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ABSTRACT

Meeting with an academic advisor may be one of the few, if not the only, one-on-one interactions an undergraduate student has with faculty or staff outside of classroom matters. This interaction connects students to the curriculum of their selected major and campus resources but, most importantly, the academic advisor provides a direct connection to the institution (Nutt, 2003) and fosters the further holistic development within the student. As such, academic advising is often connected to increased retention and persistence (Bryant, 2016; Drake, 2011; Nutt, 2003). Despite this important role, institutions do not engage in critical reflection on how they are supporting and/or impeding the development of those advisors new to this crucial position.

To address how organizational culture supports and impedes the development of a new advisor, this study employed qualitative research methods in a descriptive, embedded, single-case case study at a southeastern research university. Using the NACADA academic advising core competencies and organizational socialization, twenty-eight individuals – new advisors, seasoned advisors, advisor trainers, and advising center directors – were interviewed, four new advisors participated in a focus group, and hundreds of pages of documents were analyzed.

This study found that the culture of different colleges was varied, but each reflected a similar desire for students to develop and succeed despite there not being an overarching university advising mission. Additionally, the boundaries, responses, and tactics were similar across each college. The informational and relational core competencies were the most often
discussed by advisors and highly valued in practice, with a few advisors articulating the value of the conceptual component. The advisors also expressed various levels of perceived support at the university level.

Overall, the institution supported new advisors through college-level advisor training and professional development, creating an advisor job family and a campus-based advising organization, and developing an advising initiative. Conversely, new advisor development was impeded by the lack of a central advising mission and centralized office or administrator, lack of upper administration understanding the value of advising, no university-based training, and increased enrollment that outpaced advisor hires. As such, this study recommends that institutions develop a centralized advising mission and training program to provide support to new advisors.
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INTRODUCTION

“Institutions can no longer rely on replacing lost students with new students; they must do a better job of serving the students they have.” Tyton Partners, a strategy consulting firm, in partnership with NACADA, the Global Community for Academic Advising, shared this perspective in a 2015 publication on advising. Academic advisors and many other higher education practitioners around the nation have long held similar notions and strived to enact this in their role. As retention and graduation rates continue to be markers of success at American universities, academic advising is increasingly invaluable to higher education institutions. Academic advisors are essential in helping students plan out their academic and co-curricular careers, as well as identifying areas of struggle and need. As “perhaps the only structured campus endeavor that can guarantee students sustained interaction with a caring and concerned adult who can help them shape such an experience” (Hunter & White, 2004, p. 21), they serve as a vital connection for students. Holden, an academic advisor that participated in this study, echoed Tyton Partners (2015) and Hunter and White (2004) when he said “We want to focus more on the incoming students. And that would also help with retention because you know they don’t feel abandoned or you know ‘there’s nobody out there really to help me so why should I stay’?”

The approach to academic advising varies from institution to institution. This is not too surprising, given the vast number of American universities. The Global Community for Academic Advising (NACADA) counts among its 12,000 members – professional advisors, faculty, administrators, and students - all 50 states within the United States and several
international countries, as well as various Carnegie distinctions for higher education institutions (NACADA, n.d.). NACADA’s membership is by no means indicative of the total numbers of individuals serving in an academic advising role but no data is available on the exact number of individuals that serve in this capacity.

At some institutions, academic advising is included in the responsibilities of a faculty member who, often with little more than the academic catalog and a check sheet, assists the student in selecting classes for next semester. At another institution, it may be a professional academic advisor with a master’s degree in student affairs who went through a rigorous training process (not to mention ongoing development) and focuses on the student’s overall college experience and needs. Additionally, there are institutions that utilize a combination of both faculty and professional academic advisors with various academic backgrounds and training or development requirements.

Given the multitude of advising models and perspectives, it is not uncommon to hear conversations at advising conferences, or on campuses, regarding confusion in academic advising, how to define academic advising, or who should be in this role. This confusion influences the individuals in that role, be it, faculty or professional academic advisor. How is an academic advisor supposed to develop their role within the college or institution when so much confusion and variety abound?

**Purpose and Research Questions**

Meeting with an academic advisor may be one of the few, if not the only, one-on-one interactions an undergraduate student has with faculty or staff outside of classroom matters. This interaction serves to connect students not only with the curriculum of their selected major and campus resources, but, most importantly, the academic advisor provides a direct connection to
the institution (Nutt, 2003) and fosters the further holistic development of the student. As such, the important process of academic advising is connected to increased retention and persistence (Bryant, 2016; Drake, 2011; Nutt, 2003).

If an academic advisor is to serve a pertinent role in the development of students, then it serves that the development of the academic advisor is crucial to make that happen. Yet, very little research has been conducted on the development of professional academic advisors; specifically, those new to the role. This study seeks to address the gap in academic advising literature by exploring how organizational culture can both impede and support the development of new professional academic advisors. Frameworks for the study are based on the NACADA academic advising core competencies and organizational socialization while the following two key questions guided this study:

1. How can organizational culture support the development of new academic advisors?
2. How can organizational culture impede the development of new academic advisors?

Five Problems

The evolution of academic advising and the movement to professionalize the role is rife with clashes between faculty and administrators, as well as the struggles to differentiate the role from other professionals on campus. Despite the ground academic advising has gained towards becoming a valued practice that is more than course registration, there are still institutional roadblocks in continued development and understanding of the role. Areas that still need to be addressed are provided in the following five problems:

Academic Advising Definition

What is academic advising? The definition varies depending on who is asked, but most in higher education will answer with something related to assisting students with their schedule for
the next semester or a description of who should be in that role. In fact, Larson, Johnson, Aiken-Wisniewski, and Barkemeyer (2018) encountered the same issues while conducting research on academic advising as an occupation, with participants often including the qualifications of an academic advisor with the practice of academic advising. Despite no formal definition, literature on academic advising does state, to some degree, that the purpose of academic advising is much more than course registration and/or a pat on the back for the student making it through a semester. The perception of academic advising merely as course registration assumes that a student’s progress in college, “flows smoothly and logically from that point” (“Approaching as a sensitive”, 1987). For many students, college is rarely a smooth progress with a logical flow. Instead, the transition to and through college can be a somewhat bumpy process. An academic advisor, whether faculty or professional, is better equipped to assist a student during this potentially strenuous time when focused on the entirety of student development.

Beyond differing perceptions of the purpose of academic advising, there is also no common definition or approach for academic advising in the literature. A search for a definition of academic advising in the NACADA Clearinghouse brings up multiple definitions collected over time by the organization (NACADA, 2003). Additionally, a search for academic advising approaches and theories results in pages on appreciative advising, developmental advising, and proactive advising, among others, as well as papers on a normative theory of academic advising (NACADA, n.d.a.). Each of these approaches makes assumptions about the student experience and academic advisor capabilities, assumptions beneficial to an academic advisor as they interact with students.

How is an academic advisor, much less one new to the profession, to know what academic advising truly is with so many options and varied understandings? How does a
university use these options to move past academic advising as course registration alone? As discussed in Robbins (2013), without a common element, there is nothing to guide the academic advising of students within a program or institution. This is a shortcoming for both the development of the student and the new academic advisor.

**Faculty or Professional Academic Advisor**

For much of the history of higher education, academic advising has been under the purview of faculty members. More recently, this role has moved to staff members with backgrounds in counseling, psychology, student affairs, or similar disciplines so they may support the student’s entire university experience. The argument as to who best serves this role partially hinges on the definition of academic advising - is it course registration or student development? From there, it moves to a matter of expertise. Should only those with an educational background in the student’s given discipline serve as an academic advisor? Or should an academic advisor be an individual that has an educational background in the holistic development of students? What happens if it is one and the same? Admittedly, arguments for both sides are strong; the decision is left up to the individual institutions and academic departments.

The 2011 NACADA National Survey found that “full-time professional and faculty advisors continue to be the most frequently utilized advising personnel, and well over one-half of respondents indicated the use of both at their institution” (Self, 2011, paragraph 2). However, some faculty remained concerned that students with a professional academic advisor will not have an “intellectual mentor or role model” (Potter, 2016, June 10, para. 8) or that advising centers will steer students away from courses in which they have struggled (Potter, 2016, June 10). Potter (2016, June 12) later clarifies that she meant a mentor in the student’s department
when referring to an intellectual mentor. She further states that faculty need instruction on how to advise and that the institutions should make it a priority by demonstrating the value (Potter, 2016, June 12).

Beyond the argument of a faculty advisor or professional academic advisor is the discussion of who can serve as a professional academic advisor. As Shaffer, Zalewski, and Leveille (2010) states, “more important, because academia has long been considered a profession, the unbundling of academic advising tasks from the set of faculty activities and the assignment of academic advising to individuals who do not belong to the college or university faculty has led to the expression of professional academic advisor (emphasis is theirs)” (p.67). Who then can serve as a professional academic advisor? What academic background and/or degree(s) are required? What experience and training are necessary? If one compares multiple institutions (or even multiple programs at an institution), they are bound to find a wide range of requirements. Some universities may require a master’s degree, especially if teaching a first-year seminar is a job requirement, while others may only require a bachelor’s degree. The degree discipline at one institution may not matter while at another a degree in counseling, education, or psychology is required. These varied backgrounds can benefit the students as they gain multiple perspectives through their interaction, but it may also hinder the advancement and recognition of the field (Aiken-Wisniewski, Johnson, Larson, & Barkemeyer, 2015). As such, the problem of who can serve as an academic advisor further complicates the understanding of the field and how the role is defined and understood.

