in chapter 2) was done at four-year public institutions. Information from two-year and private institutions must be included to have a better view of what is happening during advising and how it is affecting students. This information could also assist those who are working to develop a definition of advising that would fit a variety of institutions.

As noted in several studies (Dillon & Fisher, 2000; Habley, 2004; Kelly, 1995; Templeton, Skaggs, & Johnson, 2002), faculty advisors report little training in advising though the majority of faculty are required to advise (Habley). Additional research is needed

to assess the impact of comprehensive training, evaluation, and compensation on faculty advising.

Summary

Academic advising has been acknowledged as “central to achieving the fundamental goals of higher education” (NACADA, 2004d, para. 1). Studies have shown that involvement with faculty and other students in the university community is one of the vital components of students’ retention, satisfaction, and success in higher education (Astin, 1993; Gordon, Habley, & Associates, 2000; Light, 2001a; Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991). Academic advising is the “only structured activity on the campus in which all students have the opportunity for one-to-one interaction with a concerned representative of the institution” (Nutt, n.d., para. 2), whether a faculty advisor or a staff advisor.

This study investigated the self-reported perceptions of faculty and staff advisors as to how well they are meeting the NACADA goals for advising and the relationship between student, staff academic advisor, and faculty advisor perceptions of meeting the NACADA goals for academic advising. Overall, students seemed to be satisfied with both faculty and staff advisors’ ability to meet the goals, and both groups of advisors reported they believe they are meeting the goals adequately to well. Further qualitative research into what occurs during advising would provide a richer view of how the goals were being addressed during advising sessions.

REFERENCES

- Aiken, L. R. (1998). *Human development in adulthood*. New York: Plenum.
- Alexitch, L. R. (1997). Students' educational orientation and preferences for advising from university professors. *Journal of College Student Development*, 38(4), 333-343.
- Appalachian State University. (2005a). *Enrollment by age: Fall 2001-2005*. Retrieved November 11, 2005, from http://www.appstate.edu/www_docs/depart/irp/factbook/factbook0506/S16EnrollbyAge.pdf
- Appalachian State University. (2005b). *IPEDS enrollment statistics: Fall 2005*. Retrieved November 9, 2005, from http://www.appstate.edu/www_docs/depart/irp/enrollment/ipeds/ipeds05.pdf
- Appalachian State University. (2005c). *Retention of full-time entering freshmen: Fall 1986-2003*. Retrieved November 8, 2006, from http://www.appstate.edu/www_docs/depart/irp/factbook/factbook0405/S21RetentionFTF.pdf
- Appalachian State University. (2005d). *Undergraduate Bulletin 2005-2007*. Boone, NC: Author.
- Astin, A. W. (1984). Student involvement: A developmental theory for higher education. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 25, 297-308.
- Astin, A. W. (1993). *What matters in college? Four critical years revisited*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Astin, A. W., Korn, W., & Green, K. (1987). Retaining and satisfying students. *Educational Record*, 68(1), 36-42.
- Basic readings in U.S. democracy: The Morrill Act (1862). (n.d.). Retrieved December 20, 2004, from <http://usinfo.state.gov/usa/infousa/facts/democrac/27.htm>

- Becker, B. A. (2000). Legal issues in academic advising. In V. N. Gordon, W. R. Habley, & Associates (Eds.), *Academic advising: A comprehensive handbook* (pp. 58-70). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Belcheir, M. J. (1999, May-June). *Student satisfaction and academic advising*. Paper presented at the 39th Annual Forum of the Association of Institutional Research, Seattle, WA.
- Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (1997). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bossenmaier, M. M. (1978). Faculty perceptions of academic advising. *Nursing Outlook*, 26(3), 191-194.
- Boyle, J. R. (2002). Student impressions of academic advisor efficacy: A comparison of two models. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 63(11A), 3797. (UMI No. 3070122)
- Brannen, J. (2004). Working qualitatively and quantitatively. In C. Seale, G. Gobo, J. F. Gubrium, & D. Silverman (Eds.), *Qualitative research practice* (pp. 312-326). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Broadbridge, A. (1996). Academic advising—traditional or developmental approaches: Student perspectives [Electronic version]. *British Journal of Guidance and Counselling*, 24(1), 97-112.
- Broido, E. M. (2000). Constructing identity: The nature and meaning of lesbian, gay, and bisexual identities. In R. M. Perez, K. A. DeBord, & K. J. Bieschke (Eds.), *Handbook of counseling and psychotherapy with lesbian, gay, and bisexual clients* (pp. 13-33). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