**Becoming an Academic Advisor**

Another problem is how one becomes an academic advisor. A faculty member may be assigned a certain number of students to advise each semester, with little to no training on what it
means to advise these students, though there are certainly exceptions. As a professional academic
advisor, one may have a structured training program or may learn on the job while relying upon
seemingly innate knowledge, “I was a college student. I know how this works.” Too often,
training programs for faculty and professional academic advisors focus primarily on the more
administrative functions of academic advising – university policies, major requirements, course
registration – and very little on ways to foster relationships with students and how to guide
students as they find their fit at an institution. This focus on administrative functions persists
despite a plethora of readily available resources from NACADA that provide guidelines on
training and highlight additional components of academic advising. Additionally, if academic
advising responsibilities are not included in faculty evaluations for the tenure and promotion
process, participating in training has little incentive to fully immerse in the practice (Self, 2011).

Professional academic advisors may also find their perspective on academic advising at
odds with the perspective of their institution, or even within their office. As it relates to the
various approaches of academic advising, becoming an academic advisor and understanding the
profession as a whole comes from the perspectives the academic advisor initially encountered
during their early days of training. If there is no central understanding of advising in an office or
on campus, the new academic advisor will face confusion about their role as titles may vary
(Aiken-Wisniewski et al, 2015), functions may differ, and policies may compete. Working
 toward a central understanding of academic advising could eliminate this confusion and lead to
better student outcomes and academic advisor expectations.

Regardless of who serves in this role, “the success or failure of efforts depends upon a
strong training and professional development program” (Self, 2011, paragraph 16). According to
the 2011 NACADA National Survey, many institutions have not established training or
professional development to assist academic advisors in better serving the needs of students (Voller, 2011). In fact, respondents in less than half of the institutions surveyed reported that they received training or individualized development while a tenth reported no training at all (Voller, 2011). This is particularly problematic to those serving in this role as they have little guidance on how to assist a student in a crisis, use of techniques to foster a rapport, or learn to let the students make the decision.

**Understanding Role within Upper Administration**

Another problem faced by academic advising is how it is understood as a role and practice by the higher administration (directors, department chairs, deans, provost, presidents, etc.) within a university. Administrators who previously served as faculty may think of academic advising as purely course scheduling or find it to be a menial task. Other administrators may find value in the practice, but only to the extent that it keeps students on track to graduate with little appreciation for what that requires beyond course registration. Administration and faculty may also call into question how academic advising contributes to a student’s learning experience as more than a check sheet of classes (Aiken-Wisniewski et al., 2015). In fact, the 2011 NACADA National Survey found that less than half of the respondents felt the administrators on their campus viewed academic advising’s primary role as teaching and facilitating learning (Smith, 2011). The varied requirements, functions, and training of academic advisors, even across a single campus, likely influenced this misunderstanding of the role. As it stands, there is no singular “body of knowledge and practice that advisors endorse and follow” (Shaffer et al., 2010, p. 73) nor is there a significant amount of evidence that demonstrates the effectiveness of academic advising (Habley, 2000; Shaffer et al., 2010).
Additionally, there is often little administrative emphasis on a culture of academic advising beyond course registration. The need for organizational change and accountability for academic advising is often recognized by those “in the trenches” with little power to enact said changes (Bryant, 2016). A recent report from Tryton Partners found that administrators recognize the need for a focus on student retention and the need for clear ownership of these initiatives, yet few have put such systems into place (Bryant, 2016).

For these reasons, academic advisors find that they often need to fight or negotiate for recognition due to preconceived notions or a lack of credentials. When academic advisors raise concerns about policies or curriculum issues, they are dismissed or even ignored, although they may be more likely to see these issues because of their close relationships with students. As Aiken-Wisniewski et al. (2015), reported, “despite such a unique perspective and so much knowledge to offer, academic advisors find themselves unable to influence the educational experience’ (p. 66).

Job Satisfaction and Career Path

When nobody understands what you do or how you do your job, maintaining satisfaction in your role and exploring options for further growth can be difficult. Academic advising, at many institutions, lacks a clear career path or opportunities for growth. Funding can often be an issue when it comes to promotions or the ability to attend conferences. Academic advising is typically not included in faculty annual reviews or the tenure and promotion process. This lack of evaluation and room for growth stems from the absence of understanding the role and the value it brings to the institution. This is further complicated by the varied perspectives of academic advisors, even amongst NACADA leadership, of academic advising as a profession (McGill, 2018) and career path.
Unclear job expectations and duties, lack of training, and ambiguity on the purpose of academic advising leads to low rates of job satisfaction with any role, much less academic advising. NACADA recommends academic advisor training programs that focus on the informational, relational, and conceptual components of academic advising, as well as an extended training program (Folsom, Joslin, & Yoder, 2005). At NACADA conferences, presentations on training (and how to do it with little cost) abound as academic advising programs scramble to keep both their new and seasoned academic advisors up to date on academic advising trends and research, as well as professionally satisfied with their role. Research shows that quality academic advising increases student retention (Nutt, 2003), yet academic advising remains one of the least acknowledged professions or responsibilities within institutions. As a result, academic advisors often find themselves feeling stuck, with no room to grow or transition to another opportunity in higher education.

**Research Problem**

Along with the five problems mentioned above, weaving throughout is the university culture’s often unclear and conflicting perspective on academic advising. How an institution defines and values academic advising plays a critical role in how faculty and professional academic advisors develop in this role. A professional academic advisor’s practice, in particular, is constrained by this culture, given that academic advising is their primary role. As Robbins (2013) speculated, advisors at different institutions, even accounting for similar institution size, may experience completely different definitions of academic advising. The same could likely be said for large institutions with decentralized academic advising models. The problem, then, is that institutions are not engaging in critical reflection on how the culture and understanding of academic advising affects academic advisors’ development, much
less how these perspectives may differ from NACADA advising standards. Development of new academic advisors warrants a closer look, given that only 40% of reporting institutions on the 2011 ACT survey provided pre-service training to new academic advisors (Voller, 2011). If academic advisors are to support students in their development and provide a learning environment, university support of academic advising is vital. To address this problem, it is first necessary to examine the history of academic advising and the development of a professional role.

History of Academic Advising

Academic advising, as a practice, has evolved over time just as universities have evolved—changing from a faculty role to a role that is also held by professional academic advisors. As universities and colleges first expanded and specialized, curriculum diversified. The focus on students shifted to include out-of-the-classroom pursuits. Individuals that could guide students through their academic careers separate from classroom instruction were needed. Tracing the history of academic advising from the founding of early colleges up to today is necessary in understanding the current iteration of academic advising on college campuses.

1636-1800s

The founding of Harvard College in 1636, and the subsequent development of the liberal arts college model, saw the advent of higher education in the United States. Prior to the late 1700s, colleges were mostly residential, enrolled only males, and focused on the development of ministers, lawyers, and doctors, with many of the students not completing degrees (Thelin, 2004). In addition to the responsibility for student academic development, faculty and presidents were also responsible for student “extracurricular activities, their moral life, and intellectual habits. They acted in loco parentis” (Cook, 2009, p. 18). With many of the male students
enrolled as young as fourteen (Thelin, 2004), universities acted as stand-in parents who were there to monitor not only academic, religious, and moral progress but also to discipline when necessary.

The mid-1800s saw the admission of women into colleges and the creation of the “dean of women,” a role often considered the precursor to academic advisors and the first iteration of higher education attending to an underserved population (Cook, 2009; Thelin, 2004). Around that same time, Kenyon College established the first known formal system of academic advising, in which each student was assigned to a faculty member (Cook, 2009). Moving into the late 1800s, interactions between students and faculty were contentious, as administration became very strict, enacting specific rules and guidelines for students. As a result, the divide between faculty and students was broadened; students were prone to rebellion until the establishment of the elective system in the 1870s (Kuhn, 2008).

The elective system created a sense of peace between students and faculty as it provided more choices for students (sorely lacking before this time), fostered more faculty and student interactions, and decreased the dependence on professor lectures; this allowed students to spend more time in labs and seminars (Kuhn, 2008). The elective system also gave colleges and universities the ability to specialize the subjects professors taught and researched, as well as the development of independent institutions for medicine and law (Thelin, 2004). As the disciplines expanded, faculty focused less on the role of disciplinarian and more on guiding students through class choice and career focus. This change in faculty role also brought new administrative responsibilities, such as specialized Deans and orientation programs, which were not relegated to faculty members (Cook, 2009; Kuhn, 2008).
With the implementation of the elective system, the gap between faculty and students lessened as faculty served as guides for a student’s academic exploration and development. Students were no longer relegated to a paternalistic relationship with the college; instead, the relationship acknowledged that students were free thinkers and able to make responsible choices (Gillispie, 2003). Prior to World War I, select colleges and universities assigned students to specific faculty advisors to facilitate the selection of an academic path. For example, Penn State designated a board of freshman faculty advisors with each member assigned thirty freshmen. These faculty advisors would “mould and direct the lives of men during the plastic period of freshman year” (Cook, 2009, p. 28). In 1906, the establishment of faculty advisor systems and assigning academic advisors were considered a fad, one designed to help with “the selection of classes and to help bridge the ever-widening gap in student-faculty relations” (Cook, 2009, p. 20). At this time, academic advising was not considered a fully defined role (Cook, 2009).

After World War I, higher education saw a proliferation of counselors and administrative roles that focused on individual students as a reaction to a perceived impersonal education at many institutions (Cook, 2009). With increased faculty specialization and curriculum complexity, out-of-the-classroom opportunities, and the acknowledgment of the needs of students created, there was a critical need for counselors that could focus on the personal, vocational, and academic interests of students (Cook, 2009) and move beyond a few select programs viewed as fitting all students. The interest in student counseling was also strengthened by industrial psychology practices used during World War I to place recruits in roles based on
their strengths and interest. These practices were integrated into colleges and universities by trained counselors to assist students with vocational and academic guidance (Gillispie, 2003).

In the early 1920s, colleges acknowledged that the responsibility of academic advising required assistance from across campus. As a result, academic advising was no longer a pursuit only for faculty advisors and was increasingly assigned to staff. In the 1930s, “student personnel work” appeared and academic advising was considered part of this work though separate from career guidance and counseling (Cook, 2009). Still, academic advising was not clearly defined at this point (Cook, 2009). The University of Chicago, in 1932, stated that the fundamental principles for counseling students

were a) concern for the whole student, b) recognition that transition to a university can be difficult, c) nonacademic factors can affect the academic enterprise, d) personal relationship with certain faculty members are necessary, e) some faculty members are better counselors than others, f) faculty members are preferred counselors, and g) students should have the same counselor for a sufficient period of time (Cook, 2009, p 21).

Using these principles, the university created a faculty counseling structure where each college assigned faculty counselors to their students. The faculty members worked with students on more than course selection, including topics from the fundamental principles listed above. Very few academic advising structures during this time included professional academic advisors and literature published during this period mentions a strain between faculty and professional academic advisors, calling for an end to the contentious relationship and the either/or mentality (Cook, 2009).
From the 1940s to 1970s, universities were characterized by a large jump in student enrollment, a change in perspective related to professional academic advisors, and an increased focus on the role academic advising plays in student development. With the advent of the GI Bill of Rights, many veterans attended colleges and universities, an increased enrollment that included students with unique needs. Colleges had to expand counseling services and other veteran-specific programs to address veterans’ mental health and desire for career exploration. This period also saw the advent of professional academic advisors as many institutions established offices focused primarily on academic advising. Professional academic advisors were touted as a supplement to faculty advisors, not a replacement, with a focus on course selection and registration (Cook, 2009).

According to Cook (2009), academic advising was a more defined and examined activity by the late 1950s. A report published in 1958 by the *North Central Quarterly* attempted to establish the current state of academic advising across the United States. The report recommended that faculty serve as academic advisors because it is an extension of teaching, suggested that academic advising needed a clear and defined philosophy, and addressed the undercurrent of distrust between faculty advisors and professional academic advisors (Cook, 2009). Following this report, the 1960s saw the establishment of the centralized academic advising center and the use of peers for academic advising. However, academic advising was still viewed only as assisting students with academic planning, with a separation of counseling and academic advising (Cook, 2009).

Exploration of academic advising as more than just course scheduling happened during the 1970s. Due to the variety of options available to students in terms of financial assistance,
open admissions, and community colleges, approaches for student development changed as the diversity of the student population increased and access to colleges and universities expanded. In 1972, the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education recommended an increased focus on academic advising (Cook, 2009). That same year, two foundational academic advising articles established student development as the basis for academic advising. These two articles, one by Crookston (2009) and the other by O’Banion (2009), defined academic advising as a developmental practice as well as focused on academic advising as a learning and teaching practice where the academic advisor and student negotiate the power dynamic while both learn from each other. Furthermore, O’Banion (2009) felt that academic advising should build from the student’s career aspirations and goals, to major selection, and then finally, to course registration.

The first ACT survey of academic advising in 1979 showed that faculty were academic advisors at many institutions, academic advising was considered a low-status function, and was primarily means to share information with students (Cook, 2009). Additionally, only a small number of assessment programs existed, hardly any institutions had comprehensive policies related to academic advising, and despite increased conversations on academic advising, very few institutions focused on the practice (Cook, 2009; Carterensen & Silberhorn, 1979 as cited in Cook, 2009).

With the increased numbers of professional academic advisors and the national attention on academic advising, it was only natural that groups of academic advisors from across the nation would establish ways to share information and communicate (Cook, 2009; Kuhn, 2008). The result was NACADA, the National Academic Advising Association (as it was called then), which was established in 1979. NACADA brought together faculty and professional academic
advisors to discuss the practice of academic advising as well as promote research and best practices. By the end of the 1970s, academic advising was in the initial stages of being a recognized practice focused on academic guidance and student development.

1980s-1990s

The 80s and 90s saw increased appropriations to higher education as the economy rebounded and with this, a “quest” to recruit top faculty and students while focusing on diversity and social justice; this still carries to modern times (Thelin, 2004). During the 80s and 90s, there was continued recognition of academic advising as a developmental practice intent on more than course selection and registration. It was also viewed as separate from counseling, along with a continuation of research on academic advising practices, definitions, and student outcomes. As campus models evolved beyond solely faculty advisor models, academic advising became, “a holistic developmental approach by student personnel staff and professional academic advisors to aid students in achieving academic, career, and personal development goals” (Cook, 2009, p. 24). Various academic advising models, such as collaborative peer-group interactions, student learning, and an academically centered model, were proposed to justify not only the practice but also to establish student and academic advisor outcomes. Developmental advising, established in the 70s, was operationalized in the 80s to provide guidelines for faculty and professional academic advisors (Cook, 2009).

In 1981, academic advising was made a research descriptor in the Educational Resource Information Center (ERIC) (Cook, 2009), which ushered in recognition of academic advising research. As research on academic advising developed, so did the connection between student development and developmental advising; research on students showed a clear preference for academic advisors that spent time getting to know the student and fully assisting with academic,
career, and personal development. In fact, some researchers endeavored to operationalize academic advising independent of campus or delivery system (Cook, 2009) to better understand the role of academic advising and promote academic advising student outcomes. ACT continued to survey administrators regarding academic advising policies and practice. Unfortunately, only minor changes were noted between the second survey administered in 1983 and the third survey in 1987, with little growth shown in the use of developmental advising as an academic advising model on campuses during the survey period. Toward the end of the 90s, academic advising publications started to call on assessment standards for academic advising.

**2000-now**

Changing resources, increased research, demands for outcomes, and a changing student population in the early 2000s up to current times have increased pressure placed on academic advising to prove its worth. Research and opinion connected academic advising to student retention – the stronger the academic advising program and the more interactions students had with an academic advisor, the more likely they were to persist and graduate (Nutt, 2003). Academic advising programs, bolstered by revised CAS standards and the adoption of a learning-centered paradigm, developed outcomes for the student that focused on what the student learns through academic advising and not on how academic advising develops a student. Additionally, students, while more connected to technology, were less likely to be academically prepared and more likely to feel pressured to succeed to a higher level; “their helicopter parents came with them” (Cook, 2009, p. 26). Currently, funding for academic advising programs and recognition of academic advising is still a low priority for many institutions.

The rich history of academic advising mirrors substantial growth and changes within higher education over the last few decades. As the recognition of student service-oriented fields
and the increased specialization of the college curriculum continue to occur, so too does the need for individuals that can assist college students in navigating these changes.

**History of Professional Academic Advising**

Academic advising is not yet at the point where it can be defined as a profession, field of study, or discipline (Habley, 2009; Kuhn & Padak, 2008; Shaffer et al., 2010). However, there is a short, yet rich, history on the rise of the academic advisor as a defined, specialized role, one different than faculty advisor. What follows is a brief exploration of how the role of professional academic advisors developed as well as the history of NACADA, the Global Community for Academic Advising.

**Prior to 1970**

Prior to WWII, academic advising was a faculty role in most institutions, with few exceptions, due to a focus on course selection in a discipline (Cook, 2009; Kuhn, 2008). If the staff was involved in academic advising, they were likely there to assist with counseling or only focused on freshmen. However, in the 40s, many institutions established personnel offices where professional academic advisors assisted the influx of incoming students with career and academic program exploration after WWII (Cook, 2009). As centers were established to centralize academic advising, the term academic advising was differentiated from counseling as “helping students with academic planning” (Cook, 2009, p. 22). This is the first time academic advising was explored as an action unrelated to the faculty role (Shaffer et al., 2010) and as a separate practice in and of itself.

**1970-2000**

As the number of professional academic advisors increased across the country, in part due to the growth in student enrollment and availability of higher education opportunities, so did
interest in academic advisors meeting to discuss concerns and share ideas (Cook, 2009; Kuhn, 2008). The Global Community for Academic Advising, NACADA, was established in 1979, three years after a statewide academic advising conference in California and two years after a national conference in Vermont. During this same time period, ACT conducted a national survey on academic advising that showed faculty still served primarily as academic advisors and highlighted the tension between professional and faculty academic advisors (Cook, 2009).

There was continued discussion on academic advising reaching beyond practitioners and universities in the 1980s. To recognize the research base and professional nature of academic advising, NACADA crafted a Statement of Core Values, published the *NACADA Journal*, which established a national recognition program for faculty and professional academic advisors, and held summer institutes (Cook, 2009). The Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS) established guidelines for student service programs, including academic advising, which focused on establishing a mission and policies for the program at each institution. NACADA also published the first comprehensive work on academic advising, *Handbook of Academic Advising*. During this decade, there was substantial growth in the professional development of academic advising, offered through NACADA as well as an explosion in membership. This growth continued into the next decade, with NACADA offering scholarships to its members as well as establishing a website and monograph series (Cook, 2009). Outside of the NACADA Journal, Pennsylvania State University established an online journal, *The Mentor.*

**2000-now**

With the exponential growth of professional academic advisors and the increase in membership of NACADA, the organization explored ways to further the development of its
members. To facilitate this, NACADA offered an online certificate, and later, a master’s degree, in academic advising through Kansas State University. CAS revised the academic advising program standards to include student learning and development, which further aligned with the learning-centered paradigm many academic advising centers were adopting (Cook, 2009).