- Carstensen, D. J., & Silberhorn, C. (1979). *A national survey of academic advising*. Iowa City, IA: American College Testing Program.
- Cass, V. C. (1979). Homosexual identity formation: A theoretical model. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 4, 219-235.
- Chickering, A. W., & Reisser, L. (1993). *Education and identity* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Cohen, A. M., & Brawer, F. B. (2003). *The American community college*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Committee of the Corporation and the Academical Faculty. (1828). *Reports of the course of instruction in Yale College* [Electronic version]. New Haven, CT: Yale University.
Retrieved December 21, 2004, from <http://www.yale.edu/yale300/>
collectiblesandpublications
- Cook, S. (1999, May 28). A chronology of academic advising in America. *Mentor*, 1(2).
Retrieved May, 24, 2004, from <http://www.psu.edu/dus/mentor/990528sc.htm>
- Creamer, D. G. (2000). Use of theory in academic advising. In V. N. Gordon, W. R. Habley, & Associates (Eds.), *Academic advising: A comprehensive handbook* (pp. 19-34). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Creamer, D. G., & Creamer, E. G. (1994). Practicing developmental advising: Theoretical contexts and functional applications. *NACADA Journal*, 14(2), 17-24.
- Crockett, D. S., & Levitz, R. (1983). *A national survey of academic advising: A final report*. Iowa City, IA: American College Testing Program.
- Crookston, B. B. (1972). A developmental view of academic advising as teaching. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 13, 12-17.

- Deaux, K. (1993). Reconstructing social identity. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 19*, 4-12.
- Denham, T. J. (2002). *A historical review of curriculum in American higher education: 1626-1900*. Ft. Lauderdale, FL: Nova Southeastern University, Programs for Higher Education.
- Dillon, R. K., & Fisher, B. J. (2000). Faculty as part of the advising equation: An inquiry into faculty viewpoints on advising. *NACADA Journal, 20*(1), 16-22.
- Downing, N. E., & Roush, K. L. (1985). From passive acceptance to active commitment; A model of feminist identity development for women. *Counseling Psychologist, 13*, 695-709.
- Dunker, R. E., & Belcastro, F. P. (1994). *A survey of full-time and part-time students' satisfaction with faculty academic advising*. Dubuque, IA: Western Iowa Technical College. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED377907)
- Eddy, J. P., & Essarum, C. C. (1989). Student and faculty perception of a university academic advising process. *The College Student Affairs Journal, 9*(2), 6-13.
- Eisenhardt, K. M. (2002). Building theories from case study research. In A. M. Huberman & M. B. Miles (Eds.), *The qualitative researcher's companion* (pp. 5-36). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- El-Khawas, E. (2003). The many dimensions of student diversity. In S. R. Komives, J. Dudley, B. Woodard, & Associates (Eds.), *Student services: A handbook for the profession* (4th ed., pp. 45-64). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Ender, S. C. (1994). Impediments to developmental advising. *NACADA Journal, 14*(2), 105-107.

- Ender, S. C., Winston, R. B., Jr., & Miller, T. K. (1982). Academic advising as student development. In R. B. Winston Jr., S. C. Ender, & T. K. Miller (Eds.), *Developmental approaches to academic advising* (New Directions for Student Services No. 17, pp. 3-18). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Ender, S. C., Winston, R. B., Jr., & Miller, T. K. (1984). Academic advising reconsidered. In R. B. Winston Jr., T. K. Miller, S. C. Ender, T. J. Grites, & Associates (Eds.), *Developmental academic advising: Addressing students' educational, career, and personal needs* (pp. 3-34). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Erikson, E. H. (1968). *Identity: Youth and crisis*. New York: Norton.
- Evans, N. J. (2003). Psychosocial, cognitive, and typological perspectives on student development. In S. R. Komives, D. B. Woodard Jr., & Associates (Eds.), *Student services: A handbook for the profession* (4th ed., pp. 179-202). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Frost, S. H. (1990, October). *Educational improvement through academic advising: Advisor attitudes and practices that make a difference*. Paper presented at the annual conference of the Southern Association for Institutional Research, Ft. Lauderdale, FL.
- Frost, S. H. (1991). *Academic advising for student success: A system of shared responsibility*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 3. Washington, DC: The George Washington University, School of Education and Human Development.
- Frost, S. H. (2000). Historical and philosophical foundations for academic advising. In V. N. Gordon, W. R. Habley, & Associates (Eds.), *Academic advising: A comprehensive handbook* (pp. 3-17). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Frost, S. H., & Brown-Wheeler, K. E. (2003). Evolution and examination: Philosophical and cultural foundations for faculty advising. In G. L. Kramer (Ed.), *Faculty advising examined: Enhancing the potential of college faculty as advisors* (pp. 223-244). Bolton, MA: Anker.
- Gall, M. D., Borg, W. R., & Gall, J. P. (1996). *Educational research: An introduction*. White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Goetz, J. J. (1996). Academic advising. In A. L. Rentz & Associates (Eds.), *Student affairs practice in higher education* (2nd ed., pp. 28-55). Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.
- Golde, C. M., & Dore, T. M. (2001). *At cross purposes: What the experiences of today's doctoral students reveal about doctoral education*. Madison, WI: Wisconsin University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED450628)
- Gordon, V. N. (1992). *Handbook of academic advising*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Gordon, V. N., Habley, W. R., & Associates. (2000). *Academic advising: A comprehensive handbook*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Grites, T. J. (1979). *Academic advising: Getting us through the eighties*. Washington, DC: AAHE-ERIC Higher Education Research Report No. 7.
- Gross, R. D. (1998). A survey of sophomore students' impressions of academic advising services. *Journal of Educational Opportunity*, 17(1), 23-49.
- Habley, W. R. (1983). Organizational structures in academic advising: Models and implications. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 26(4), 535-539.