Current research continues to examine academic advising approaches and student satisfaction, but recently, focus has shifted to the profession of academic advising itself (what it is, what an academic advisor does, and how an academic advisor develops). Additionally, the development of academic advisor job families, expanded roles related to academic advisor training, further professional development, and intentional assessment, as well as campus-wide academic advising directors further facilitate the growth of the role of professional academic advisors.

**Definitions**

This study is informed by the following definitions:

**Academic Advising**

Although academic advising can be and has been defined in multiple ways, the following broad perspective of academic advising is used to guide this research study. Academic advising takes place in "situations in which an institutional representative gives insight or direction to a college student about an academic, social, or personal matter. The nature of this direction might be to inform, suggest, counsel, discipline, coach, mentor, or even teach" (Kuhn, 2008, p. 3). This definition was selected because of its broad perspective, which goes beyond course registration to include counsel, teaching, and mentoring – words often evoked by professional academic advisors when describing their practice and role.
Faculty Advisor

Self (2008) defines faculty advisors as “those individuals whose primary responsibility at the institution is to teach or conduct research,” and academic advising may be “one of many additional responsibilities assigned” (p. 267). At many institutions of higher education, faculty serve as the primary academic advisors for students – graduate and undergraduate. For this study, a faculty advisor is any member of the faculty, full-time or adjunct, who has the primary role of teaching and research and is also assigned, as part of their responsibilities, the role of academic advising.

Academic Advisor

As discussed previously, academic advising was historically the role of faculty; however, recent NACADA data indicates an increase in the number of non-faculty members that serve as academic advisors (Self, 2011). Academic advisors, for this study, refer to “individuals who have been hired to focus primarily on academic advising activities that promote the academic success of students, with additional attention to general student development at the institution” (Self, 2008, pp. 267-268). Furthermore, in this study specifically, academic advisors serve in a full-time capacity and the job description requires at least a bachelor’s degree.

Development

Development is viewed as the process by which an academic advisor comes to understand the purpose and role of their position. This process can include training, formal education, self-directed learning, or other means. It is important to note that the researcher does not view development as a “one-and-done” process, but instead, as a process that continues throughout the academic advisor’s time in the role.
Researcher Positionality

For close to a decade, I had the privilege of working with undergraduate students as an academic advisor through several institutions, including a few years at the study location. Three years into the profession, I was exposed to NACADA and the notion that academic advising is more than course scheduling. Since that introduction to NACADA, my perspective on academic advising has undergone a dramatic transformation, moving from academic advising as course registration to academic advising as a practice that attends to the holistic needs of a student. The struggle to communicate that academic advising is more than course registration and show how it contributes to retention and graduation to colleagues, students, and administrators has led me to consider how institutions of higher education socialize new academic advisors to the profession. If academic advising is truly more than course scheduling (and I know that it is), then how are institutions attending to this through their organizational culture as it supports and/or impedes academic advisor development? Admittedly, it is hard to separate self from this research study.

Additionally, I am approaching this qualitative study as a post-positivist researcher. Although traditionally used in quantitative research, the post-positivist perspective argues that absolute truth can never be found (though research should make strides to find this truth) and that “causes probably determine effects or outcomes” (Creswell, 2009). As a researcher I am concerned with how we know and understand reality and use theory to assist with explaining and predicting that understanding and the resulting outcomes (VanWynsberge & Khan, 2007).

Organization of the Dissertation

From here forward, academic advising will be referred to as advising and academic advisors will be referred to as advisors. Chapter two consists of an overview of literature on academic advising standards, approaches, and training; organizational culture research; and
research on organizational socialization in business and higher education. The chapter concludes with an in-depth explanation of the two perspectives that form the theoretical framework of this study – NACADA core competencies of academic advising and organizational socialization. Chapter three provides the reader with an understanding of the methodology employed with a description of the type of case study, methods used, and the participants involved. The data collection and analysis processes are also described in chapter three. Chapter four offers the results of the study by each college and at the university level. The final chapter provides a discussion of the results, implications for practice, and possible further research.
CHAPTER ONE - LITERATURE REVIEW

To understand how organizational culture supports or impedes a new advisor’s development through advising core competencies and organizational socialization, it is first necessary to explore the literature for each. What follows is a survey of documents that inform how advising is understood within the profession, research on theories and approaches to advising, and research on how advisors are trained. This review explores research on organizational socialization for newcomers as well as research on higher education institutions employing organizational socialization as a theoretical framework. Finally, it fully defines the core competencies of advising and organizational socialization to demonstrate how each serves as part of the theoretical framework of this study.

Advising Purpose and Standards

In late 2017, NACADA released the core competencies of academic advising to complement the previously released concept of academic advising and the updated core values of academic advising. These documents, in addition to the CAS standards for academic advising, are referred to as the pillars of advising and serve as “guiding principles [to] affirm the role of academic advising in higher education” (NACADA, n.d.e.). NACADA also maintains that these pillars can be used for implementing programs, assessment, and, of importance within this study, professional development (NACADA, n.d.e.). Created by professionals in the field, these documents are not based on a single approach, theory, or research study.
The first pillar, the *concept of academic advising*, is the association’s statement on advising; it has three components: curriculum, pedagogy, and student learning outcomes (NACADA, 2006). These three components provide an overview of advising “regardless of the diversity of our institutions, our students, our advisors, and our organizational structure” (NACADA, 2006).

The curriculum of advising focuses on what advising deals with, such as the institution’s curriculum and mission, “development of life and career goals,” resources, policies, and the development of advisors’ skills (NACADA, 2006). The pedagogy of advising, or “how advising does what it does,” consists of the strategies and techniques necessary to advising (NACADA, 2006). The pedagogy acknowledges that these may vary by advisor and office but emphasizes the critical relationship between advisor and student. Finally, the learning outcomes serve as the result of advising; it is what students will know, do, and value because of advising. These outcomes are based on an institution’s mission and goals as well as those of the advising unit (NACADA, 2006). The *concept of academic advising* defines the philosophy behind the practice of advising while leaving open the possibilities of who can serve as an advisor, how an advisor is developed, how advising is structured, and how an institution defines advising.

The *core values of academic advising* are the second pillar. Recently updated and developed by a task force with member contributions, it is meant to represent the values of the profession. According to NACADA (2017b), “these values apply to all who perform academic advising by a role, title, or position as educators at their institutions.” The seven core values are caring, commitment, empowerment, inclusivity, integrity, professionalism, and respect.

Caring refers to how advisors build relationships with their students and others, as well as their ability to be accessible and responsive. As demonstrated by assessment and education,
advisors are committed, the second value, to the success of their students as well as colleagues, institution, and the profession. To address the third value of empowerment, advisors empower others by motivating, encouraging, and supporting students and the higher education community. For the value of inclusivity, advisors foster supportive environments for diverse populations. Advisors act with integrity, the next value, by deliberately practicing and valuing “honesty, transparency, and accountability to the student, institution, and the advising profession” (NACADA, 2017b) In order to demonstrate the value of professionalism, advisors act in accordance with the values of the profession and their institution. Finally, advisors uphold the value of respect by honoring students through “understanding and appreciating the students’ views and values, maintaining a student-centered approach and mindset, and treating students with sensitivity and fairness” (NACADA, 2017b). The core values of academic advising are essentially the characteristics an advisor should embody regardless of title, practice, or institutional structure. As with the concept of academic advising, the core values do not define who advises, how advising is structured, or how an advisor is developed. However, the core values of academic advising do further define how to advise.

The latest addition to the NACADA advising pillars, the academic advising core competencies model was developed by NACADA’s professional development committee to “identify the broad range of understanding, knowledge, and skills that support academic advising…” (NACADA, 2017). The third pillar classifies these competencies into three components; conceptual, informational, and relational. These three components are constantly supporting and interacting in advising practice and serve to inform the other components. The conceptual component refers to the delivery of advising, which includes the theories an advisor must know to be effective. The informational component refers to the knowledge (procedures,
policies, curriculum) an advisor must possess in assisting students at their institution. The final component, relational, includes the skills necessary to foster relationships with students and implement the other two competencies (NACADA, 2017). These competencies are essentially a “how-to” guide for advising, serving as a framework for the development of an advisor. Core competencies are one of the two approaches used as the theoretical framework for this study; they will be explored more in depth later.

The fourth pillar of advising, CAS standards for academic advising, was developed by the Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS). CAS has developed standards for other components of higher education as well. The advising standards created by CAS are meant to serve as guidelines, as a tool to assess the effectiveness of advising programs and offices, and as means for training (Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education, 2014). These standards provide programs with direction for the development and evaluation of the mission, the program (including student outcomes, programming, and intentional design), leadership, human resources, ethics, law and policy, diversity, internal and external relations, financial resources, technology, facilities, and assessment (Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education, 2014.)