- Habley, W. R. (1986). Show us the future: The challenges facing academic advising.
NACADA Journal, 6(2), 5-11 .
- Habley, W. R. (1988). Introduction and overview. In W. R. Habley (Ed.), *The status and future of academic advising: Problems and promises* (pp. 1-10). Iowa City, IA: The ACT National Center for the Advancement of Educational Practices.
- Habley, W. R. (1994). Fire! (Ready, aim): Is criticism of faculty advising warranted?
NACADA Journal, 14(2), 25-34.
- Habley, W. R. (2000). Current practices in academic advising. In V. H. Gordon, W. R. Habley, & Associates (Eds.), *Academic advising: A comprehensive handbook* (pp. 35-43). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Habley, W. R. (2003). Faculty advising: Practice and promise. In G. L. Kramer (Ed.), *Faculty advising examined: Enhancing the potential of college faculty as advisors* (pp. 23-39). Bolton, MA: Anker.
- Habley, W. R. (2004). *The status of academic advising: Findings from the ACT sixth national study*. Manhattan, KS: National Academic Advising Association.
- Habley, W. R., & Crockett, D. S. (1988). The third ACT national survey of academic advising. In W. R. Habley (Ed.), *The status and future of academic advising: Problems and promises* (pp. 11-76). Iowa City, IA: The ACT National Center for the Advancement of Educational Practices.
- Habley, W. R., & Morales, R. H. (1998). *Current practices in academic advising: Final report on ACT's fifth national survey of academic advising*. Manhattan, KS: National Academic Advising Association.

- Hamrick, F. A., Evans, N. J., & Schuh, J. H. (2002). *Foundations of student affairs practice: How philosophy, theory, and research strengthen educational outcomes*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Hartsell, J. L. (1999). The relationship between academic advising preferences, career decidedness and certain demographic characteristics of community college students. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 61(02A), 508. (UMI No. 9960178)
- Helms, J. E. (1995). An update of Helms's White and People of Color racial identity models. In J. G. Ponterotto, M. M. Casas, L. A. Suzuki, & C. M. Alexander (Eds.), *Handbook of multicultural counseling* (pp. 181-198). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Helms, J. E., & Cook, D. A. (1999). *Using race and culture in counseling and psychotherapy: Theory and process*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Herndon, J. B., Kaiser, J., & Creamer, D. G. (1996). Student preferences for advising style in community college environments. *Journal of College Student Development*, 37(6), 637-648.
- Holland, J. L. (1985). *Making vocational choices: A theory of vocational personalities and work environments* (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Homer, G. L. (1997). Relationship of student attitudes toward academic advising to student persistence, student academic success, and student performance on the Texas Academic Skills Program (TASP) Test. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 59(02A), 403. (UMI No. 9824965)

- Hurst, J. C., & Pratt, G. A. (1984). Enhancing students' intellectual and personal development. In R. B. Winston Jr., T. K. Miller, S. C. Ender, T. J. Grites, & Associates (Eds.), *Developmental academic advising: Addressing students' educational, career, and personal needs* (pp. 173-196). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Jung, C. G. (1962). *Psychological type* (H. G. Baynes, Trans.). London: Pantheon. (Original work published in 1923).
- Keller, G. (2001). The new demographics of higher education. *The Review of Higher Education*, 24(3), 219-235.
- Kelly, J. (1995). Faculty speak to advising. In A. G. Reinarz & E. R. White (Eds.), *Teaching through academic advising: A faculty perspective* (New Directions for Teaching and Learning No. 62, pp. 13-24). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kenworthy, W. J. (1970). Instruction. In A. S. Knowles (Ed.), *Handbook of College and University Administration: Vol. 2 Academic*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Keppel, B., & Hamilton, A. (1998). Sexual and affectional orientation and identity scales [Electronic version]. Retrieved October 2, 2005, from <http://www.biresource.org/pamphlets/scales.html>
- King, D. W. (1984). Administering advising programs: Staffing, budgeting, and other issues. In R. B. Winston Jr., T. K. Miller, S. C. Ender, T. J. Grites, & Associates (Eds.), *Developmental academic advising* (pp. 347-380). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- King, P. M. (1978). William Perry's theory of intellectual and ethical development. In L. Knefelkamp, C. Widick, & C. A. Parker (Eds.), *Applying new developmental findings*. (New Directions for Student Services No. 4, pp. 35-52). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Kinsey, A. C., Pomeroy, W. B., & Martin, C. E. (1948). *Sexual behavior in the human male*. Philadelphia: Saunders.
- Klein, F., Sepehoff, B., & Wolf, T. J. (1990). Sexual orientation: A multi-variable dynamic process. In T. Geller (Ed.), *Bisexuality: A reader and sourcebook* (pp. 64-81). Ojai, CA: Times Change Press.
- Knedlik, A. D. (2003). An examination of the perception of community college students about developmental academic advising and retention. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 64(05A), 1539. (UMI No. 3090366)
- Kohlberg, L. (1985). Part XVI: Concluding chapter: A current statement on some theoretical issues. In S. Modgil (Ed.), *Lawrence Kohlberg: Consensus and controversy*. Philadelphia: Falmer.
- Kohlberg, L. (1994). The development of modes of moral thinking and choice in the years 10 to 16. In B. Puka (Ed.), *Kohlberg's original study of moral development* New York: Garland.
- Kopera, A. T. (1998). The role of the academic advisor in a public university. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 59(03A), 750. (UMI No. 9826089)
- Kramer, G. L., Arrington, N. R., & Chynoweth, B. (1985). The academic advising center and faculty advising: A comparison. *NASPA Journal*, 23(1), 24-35.
- Langston, D. (1995). Tired of playing Monopoly? In M. L. Andersen & P. H. Collins (Eds.), *Race, Class, and Gender: An Anthology* (2nd ed., pp. 100-110). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Larsen, M. D., & Brown, B. (1983). Student and faculty expectations of academic advising. *NACADA Journal*, 3(10), 31-37.