Only a small amount of research has been conducted on the effects the pillars of advising have on the advising profession and advisors themselves. At the time of this study, one research article discussed the influence of CAS standards on advising programs and advisors while another one discussed advisor competencies; though not the specific competencies described by NACADA. Keeling (2010) explored how CAS standards are used by offices who claim they follow the standards. Employing a qualitative approach, Keeling visited five different advising offices and interviewed advisors and advising administrators across all sites. The study found
that CAS standards “exert the most influence on practice when a champion promotes and implements them” (Keeling, 2010, p. 12). In some instances, Keeling (2010) found that the CAS standards clearly influenced practices while in other circumstances, practices may have mirrored the standards, but direct influence remained unclear. The direct influence of the CAS standards was demonstrated by one site with advisors being assigned a specific population of students and at another site through their assessment strategy. The researcher indicated difficulty finding sites that used the CAS standards, despite the sense from the advising community that many programs follow them (Keeling, 2010).

Published after the release of the NACADA academic advising core competencies, but based on research conducted prior to the release, Menke, Stuck, and Ackerson (2018) explored the competencies needed for entry-level advisors. Using the Delphi method to build consensus among experts in the field, advisors in the role for at least five years, they attempted to build a consensus on competencies within three surveys. They found that communication, listening, and interpersonal skills consistently ranked among the most important competencies, but the rankings widely varied after the top three depending on the time that the participants served within an advising role (Menke et al., 2018). The researchers saw this as an example of the “variety of competencies necessary coupled with the varied environments where academic advisors work with students” (Menke et al., 2018, p.18). Additionally, Menke et al. (2018) felt this supported the need for advising, as a profession, to identify the competencies necessary for advising and to identify ways to support this development.

Instead of demonstrating a lack of awareness of the skills necessary to perform in the role or of the NACADA pillars, Keeling (2010) and Menke et al. (2018) show there is a lack of understanding of the value of both. Furthermore, these two articles highlight the struggle of
advising to define what is necessary for practice. These studies also give a sense in the advising community of inherently utilizing the pillars simply because one is an advisor.

Advising Approaches and Theory

Although little research has been conducted on how the pillars of advising effect the practice of advising, the profession, and programs, there are a fair number of studies on how advising approaches and related theories can be beneficial for students. For this study, the concern is not on the use of the theory or approach, rather, it is concerned by the minimal focus there is on an advisor’s ability to employ these approaches and how they assist with advisor development. It is important to highlight that there is no concrete theory of, or for, advising; instead, advisors employ multiple approaches to advising or use theories of development from other disciplines (Williams, 2007). However, there have been discussions on a normative theory of advising (Lowenstein, 1999, 2009). What follows is an overview of heavily cited and popular in practice approaches to advising.

Developmental Advising

Attributed in large part to Crookston, developmental advising is viewed as a foundational advising approach and is considered the first approach that offered a view of advising as more than course selection. It is frequently referenced in introductory advising texts as well as when innovative approaches are described. Developmental advising is often contrasted with prescriptive advising, an approach where the advisor has the authority, answers questions, and provides no real guidance beyond academic concerns (Crookston, 2009; Williams, 2007).

Crookston’s foundational article on developmental advising, published around the same time that NACADA was founded, is based on two assumptions: learning is an opportunity that leads to a “self-fulfilling life” (Crookston, 2009) and teaching is part of any experience the
students encounters. In fact, the student may be the teacher to others. For Crookston (2009), the relationship between an advisor and a student is important as neither holds complete power. Instead, it is negotiated, and both parties should learn from each other during the advising conversations.

This advising approach views advising as means to foster the development of the student in the academic setting and the world around them. Students are viewed as having potential and the ability to motivate themselves as they strive for “self-enhancement” (Crookston, 2009, p. 79), seeking rewards of personal growth while aiding others. They can mature and grow as well as develop meaningful relationships. According to this advising approach, students can negotiate control of advising conversations and roles, understand the responsibilities of pursuing an education and relationships, and see the advisor and themselves as equally involved in the outcomes. Finally, they are open to self-evaluation and able to negotiate roles in a relationship with the advisor. During these interactions, the advisor is not the sole owner of knowledge and director of the conversation; instead, the student shares custody of such activities (Crookston, 2009). How does an advisor do this? Developmental advising is an approach that illustrates what advising should do for the student and how the student develops because of advising. Yet, little is said about the effect it has on the advisor, beyond learning more about the student, nor how an advisor could develop through this approach.

Often mentioned in the same breath as Crookston and published in the same year, O’Banion (2009) developed a model for two-year school advisors, which assisted students in finding a program of study that would help them develop to their fullest potential. O’Banion (2009) viewed this model as a logical sequence focused on exploring life and career goals, selecting a program, reviewing courses required for that program, and registering for courses that
helped the student move forward in the program as it related to their life and career goals.

Whereas Crookston’s view of developmental advising is one that lacks an obvious way to be utilized, O'Banion’s theory provides a clear progression that can be operationalized. Still, there is little is known about how this approach is employed by advisors and/or what effect it has on their development and understanding of their role.

Over the years, several authors have revisited developmental advising, discussing both how it has evolved and the ways it has informed newer advising approaches. In 2013, Grites found that although Crookston was cited in many resources since publication, the approach has struggled to be operationalized and to take hold in practice. For many advising units, the focus is primarily on course selection and less on the overall development of the student. Hendey (1999) discussed O’Banion and Crookston in concert to evaluate developmental advising for its practicality. For Hendey (1999), Crookston’s approach is a bit grandiose, but should still serve as a guide for advisors. Fielstein (1994) also revisited Crookston after a study conducted on student preferences for developmental and prescriptive advising, which showed that students highly ranked many aspects of prescriptive advising. Fielstein (1994) argued that prescriptive and developmental advising were not opposing approaches, but instead, worked in tandem depending on the needs of the student an advisor was working with. After all, some students may prefer an advisor tell them their next steps while another student may be open to discussions about life aspirations and how their courses fit their goals. Fielstein (1994) focuses on the student’s perceptions and desires for advising approaches, with little to be said for the effect this has on the student’s development or the specific tactics employed by the advisor.

Developmental advising is not without its detractors, and as a result, many other approaches have been developed over the years. Even still, developmental advising remains a
hallmark of advising, with many articles referencing its foundation, exploring how it could be used in practice, or examining where it falls short.

**Advising as Teaching**

With some roots established in Crookston’s developmental view of advising, advising as teaching is now somewhat of a catchphrase in the world of advising (with bumper stickers available for purchase). Advising as teaching, in contrast to developmental advising, is viewed as being more readily accessible to faculty advisors and more in line with the role of the curriculum. Taking a more literal approach to this view, Hurt (2007) proposes that advising, much like teaching, should consist of learning outcomes, delivery tools, and assessment. While no estimation of the effect on students is offered, the thought behind Hurt’s approach is that advising as teaching contributes to a student’s overall development.

Taking a more theoretical perspective than Hurt, Lowenstein (1999, 2009) provides a learning-centered paradigm (originally called academically centered and later expanded) as a normative theory of advising, an alternative to developmental advising. There is no empirical research on the effect of the learning-centered paradigm on either students or advisors. Developmental advising is seen as a “theory about the content of advising” (Lowenstein, 1999) while the learning-centered paradigm provides an alternative approach to the content of advising. The difference lies in how students are centered in the process; with developmental advising, the focus is on growth and development; with learning-centered advising, the focus is on the student’s academic learning (Lowenstein, 1999). Why does this difference matter? Focusing on academics allows the learning to become active and assists the student in understanding the “logic of the curriculum” (Lowenstein, 2009, p. 127). As a result, the advisor “seeks to help the students decide, in the context of his or her emerging understanding, the direction, goals, and
logic of his or her education” (Lowenstein, 2009, p.128). This approach enables the advisor to assist the student through the curriculum so that it is no longer a series of checkboxes, but instead, a series of connected pieces that support continued learning.

Hemwall and Trachte (2009) also proposed a learning-centered approach for advising to address the issues they saw in developmental advising. To them, developmental advising had lost sight of the mission of higher education and was a term being used for different things. Additionally, they viewed developmental advising as perpetuating the divide between faculty and professional advisors because it did not provide a focus on learning. The learning-centered approach, based in practice, would encourage advisors to “engage their advisees in dialogue about the purpose and meaning of course requirements” as well as “engage [students] in critical self-reflection or to see the connection between ideas and consequent action” (Hemwall & Trachte, 2009, p. 116). According to the authors, this approach differs from developmental advising through its focus on self-transformation and change, not personal development, and the notion that advisor and advisee are not equal.

Building on Hemwall and Trachte’s “advising as learning,” Kelley (2008) layered Fink’s learning paradigm on to the approach. According to Kelley, Fink believed that ‘significant learning’ changes the individual and that advising based on this paradigm could bring about meaningful change within the student. Kelley’s (2008) interpretation of Fink for advising conversations follows fluid movement between three separate stages and six categories of significant learning. The key role of advising in this approach, like Hemwall and Trachte, is the change within the advisee because of learning. The student walks away from their advising experience able to think about their learning and apply what they have learned to their life (Kelley, 2008).
Hemwall and Trachte (2009), Kelley (2008), and Lowenstein’s (1999, 2009) articles focus on a theoretical approach to advising. Advising as teaching is less focused on the intrapersonal development and counseling aspect of advising, a departure from many of the advising literature and professional documents. This approach demonstrates how a change in assumptions and outcomes can alter the definition of advising, thereby changing how an advisor develops within their own role.

At this time, no empirical study was found on the effect that a learning-centered approach has on students, much less how an advisor can use this approach in practice. It is appropriate to mention that neither developmental advising, learning-centered advising, nor any of the approaches mentioned below are viewed as central theories of advising. These approaches offer no specific outcomes, suggest no next step based on task completion, and do not attempt to explain why something happens. Instead, the approaches establish how an advisor and student could interact and define the goal(s) of the advising process.

Other Advising Approaches

Developmental advising and advising as teaching remain as theoretical ways to engage students in the advising process. Yet, there are many other approaches that provide more practical applications for advising, such as hermeneutics, full range advising, proactive advising, appreciative advising, and the use of self-authorship. The approaches discussed below do not provide a complete overview of the advising approaches discussed in the literature; however, they do offer more concrete ways for advisors to apply the approach in practice.

Hermeneutic.

Offered as a space for reflection, hermeneutic theory “is engaged with the question of what it means to understand,” (Champlin-Scharff, 2010, p.59) with a focus on offering students a
way to make meaning of the world around them over time. Using this approach, advisors begin each interaction by working with the student to understand how the student makes sense of things and not simply offering advice (Champlin-Scharff, 2010). In practice, this typically works as two-way conversations consisting of open-ended questions that allow the student to offer their perspectives to the advisor (Champlin-Scharff, 2010; Champlin-Scharff & Hagen, 2013). The goal is not to prescribe a set of courses for the student to take, but to focus on how the student makes sense of the courses in terms of their life goals (Champlin-Scharff & Hagen, 2013). It could be argued that applying hermeneutic theory to advising offers a similar approach to Lowenstein’s previously discussed learning-centered approach, given the focus on how the courses apply to a student’s life.

**Full range.**

Full range advising, based on the full range leadership model, focuses on the transactional and transformational relationship between advisee and advisor (Barbuto, Story, Fritz, & Schinstock, 2011). Barbuto, Story, Fritz, and Schinstock (2011) not only outlined full range advising, but also conducted a quantitative study to assess students’ ratings of effectiveness, satisfaction, and the extra effort of advisors who used transformational advising. Advisors in the study participated in a semester-long training seminar and completed a leadership questionnaire. Their advisees were then asked to complete an online survey. The results found that advisors “who do not give directions to students and wait for students to make mistakes before intervening are viewed as less effective” (Barbuto et al., 2011, p 667), a component of transformational advising, whereas advisors that gave personal attention and showed they cared were viewed as most effective. As one of the few articles to explore both the advising approach and its effect on students, Barbuto et al. (2011) emphasize how advisors can
engage students in the advising process. However, it gives little attention to how the approach alters the definition of advising, how it affects an advisor, and what is necessary for the advisor to use this approach.

**Proactive.**

Proactive advising, also known as intrusive advising, is viewed as a pre-emptive strike approach to advising. The goal is to reach out to the student prior to the first instance of trouble (Varney, 2007); this approach is often used with students that are deemed at-risk. The advisor works to foster a relationship with the student prior to their first week on campus and meets with the student several times a semester (Varney, 2013). Proactive advising is characterized by deliberate student interactions, “purposeful involvement of the student,” and the responsibility of the student to perform (Varney, 2013). The goal of the advisor is to become a part of the student’s life, reaching out to the student before they ask for help, teaching them how the advising process works, and working with the student to address their concerns (Varney, 2013). Despite being widely viewed as an ideal way to engage with at-risk students, there is no research on how this process affects a student or the impact it has on advising. Proactive advising is an approach that can be layered with other approaches, depending on the goals of advising.

**Appreciative.**

Appreciative advising, a popular advising approach, is based on principles found in appreciative inquiry. There are many research studies demonstrating the approach’s ability to increase student retention (Bloom, Hutson, & He, 2013). The framework consists of six phases that advisors may or may not employ in one session: disarm, discover, dream, design, deliver, and do not settle (Bloom et al., 2013). The phases are not necessarily sequential. The approach employs positive, open-ended questions that assist students in focusing on their strengths and
goals as well as the steps to take to get there. For advisors, the strength of appreciative advising are the clearly laid out behaviors and expectations of each phase. Appreciative advising is unique in that it has very specific guidelines for each phase to assist advisors as they engage with students. Additionally, appreciative advising is the only advising approach with training programs, a certificate, a conference, and that focuses not only the effects of the approach on students but also on how advisors develop in and use this approach.

**Self-authorship.**

Self-authorship, a developmental theory, has been introduced to advising in recent years by Pizzolato (2006, 2008) and Baxter Magolda and King (2008). Self-authorship is a transformative process by which an individual learns to internally develop an understanding of the world around them and how their beliefs, values, and identity fit within this understanding (Baxter Magolda & King, 2008). Essentially, they become a self-authored individual who seeks guidance from those around them and are reflective of the decisions they make and how those decisions impact their future (Pizzolato, 2006). Pizzolato argues that using self-authorship by way of the learning partnership model (LPM) promotes the development of the basic outcomes identified by CAS standards, allowing the student to fold these outcomes into their ways of knowing and decision-making processes (Pizzolato, 2006). Pizzolato (2006) developed a quantitative study to examine how the advising relationship supported and provoked students when self-authorship was used. The researcher found that self-authorship is particularly provoking in goal reflection related to major selection and vocation planning. Additionally, advisors were supportive of students as they made sense of the additional information uncovered and the student moved to toward becoming a self-authored individual (Pizzolato, 2006). What is interesting about LPM and Pizzolato’s research, compared to some of the other approaches
discussed, is the focus on how the outcomes of advising relate back to the theory, with less emphasis on how satisfied a student is with the advisor or process.

All the approaches discussed focus on the student - their development, understanding of the curriculum, and how the student makes decisions. These approaches have been explored to varying degrees as they relate to student satisfaction with advising and the advisor as well as the outcomes of the advising process. What remains to be seen is how these approaches and theories alter the understanding of advising overtime as a process and role. Currently, we do not fully understand how these approaches assist an advisor in defining advising or developing in and understanding their role, especially for the new advisor.

**Advisor Training**

A large part of understanding a role comes through training. NACADA has published many monographs, hosted several webinars, and devoted a Clearinghouse page to this topic. From faculty advisors to new advisors, there is much on why to train for advising and how to go about training. O’Banion (2009) called for professionally prepared counselors to assist students in exploring their career and professional goals. Gordon (1982) stated that “one of the most important components of an effective advising program is well-trained academic advisors” (p. 35) and that training should be well thought out and able to “provide the continuity, broad base of knowledge, skills, and specific information crucial to sound advising” (p. 35). Not much has changed in these perspectives over the years – NACADA and higher education still call for highly trained advisors to serve students.

Despite the acknowledgment that training can lead to improvement or growth of an advisor’s skills and ability to relate to students, there is still “little or no formal training” (Folsom & Scobie, 2010, pg. 15) at most institutions. In part, this is due to the pressures put upon advisor
trainers to get new advisors into the field and interacting with students as soon as possible (Folsom & Scobie, 2010) as well as the low priority that is placed on advising within an institution. Gordon (1982) found that some advisors are “never formally trained after they are on the job, but are issued a handbook or printed materials and expected to learn how to advise on their own” (p. 35). It does not help that training for advisors varies depending on the institution, the college, the department, or the office that an advisor works within. The topics covered can also vary; advising role and purpose, departmental requirements, institutional resources, advising styles, communication techniques, or student background. NACADA has organized monographs, publications, and interest groups around the idea of advisor training to instill this practice into more areas. Folsom, Joslin, and Yoder (2005) advocated for new advisor training programs, which includes a year-long developmental curriculum that can “recognize proficiency in advising as a developmental process and provide first-year ‘blueprints’ in the form of clear relational and informational expectations” (para. 8).

Many of the NACADA resources on advising training focus on three notions of knowledge for advisors: conceptual, informational, and relational (Folsom et al, 2005; Folsom & Scobie, 2010). Though more recent notions in the field of advising, these three components are expressly represented in NACADA’s pillars of advising and training programs, but come with little explanation on why these areas are of value to advising or how they came about. Conceptual knowledge focuses on the theoretical, historical, and philosophical foundations; informational knowledge focuses on knowledge of the institution and its practices; and relational knowledge explores the ways in which an advisor can develop a relationship with their student (Folsom et al, 2005; Folsom & Scobie, 2010).
Despite this focus on how to train an advisor, evidence on the value of training, whether published by NACADA or other resources, is still sorely lacking. This lack of evidence is not just on professional advisors but faculty advisors as well. Waters (2002) found that faculty advisors often lack training on how to advise. If there is any training for faculty, it tends to focus only on the curriculum, with little understanding of what their responsibilities are as an advisor (Waters, 2002).

The only research-based reference found for training effectiveness comes from an article that refers to student advisors, who perform more of a mentoring role for first- and second-year students. Sciezlo, Neeper, and Smith-Jentsch (2012) sought to understand how the advisee-advisor relationship was affected by training that focused on learning-goal orientation through computer-based advising. This quantitative study found the training had a positive effect on the advisee’s goal orientation and the student advisors were less likely to avoid goal orientation behaviors. Training clearly influenced how the student advisors engaged with the students as well as the outcomes of the advising process. Yet, sparsely any research has been done to demonstrate this at a larger level.

Although advisor training and development beyond the first year is celebrated within the advising field and has articles, monographs, and books devoted to the subject, little is known about the effect of a vigorous training program on the advisor. Many assume training programs focused on the informational, conceptual, and relational aspects of advising support the growth of advisors who are in tune with their students’ needs and who can foster a more professional environment. Additionally, how does training work when there may be no central definition of advising in an office or across a campus or the use of a particular advising approach? Do the informational, conceptual, and relational aspects of advisor training change if an office adopts
appreciative advising or the learning partnership model? There is little to prove the value or the potential effects, whether negative or positive, that training has on the new advisor.