- Laureano, G. M. (2003). Expectation, satisfaction, and performance gap scores for education students regarding advising services. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 64(08A), 2805. (UMI No. 3094805)
- Lewin, K. (1969). *Principles of topological psychology* (F. Heider & G. M. Heider, Trans.). New York: Johnson Reprint Corp. (Reprinted from *Principles of topological psychology*, by K. Lewin, 1936, New York: McGraw-Hill)
- Light, R. J. (2001a). *Making the most of college: Students speak their minds*. Boston: Harvard University.
- Light, R. J. (2001b, May 1). The power of good advice for students. *Mentor*, 3(2). Retrieved May, 24, 2004, from <http://www.psu.edu/dus/mentor/010501rl.htm>
- Locke, D. C. (1998). *Increasing multicultural understanding: A comprehensive model* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Love, P. (2003). Advising and consultation. In A. L. Rentz & Associates (Eds.), *Student affairs practice in higher education* (2nd ed., pp. 507-524). Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.
- Lovett, C. M. (2003). Focusing on what matters [Electronic version]. *Change*, 35(2), 33-38.
- Lowe, A., & Toney, M. (2000). Academic advising: Views of the givers and takers. *Journal of College Student Retention*, 2(2), 93-108.
- Lynch, M. (2002). Advising at the millennium: Advisor satisfaction and perceived avenues to enhancement. *NACADA Journal*, 22(2), 5-25.
- McEwen, M. K. (2003). New perspectives on identity development. In S. R. Komives, D. B. Woodard Jr., & Associates (Eds.), *Student services: A handbook for the profession* (4th ed., pp. 203-233). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- McGillin, V. A. (2000). Current issues in advising research. In V. N. Gordon, W. R. Habley, & Associates (Eds.), *Academic advising: A comprehensive handbook* (pp. 365-380). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Melear, K. B. (2003). From *in loco parentis* to consumerism: A legal analysis of the contractual relationship between institution and student. *NASPA Journal*, 40(4), 123-148.
- Miller, T. K. (2001). *The CAS book of professional standards for higher education 2001*. (2nd rev. ed.). Washington, DC: Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education.
- Miller, T. K., & Winston, R. B., Jr. (1991). Human development and higher education. In T. K. Miller & R. B. Winston Jr. (Eds.), *Administration and leadership in student affairs: Actualizing student development in higher education* (2nd ed., pp. 3-36). Muncie, IN: Accelerated Development.
- Miville, M. L., & Sedlacek, W. E. (1995). An assessment of centralized versus faculty advising in a college of engineering. *NACADA Journal*, 15(2), 20-25.
- Myers, I. B. (1980). *Gifts differing*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- National Academic Advising Association. (n.d.a). *Member benefits*. Retrieved Octover, 12, 2004, from <http://www.nacada.ksu.edu/Membership/benefits.htm>
- National Academic Advising Association. (n.d.b). *NACADA's mission*. Retrieved December, 26, 2004, from: <http://www.nacada.ksu.edu/AboutNACADA/NACADAInfo.htm>
- National Academic Advising Association. (1992). Notes to contributors and subscribers. *NACADA Journal*, 12(1), 80-81.

National Academic Advising Association. (1994). *NACADA statement of core values of academic advising*. Retrieved September 8, 2004, from NACADA Clearinghouse of Academic Advising Resources Web site: http://www.nacada.ksu.edu/Clearinghouse/Research_Related/corevalues/htm

National Academic Advising Association. (2004a, October). *Core values of academic advising*. Poster session presented at the annual meeting of the National Academic Advising Association, Cincinnati, OH.

National Academic Advising Association. (2004b). Member input needed! *Academic Advising News – Quarterly Newsletter*, 27(3). Retrieved from http://www.nacada.ksu.edu/Newsletter/NW27_3.htm

National Academic Advising Association. (2004c). *NACADA: Lighting student pathways for 25 years. Power Point presentation utilized at the 2004 national conference*. Retrieved November 10, 2004, from NACADA Clearinghouse of Academic Advising Resources Web site: <http://www.nacada.ksu.edu/AboutNACADA/>

National Academic Advising Association. (2004d). *Statement on the concept of academic advising*. Retrieved October 7, 2004, from NACADA Clearinghouse of Academic Advising Resources Web site: <http://www.nacada.ksu.edu/definitions.htm>

National Academic Advising Association. (2005a). *About NACADA*. Retrieved October 16, 2005, from NACADA Web site: <http://www.nacada.ksu.edu/AboutNACADA/>

National Academic Advising Association. (2005b). *Strategic Plan*. Retrieved November 12, 2005, from NACADA Web site: <http://www.nacada.ksu.edu/Leadership/stratplan.htm>

- National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform* [Electronic version]. Retrieved December 14, 2004, from <http://www.ed.gov/pubs/NatAtRisk/title.html>
- National Institute of Education. (1984). *Involvement in learning: Realizing the potential of American higher education*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED246833)
- Noel, L. (1985). Increasing student retention: New challenges and potential. In L. Noel, R. Levitz, D. Saluri, & Associates (Eds.), *Increasing student retention* (pp. 1-27). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Nolden, D. F., Kim, S. H., & Sedlacek, W. E. (2000). The best and the worst: College seniors' experiences with academics and services. *Journal of the First-Year Experience, 12*(2), 89-106.
- Nuss, E. M. (2003). The development of student affairs. In S. R. Komives, D. B. Woodard Jr., & Associates (Eds.), *Student services: A handbook for the profession* (4th ed., pp. 65-88). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Nutt, C. L. (n.d.). *Academic advising and student retention and persistence*. Retrieved May 11, 2004, from NACADA Clearinghouse of Academic Advising Resources Web site: <http://www.nacada.ksu.edu/Clearinghouse/AdvisingIssues/retention.htm>
- O'Banion, T. (1972). An academic advising model. *Junior College Journal, 42*, 62-69.
- Ossana, S. M., Helms, B. J., & Leonard, M. M. (1992). Do "womanist" identity attitudes influence college women's self-esteem and perceptions of environmental bias? *Journal of Counseling and Development, 70*, 402-408.

- Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (1991). *How college affects students: Findings and insights from twenty years of research*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (1995). The impact of college on students: Myths, rational myths, and some other things that may not be true. *NACADA Journal*, 15(2), 26-33.
- Perry, W. G., Jr. (1998). *Forms of ethical and intellectual development in the college years: A scheme*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Peterson, M., Wagner, J. A., & Lamb, C. W. (2001). The role of advising in non-returning students' perceptions of their university. *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education*, 10(3), 45-59.
- Polson, C. J., & Cashin, W. E. (1981). Research priorities for academic advising: Results of a survey of NACADA membership. *NACADA Journal*, 1(1), 34-43.
- Polson, C. J., & Gordon, V. N. (1988). Issues in advising revisited. *NACADA Journal*, 8(2), 49-58.
- Poston, W. S. C. (1990). The biracial identity development model: A needed addition. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 69, 152-155.
- Raskin, M. (1979). Critical issue: Faculty advising. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 56(2), 99-108.
- Rentz, A. L. (1996). A history of student affairs. In A. L. Rentz & Associates (Eds.), *Student affairs practice in higher education* (2nd ed., pp. 28-55). Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.
- Richards, L. (2005). *Handling qualitative data: A practical guide*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Roberts, D. C. (2003). Community building and programming. In S. R. Komives, D. B. Woodard Jr., & Associates (Eds.), *Student services: A handbook for the profession* (4th ed., pp. 539-554). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Root, M. P. P. (1996). The multiracial experience: Racial borders as a significant frontier to race relations. In M. P. P. Root (Ed.), *The multiracial experience: Racial borders as the new frontier* (pp. xiii-xxviii). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Rosenthal, R., & Rosnow, R. L. (1975). The volunteer subject. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Sanford, N. (Ed.). (1962). *The American college: A psychological and social interpretation of the higher learning*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Sanford, N. (1966). *Self and society: Social change and individual development*. New York: Atherton.
- Saving, K. A., & Keim, M. C. (1998). Student and advisor perceptions of academic advising in two Midwestern colleges of business. *College Student Journal*, 32(4), 511-521.
- Schlossberg, N. K. (1989). Marginality and mattering: Key issues in building community. In D. C. Roberts (Ed.), *Designing campus activities to foster a sense of community* (New Directions for Student Services No. 48, pp. 5-15). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Smart, J. (2001). *Disability, society, and the individual*. Gaithersburg, MD: Aspen.
- Smerglia, V. L., & Bouchet, N. M. (1999). Meeting upper-level students' advising needs: A developmental study of student and faculty opinion. *NACADA Journal*, 19(1), 29-34.