**Organizational Culture**

The culture of an organization is likely to support or impede the development of an individual in their role. Masland (1985) explored a research trend from the 1980s in organizational culture by digging further into higher education institutions. For Masland (1985), organizational culture “focused on the shared values, beliefs, and ideologies which are unique to a campus” (p. 159) and was important in understanding what matters to an organization and the members the culture influenced. To uncover the influence of organizational socialization, he presented not an empirical study, but what he described as “windows” on organizational culture. The four “windows” – sagas, heroes, symbols, and rituals – served to identify the values, beliefs, and ideologies of an organization’s culture. The culture illuminated by these four windows is crucial in understanding the current state of an institution, decisions that are made, and how an individual works day-to-day within this organization. However, Masland’s approach only gives credence to more overt and outward facing aspects of an institution.

Tierney (1988) offered up a different approach to organizational culture in higher education through a framework developed via a case study at Family State College. He stated that organizational cultures are “grounded in shared assumptions of individuals participating in the organization” and that “these assumptions can be identified through stories, special language, norms, institutional ideology, and attitudes” (Tierney, 1988, p. 4). A somewhat similar idea to Masland’s four “windows,” Tierney went on to develop certain concepts, what he calls his framework, to uncover more of the perceptions and attitudes within an organization. The perceptions and attitudes of an organization are important in understanding how decisions are
made, the values of the institution, and the way in which it functions. These six concepts are identified as environment, mission, socialization, information, strategy, and leadership. Tierney (1988) presented his framework without presuming all colleges function the same, but that members could use this framework to “diagnose” their own organizations.

Organizational Socialization

Developing as an advisor is more than learning theories and approaches, following a training plan, or understanding an institution’s culture. The organization in which the advisor is located – college, department, office – plays an influential role in this development. Organizational socialization is how newcomers come to understand their role in an organization as well as the organization’s culture and norms (Van Maanen, 1978; Van Maanen & Schein, 1977). This theory has been used primarily in business and human resources to better understand the experiences of new employees and their development. Below, recent applications to higher education and business are discussed as are alternative perspectives of the approach.

Business Studies

Organizational socialization has wide applications for businesses. It provides an ideal way for the organization to understand the role it plays in developing members as well as identifying how it may fail to achieve its goal. It has been used to understand how new employees take in information, how information is shared, how the needs of new employees have been met, as well as a wide range of other applications.

Information.

Much attention has been paid to how organizations share information and socialize new employees, but Morrison (1995) noticed issues within the research. Morrison (1995) observed that little attention had been paid to the type of information new employees received and how
useful the information was considered. Building off seven types of information (technical, referent, social, appraisal, normative, and organizational), Morrison (1995) addressed “the perceived usefulness and patterns of acquisition of” (p. 134) each information type during assimilation into a role. Through a study on recent graduates of a large business school, he found that the type of information a new employee places most importance on is the information they are most likely to seek out. However, the information the new employee deems as important may not be the information the organization provides, such as political information (Morrison, 2005). It is important for the organization to identify the information that is necessary to perform a role, in addition to the information a newcomer identifies as important to understand the organization in the context of their role themselves. Without the connection between the two, the newcomer is left to identify individuals who hold this information and may share information in a manner not conducive to development.

Hart (2012) also analyzed the information shared with new employees, this time new hotel managers, to explore the content of messages shared. Chao’s socialization content areas (closely related to those employed by Morrison) were used to explain not only the content of messages received but also who communicated the messages to the new employees. Hart (2012) found that messages related to the goals and values of the organization had the highest emphasis; supervisors were the main source of this information. Conversely, coworkers were the largest source of information on the people within the organization. The strength of this study is that it asks the new employees what information they received and how it was emphasized, not just if they possess the knowledge to perform the role (Hart, 2012). Hart (2012) argues that organizational socialization must focus on the content of the information as much as it does the process by which this information is received.
Organizational socialization has also been used to understand how the needs of new employees are attended to by organizations (Gruman & Saks, 2015; Taormina, 2009). Taormina (2009) examined the gaps in organizational socialization research between employee need, organizational culture, and organizational socialization. Taormina (2009) found that including employee needs into the socialization process contributed to greater gains for the employee’s goals and interest in advancement. Coworker support was also ranked highly when addressing the needs of new employees (Taormina, 2009). It is not enough to simply provide information on how to perform a new role, but it is essential to identify what the individual in that role needs to be successful.

Gruman and Saks (2015) also argue that the needs of the employees must be attended to during the uncertain and challenging time of transitioning into a new role. To them, the focus of organizational socialization on learning and knowledge has been to the detriment of organizations and new employees, given the uncertain climate which these organizations are facing. They provided a new framework, Socialization Resources Theory (SRT), to address these concerns. Whereas Taormina placed importance on how information was received and how it related to their needs, Gruman and Saks (2015) placed importance on the information received and the experience the new employee has. SRT is a reimagining of organizational socialization that “focuses on the resources newcomers require for successful adjustment to their jobs, roles, and the organization” (Gruman & Saks, 2015, p. 221). The 17 dimensions and corresponding time periods of SRT are related to specific events and concrete behaviors, with an emphasis on the psychological capital and well-being of employees. This differs greatly from Van Maanen and Schein's (1977) more general approach to tactics of organizational socialization that merely
focused on how a newcomer comes to learn and develop in a role. SRT reflects the larger conversation on well-being and self-care found in many disciplines, with close attention paid to the needs an organization must meet for newcomers to adequately prepare them for their role. Given the recent publication of this approach, no empirical studies were available.

In a much more literal sense, Ponte and Rizzi (2010) continued with the reimagining of organizational socialization by looking at the literature to argue for organizational socialization as a revolving practice. Using the case study of a consulting firm, Ponte and Rizzi (2010) addressed “the ‘how’ and ‘to what extent’ the socialization practice evolves over time and in relation to the other organizational practices” (p. 146). What makes this case study interesting is that during the time of the study, the consulting firm experienced external shock via the acquisition of an IT company; it truly demonstrated how organizations must adapt their practices even during unexpected times. Prior to the “shock,” socialization consisted of formal training and on-the-job aspects that were organized by each department’s human resources division. After the shock, IT was incorporated into the formal training process. Online training lessons were developed and made available for all employees to participate in autonomously. Unfortunately, new employees in need of socialization in the aftermath of the “shock” were hardly considered as the consulting firm sought ways to manage growing from 300 employees to 1,200 and ultimately shrinking back to 300 (Ponte & Rizzi, 2010). The “ambiguous signals” (Ponte & Rizzi, 2010, p. 150) made it difficult for managers to cope and the company felt it was a work in progress. As such, Ponte and Rizzi (2010) highlight a need to understand how organizations cope with socialization in times of transition within the organization.

The literature tells us that new employees place importance on particular types of information and that it is important to address their well-being because transition is often
stressful. New employees also find that the information shared by the organization in formal settings may have immediate benefits in understanding their role, but in the long term, the information lacks the ability to help them integrate into the organization. Further research on how organizations can focus more on the varied needs of new employees while fostering an environment open to reinterpreting the culture is critically needed, especially given the current climate in higher education.

**Higher Education Studies**

The use of organizational socialization to understand the culture of higher education is not new. It has been used to understand the student, staff, and faculty experiences in higher education settings and to assess how different tactics are employed. Organizational socialization has offered insights into the tenure and promotion process, how new student affairs staff navigate their education background and the community college setting, and the information received by faculty advisors. This theory serves to inform some oft-overlooked areas in the onboarding of new members of higher education institutions.

**Faculty.**

Tierney (1997) offers a perspective on organizational socialization in higher education that moves it from a modernist perspective, where culture is out there to be found, to a postmodernist interpretation that allows for multiple perspectives within process. Tierney (1997) was involved in a project that interviewed over three hundred junior faculty members across the United States to gain their perspectives on tenure and promotion processes. The faculty shared that they maintained long hours to complete work, felt that the tasks of research, teaching, and service were ill-defined, and did not hold a sense of “institutional purpose or identity” (Tierney, 1997, p. 12). These tasks were not understood through grand moments such as training,
speeches, or convocations; instead, these moments were understood through daily practices and communication with peers. Tierney (1997) argued that instead of bringing new members into the culture of an organization that is established, the new members’ perspectives should be included in the culture of the organization. This allows difference and discontinuity to be celebrated and socialization becomes a way to think about “us” and rather than “them” (Tierney, 1997). The challenge is how to go about this with an organization that employs many individuals, provides a service to a separate set of individuals, and must meet goals established by the institution, state, and federal government. If new members are constantly brought in to the organization and are expected to contribute to the culture, how is the culture ever understood? Organizational socialization is a language to understand, not a call to action; however, an organization that values the individual contributions of its faculty may find it easier to navigate the perspectives Tierney proposes. How does this apply to staff roles where the individual contribution may not be as valued?

Similarly, Trowler and Knight (1999) found that organizations tend to focus on overt and formal means of socialization for new faculty instead of the more tacit and naturally occurring forms of socialization. In their minds, organizations are in dire need of reconceptualization to focus on means of socialization that are not so obvious that reinvigorate and target the needs of the new individuals (Trowler & Knight, 1999). They call for induction and socialization that operates at the local level (within academic departments) and can allow new members to change the culture (Trowler & Knight, 1999). As with Tierney, this perspective may work well with faculty members whose individual contributions are valued but may have a harder application to certain staff.
Staff.