- Smith, A. F. (1978). Lawrence Kohlberg's cognitive stage theory of the development of moral judgment. In L. Knefelkamp, C. Widick, & C. A. Parker (Eds.), *Applying new developmental findings* (New Directions for Student Services No. 4, pp. 53-68). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Smith, J. S. (2002). First-year student perceptions of academic advisement: A qualitative study and reality check. *NACADA Journal*, 22(2), 39-49.
- Spady, W. (1971). Dropouts from higher education: Toward an empirical model. *Interchange*, 2(3), 38-62.
- Strange, C. (1999). Student development: The evolution and status of an essential idea. *Journal of College Student Development*, 40(5), 570-586.
- Strommer, D. W. (1994). Constructing a new paradigm for academic advising. *NACADA Journal*, 14(2), 92-95.
- Templeton, R. A., Skaggs, J. L., & Johnson, C. E. (2002, April). *Examining faculty's perceptions of student advising to improve learning environments*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.
- Thelin, J. R. (2003). Historical overview of American higher education. In S. R. Komives, D. B. Woodard Jr., & Associates (Eds.), *Student services: A handbook for the profession* (4th ed., pp. 3-22). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Thomas, R. E., & Chickering, A. W. (1984). Foundations for academic advising. In R. B. Winston Jr., T. K. Miller, S. C. Ender, T. J. Grites, & Associates (Eds.), *Developmental academic advising: Addressing students' educational, career, and personal needs* (pp. 89-118). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Tiberii, R., Grites, T., & Campbell, S. (2005, October). *Defining academic advising*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Academic Advising Association, Las Vegas, NV.

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

Tinto, V. (1986). Theories of college student departure revisited. In J. C. Smart (Ed.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research, Vol. 2* (pp. 359-384). New York, Agathon Press.

Tuttle, K. N. (2000). Academic advising. In L. K. Johnsrud & V. J. Rosser (Eds.), *Understanding the work and career paths of midlevel administrators* (New Directions for Higher Education No. 111, pp. 15-24). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Veysey, L. R. (1965). *The emergence of the American university*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Weber, L. (1998). A conceptual framework for understanding race, class, gender, and sexuality. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 22*, 13-32.

Widick, C., Parker, C. A., & Knefelkamp, L. (1978a). Arthur Chickering's vectors of development. In L. Knefelkamp, C. Widick, & C. A. Parker (Eds.), *Applying new developmental findings* (New Directions for Student Services No. 4, pp. 19-34). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Widick, C., Parker, C. A., & Knefelkamp, L. (1978b). Erik Erikson and psychosocial development. In L. Knefelkamp, C. Widick, & C. A. Parker (Eds.), *Applying new developmental findings* (New Directions for Student Services No. 4, pp. 1-17). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Winston, R. B., Jr. (1994). Developmental academic advising reconsidered: Chimera or unrealized potential? *NACADA Journal*, 14(2), 112-116.
- Winston, R. B., Jr., & Sandor, J. A. (2002). *Evaluating academic advising: Manual for the Academic Advising Inventory*. Athens, GA: Student Development Associates, Inc.
- Wood, K. D. (2002). Developmental versus prescriptive advising: An investigation of advising delivery at a major university. *Masters Abstracts International*, 41(04), 885. (UMI No. 1412163)
- Wood, J. H., & Wood, P. H. (1989). *Student and advisor attitudes toward academic advisement*. Bowling Green, OH: Bowling Green State University, College of Education and Allied Professions.
- Wood, P. H., & Wood, J. H. (1979). *Student attitudes toward academic advisement*. Bowling Green, OH: Bowling Green State University, College of Education.

APPENDICES

Appendix A
Permission Statement from
North Carolina State University
Institutional Review Board for the
Use of Human Subjects in Research

NC STATE UNIVERSITY

Sponsored Programs and
Regulatory Compliance
Campus Box 7514
1 Leazar Hall
Raleigh, NC 27695-7514

919.515.7200
919.515.7721 (fax)

From: Debra A. Paxton, Regulatory Compliance Administrator
North Carolina State University
Institutional Review Board

Date: March 10, 2005

Project Title: Student, Staff Advisor, and Faculty Advisor Perceptions of Academic Advising

IRB#: 061-05-3

Dear Ms. Wyatt:

The research proposal named above has received administrative review and has been approved as exempt from the policy as outlined in the Code of Federal Regulations (Exemption: 46.101.b.2). Provided that the only participation of the subjects is as described in the proposal narrative, this project is exempt from further review.

NOTE:

1. This committee complies with requirements found in Title 45 part 46 of The Code of Federal Regulations.
For NCSU projects, the Assurance Number is: FWA00003429; the IRB Number is:
IRB00000330
2. Review de novo of this proposal is necessary if any significant alterations/additions are made.

Please provide a copy of this letter to your faculty advisor. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Debra Paxton
NCSU IRB



Appendix B
Permission Statement from
Appalachian State University
Institutional Review Board for the
Use of Human Subjects in Research

APR 7 17 05 (THU) 10:42

AVL GRADUATE CENTER

TEL: 828 251 6618



Graduate Studies & Research
 ASU Box 82068
 Boone, NC 28608-2068
 (828) 262-2130
 Fax: (828) 262-2709
www.graduate.appstate.edu

TO: Dr. Don Locke
 NCSU Adult & Comm.
 Ms. Jennifer Wyatt
 Department of Academic Services

FROM: Robert L. Johnson, Administrator
 Institutional Review Board

DATE: February 25, 2005

SUBJECT: Institutional Review Board
 Request for Human Subjects Research

REFERENCE: "Student, Staff Advisor, and Faculty Advisor Perceptions of Academic Advising"

IRB Reference #05-114

Initial Approval Date – February 23, 2005
End of Approval Period – February 22, 2006

Your request for Review of Human Subjects Research has been approved.

OHRP Guidelines stipulate that projects may be approved for a maximum of one (1) year. During this period, you should contact this office to:

1. report any unanticipated problems involving risks to subjects or others,
2. request modification in the approved protocol,
3. request an Extension beyond the one (1) approval, and/or
4. inform the IRB of the completion of the project.

Best wishes with your research.

RLJ/lab

Appendix C
Appalachian State University
Informed Consent Form for Research

APPALACHIAN STATE UNIVERSITY
&
North Carolina State University

Informed Consent for Participants in Research Projects Involving Human Subjects

Title of Project Student, Staff Advisor, and Faculty Advisor Perceptions of Academic Advising
 Investigator(s) Jennifer L. Wyatt Faculty Sponsor: Don C. Locke

I. Purpose of this Research/Project

The purpose of this study is to investigate the self-reported perceptions of faculty and staff advisors as to how well they are meeting the National Academic Advising Association's (NACADA) goals for advising. In addition, the study will investigate the relationship between student, staff academic advisor, and faculty advisor perceptions of meeting NACADA goals for academic advising at a comprehensive four-year public university in Western North Carolina.

The population used in this study will consist of 21 staff advisors in the General Studies Academic Advising Center, 200 faculty advisors in the College of Arts and Sciences, and 200 students who receive advising from either of the advisor groups above. Participation is voluntary.

II. Procedures

If you agree to participate in this study, you will be asked to electronically complete a survey and submit it via the Internet. This survey should take 5 to 15 minutes of your time. When you submit your survey, your name will be taken off your individual responses to ensure confidentiality of your survey responses. Your name will be kept separately for purposes of awarding one \$50 gift certificate to Amazon.com for each group of participants (students, staff advisors, and faculty advisors).

III. Risks

There should be no risks or discomforts involved in this survey. Confidentiality will be maintained to ensure no individual's responses can be identified.

IV. Benefits

The research may not benefit the participants directly, but the results may be used to make decisions about the academic advising program overall. In addition, the results will be shared with the National Academic Advising Association, which is currently reviewing the goals for academic advising. No promise or guarantee of benefits have been made to encourage you to participate.

V. Extent of Anonymity and Confidentiality

The information in the study records will be kept strictly confidential. Data will be stored securely in the office of Jennifer L. Wyatt at Appalachian State University. No reference will be made in oral or written reports which could link you to the study. At no time will the researchers release the results of the study to anyone other than individuals working on the project without your written consent.

VI. Compensation

For participating in this study you will receive a chance to win a \$50 gift certificate to Amazon.com. If you withdraw from the study prior to its completion, you will not be entered in the drawing.

VII. Contacts

If you have questions at any time about the study or the procedures, you may contact the researcher, Jennifer L. Wyatt at the College of Arts & Sciences, 100 I. G. Greer Hall, Appalachian State University, at wyattjl@appstate.edu or at 828-262-6647. If you feel you have not been treated according to the descriptions in this form, or your rights as a participant in research have been violated during the course of this project, you may contact Dr. Matthew Zingraff, Chair of the NCSU IRB for the Use of Human Subjects in Research Committee, Box 7514, NCSU Campus (919/513-1834) or Mr. Matthew Ronning, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Research Administration, Box 7514, NCSU Campus (919/513-2148)

VIII. Freedom to Withdraw

Your participation in this study is voluntary; you may decline to participate without penalty. If you decide to participate, you may withdraw from the study at any time without penalty and without loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. If you withdraw from the study before data collection is completed your data will be returned to you or destroyed at your request.

IX. Approval of Research

This research project has been approved, as required, by the Institutional Review Board of Appalachian State University and North Carolina State University (if others, i.e., school or school system, hospital, daycare center, multi-institutional project etc.).

February 23, 2005

IRB Approval Date

February 22, 2006

Approval Expiration Date

X. Subject's Responsibilities

I voluntarily agree to participate in this study. I have the following responsibilities:

- Complete the survey questions and submit electronically.

XI. Subject's Permission

I have read and understand the Informed Consent and conditions of this project. I have had all my questions answered. I hereby acknowledge the above and give my voluntary consent by responding to the survey electronically.

Robert L. Johnson

Administrator, IRB

Graduate Studies and Research
Appalachian State University
Boone, NC 26608

828-262-2692

Telephone

johnsonrl@appstate.edu

e-mail

Subjects must be given a complete copy (or duplicate original) of the signed Informed Consent.

Appendix D
Email Sent to Participants

You have been selected to be a participant in a research study on academic advising. Your participation is voluntary and any information gathered will be kept confidential.

What is it?

The purpose of this study is to investigate the self-reported perceptions of faculty and staff advisors as to how well they are meeting the National Academic Advising Association's (NACADA) goals for advising. In addition, the study will investigate the relationship between student, staff academic advisor, and faculty advisor perceptions of meeting NACADA goals.

How do I participate?

First, read the informed consent document. By responding to the survey electronically, you are submitting an electronic signature verifying that you:

- read and understood the Informed Consent and conditions of this project;
- give your voluntary consent to participate.

Then, simply complete the attached survey and submit it by clicking on the "Submit my Survey" button.

What's in it for me?

You will be helping ASU gather information on its academic advising program. In addition, everyone who completes and submits a survey will be entered in a drawing for a \$50.00 gift certificate from Amazon.com! (One certificate each will be awarded to one student, one staff advisor, and one faculty advisor.)

What if I have questions?

Please feel free to contact Jennifer Wyatt at 262-6647 or at wyattjl@appstate.edu.

Appendix E
Advisee Survey Form

On the scale to the right of each statement, circle the number that best reflects how well your advisor provides each advising service. Then list three methods your advisor uses most often to provide each service.

1 = VERY POORLY 2 = POORLY 3 = ADEQUATE 4 = WELL 5 = VERY WELL

Assisting students in self-understanding and self-acceptance

1 2 3 4 5

3 methods used: _____

Assisting students in considering their life goals by relating their interests, skills, abilities, and values to careers, the world of work, and the nature and purpose of higher education.

1 2 3 4 5

3 methods used: _____

Assisting students in developing an educational plan consistent with their life goals and objectives.

1 2 3 4 5

3 methods used: _____

Assisting students in developing decision-making skills.

1 2 3 4 5

3 methods used: _____

Providing accurate information about institutional policies, procedures, resources, and programs.

1 2 3 4 5

3 methods used: _____

Referring students to other institutional or community support services.

1

2

3

4

5

3 methods used: _____

Assisting students in evaluating or reevaluating progress toward established goals and educational plans.

1

2

3

4

5

3 methods used: _____

Providing information about students to the institution, college, academic departments, or some combination thereof.

1

2

3

4

5

3 methods used: _____

All statements are from the National Academic Advising Association's goals for academic advising.

Please provide the following information.

I am a: first year student sophomore junior senior **Sex:** Male Female

Please check if you are a/an: NCAA athlete Watauga College student International student

Age: _____ **Ethnicity:** _____ **Home State:** _____

My academic advisor is in: General Studies (D.D. Dougherty) my major department
 Other (please specify): _____

How often do you meet with your advisor?

never once per year once per semester twice per semester more than twice per semester
My major is: _____ **My cumulative GPA is (best guess):** _____

Any additional comments to add? _____

Appendix F
Advisor Survey Form

On the scale to the right of each statement, circle the number that best reflects how well you are able to provide each advising service. Then list three methods you use most often to provide each service to your advisees.

1 = VERY POORLY 2 = POORLY 3= ADEQUATE 4= WELL 5 = VERY WELL

Assisting students in self-understanding and self-acceptance

1 2 3 4 5

3 methods used: _____

Assisting students in considering their life goals by relating their interests, skills, abilities, and values to careers, the world of work, and the nature and purpose of higher education.

1 2 3 4 5

3 methods used: _____

Assisting students in developing an educational plan consistent with their life goals and objectives.

1 2 3 4 5

3 methods used: _____

Assisting students in developing decision-making skills.

1 2 3 4 5

3 methods used: _____

Providing accurate information about institutional policies, procedures, resources, and programs.

1 2 3 4 5

3 methods used: _____

Referring students to other institutional or community support services.

1**2****3****4****5**

3 methods used: _____

Assisting students in evaluating or reevaluating progress toward established goals and educational plans.

1**2****3****4****5**

3 methods used: _____

Providing information about students to the institution, college, academic departments, or some combination thereof.

1**2****3****4****5**

3 methods used: _____

All statements are from the National Academic Advising Association's goals for academic advising.

Please provide the following information.

I am a: staff advisor faculty advisor **Department:** _____

Sex: Male Female **How long have you been an advisor?** _____

How many advisees do you have? _____

Which, if any, special populations do you advise (athletes, first year students, preprofessional majors, Watauga College students)? _____

Any additional comments to add?