Organizational socialization has also been used to understand the socialization process for new student affairs staff. Hornak, Ozaki, and Lunceford (2016) framed their study using Van Maanen and Schein’s six dimensions of socialization to understand how new student affairs professionals are socialized in community colleges. This study used semi-structured interviews and focus groups to explore how individuals were prepared for their position, the role prior learning played, and their current experiences (Hornak et al., 2016). Participants’ responses were found to fall into two categories – institutional and professional socialization. Institutional socialization was easily identified whereas professional socialization was not as evident and had no connection to the institution where they were employed. Despite involvement in a professional organization or a graduate degree in the field, what really mattered was how the organization wanted the individual to understand their role (Hornak et al., 2016).

Lombardi and Mather (2016) discussed the experience of new student affairs professionals’ first position out of graduate school through anticipatory socialization. Mirroring the previous studies of Hornak, Ozaki, and Lunceford, Lombardi and Mather (2016) found that formal education in student affairs served as a training ground for expectations leading into the new role. They posited that the professionals experienced the transition in very public ways through the job search process and discussions with others (Lombardi & Mather, 2016). At the same time, the transition was also a private experience as the participants second-guessed decisions, managed expectations, sought fit, and negotiated relationships (Lombardi & Mather, 2016). Lombardi and Mather (2016) highlight the importance of organizations by not only paying attention to how newcomers are socialized when they begin at the organizations but also giving attention to the socialization that takes place leading up the role. The recruitment and
interview process are ideal areas to begin socializing candidates to the expectations of the new role and institution prior to starting.

**Advising.**

Only two research articles were found on organizational socialization and advising; one on faculty advisors (Waters, 2002) and the other focuses on how advisors can use this perspective with their advisees (Yarbrough & Brown, 2003). Waters (2002) asked faculty advisors to complete questionnaires to “categorize the information they received when learning advising responsibilities” (p. 15). Waters (2002) employed Morrison’s seven information types to categorize the information faculty advisors received and how they ranked the information. Faculty advisors reported that training mostly focused on curriculum content (though, often, even this area was lacking) and that their role as a faculty advisor was not made clear (Waters, 2002). Not surprisingly, faculty advisors received the least amount of information on how to work with advisees, but also ranked the need for this information as low (Waters, 2002). Institutions are not socializing faculty to the value of advising nor how to perform this role. Instead, it appears to be a role given low priority despite research that shows the impact advising has on student retention. The purpose of advising and the role of the faculty advisor needs to be defined and clearly articulated before the organization can properly socialize an individual in this role.

Yarbrough and Brown (2003) explored organizational socialization as an ideal way for advisors to assist new students with understanding the value, norms, and behaviors inherent to the university setting. They promoted interactions with students prior to attendance, during the first six weeks of the semester, and throughout the first year; this acknowledged the different skill sets students enter college with and that encourage growth (Yarbrough & Brown, 2003). Organizational socialization can assist in an advisor gauging a student’s adjustment to college
and what areas they may need further assistance with by using the stages described by Yarbrough and Brown (2003). However, this approach relies on the assumption that there is one way in which to adjust to college and does not account for the variety of backgrounds in which students enter college.

Organizational socialization research on college settings focuses on formal opportunities such as training and meetings that inform newcomers of their role and the culture of the institution. These understandings come from the reflection of newcomers on the actions that have been taken against them and not always on how the newcomer enacted on the organization.

**Summary**

Although there are established guidelines for advising, little research has been conducted on the effect they have on the role and process of advising. Most importantly, it is not clear what effect they have on new advisors and the programs designed to assist advisors in understanding their role. The same can be said for advising approaches and theories applied to advising practice. We know the theories and approaches are designed to improve the student’s experience and foster growth, but too little is known about the effect the approaches have on the advisor using them. Understanding how the guidelines, theories, and approaches affect advisors is critical to the experience of new advisors.

Organizational socialization and training show us that the way an individual comes to understand their role is valuable to the organization and the development of the individual. This process further inscribes the culture of the organization or has the power to disrupt it. Organizational socialization demonstrates the effect the organization has on the individual as well as the effect the individual has on the organization. However, in advising, there is little evidence of these areas being investigated and employed.
To this end, it is clear more research is needed on the development and experience of new advisors and the effect the institution has on how they develop in their role. New advisors serve to further the profession and to offer new perspectives, but the way in which organizational culture can support or impede this role is rarely understood. Since the experience of the new advisor is more than this formal setting, focus on training is not enough to investigate new advisor development. Instead, this study proposes the use of organizational socialization and the core competencies for advising as a framework to understand the new advisor experience.

**Theoretical Framework**

This study draws primarily from NACADA’s advisor competencies while also incorporating language from organizational socialization as a framework. Employing these two frameworks provides an advantageous insight into not only understanding what characteristics and skills are deemed necessary to serve as an advisor but also how organizations assist employees in understanding their role.

**Organizational Socialization**

Organizational socialization is how individuals come to understand and assume a new role or position through the ways the position has been structured and introduced by others within the organization (Van Maanen & Schein, 1977). An organization’s culture and norms are based on certain strategies that reinforce the norms and culture. Nonetheless, new members can bring about change even though older members may show opposition or even try to block these changes (Van Maanen & Schein, 1977). Introduced in the late 1970s by Van Maanen and Schein, organizational socialization is different for each role and organization; “not only because people are different, but, more critically because the techniques or strategies of people processing differ” (Van Maanen, 1978, p. 19). The ways in which an individual is socialized to a role and
organization, especially early on, play a huge role in how that person understands, develops, and moves beyond the role (Van Maanen, 1978; Van Maanen & Schein, 1977). However, organizational socialization is not a perfect pathway to the development of an individual in a particular role or the continued development beyond a role; organizational socialization is inherently messy and problematic. Organizational socialization does not attempt to dictate how this is done, it simply serves to describe the process and tactics employed.

**Assumptions.**

The theory of organizational socialization operates on several assumptions related to the individuals and the organization. Most importantly, the theory assumes that individuals going through an organizational transition (moving to a new position or new organization) are in an anxiety-producing situation (Van Maanen, 1978; Van Maanen & Schein, 1977). To reduce this anxiety, individuals attempt to learn their new role as quickly as possible to avoid feelings of loneliness and isolation, understand the social atmosphere, and interact with those around them (Van Maanen & Schein, 1977).

The second assumption is that learning “does not occur in a social vacuum strictly on the basis of the official and available versions of the job requirements” (Van Maanen, 1978, p. 20). Instead, the people the new individual interacts with, such as coworkers, colleagues, and clients, assist the individual with interpreting the situations and experiences encountered. They provide the individual with clues and a sense of accomplishment or failure as they develop in a role (Van Maanen, 1978; Van Maanen & Schein, 1977).

How an individual comes to “carry out their tasks” (p. 20) has a profound impact on the productivity of an organization (Van Maanen, 1978). This third assumption focuses on the passing of knowledge from one person to the next, including the continuous entrenching of
certain values and roles as it assures the mission of the organization is maintained (Van Maanen, 1978; Van Maanen & Schein, 1977). The fourth assumption offers that how an individual adjusts is similar though there are variations in how this occurs and there is always an adjustment, even if the individual is somewhat familiar with the role (Van Maanen, 1978).

The theory makes no assumption that individuals must be socialized in a certain way for a certain role, or that an organization must socialize members. In fact, subscribing to such a notion “leaves little room for individual uniqueness and ignores the always problematic contextual nature of the various ways organizational roles can be filled” (Van Maanen & Schein, 1977, p. 10). Finally, organizational socialization assumes no preoccupation with individual characteristics or a role. Rather, it is concerned with the general and typical strategies of socialization and allows for empirical studies to hone in on the outcomes of the use of such strategies (Van Maanen & Schein, 1977).

**Setting.**

What, then, is an organization? According to Van Maanen and Schein (1977), an organization consists of people that, while individually unique, interact on a regular basis and over time, determine what is undertaken by each member to fill a defined organizational role and how to complete the undertaking. Additionally, members of an organization do not perform in identical manners when completing the same tasks nor do they understand a given situation in the same way. Novel events within an organization are likely to bring members together to make sense of them but may result in different understandings of the organization role and culture (Van Maanen & Schein, 1977). As such, it is important to understand how knowledge of what is necessary to undertake a role is passed on and how members interpret it. Schein's model of the
organization proves helpful in clarifying how the setting assists in understanding a role and passing on knowledge (Van Maanen & Schein, 1977).

**Functional.**

The functional dimension of an organization refers to the tasks of the organization and how they are organized. Often viewed in a circle, the functional dimension divides the organization into departments and programs easily divisible by tasks into slices of a pie (Van Maanen & Schein, 1977). The size of the slice is based on the number of members in that department or program and has very clear boundaries (Van Maanen & Schein, 1977).

**Hierarchical.**

The second dimension of an organization is the hierarchy. The hierarchy indicates which members of the organization are responsible for other members but makes no assumption regarding the direction of behavior by supervisors (Van Maanen & Schein, 1977). Characterized by the structure of a triangle, the hierarchal dimension changes shape depending on the number of supervisory roles, how many hold said supervisory roles, and the number of members that report to the supervisor (Van Maanen & Schein, 1977). Though typically thought of as an equilateral triangle, many organizations will take on flatter, taller, or misshapen formations.

**Inclusion.**

The final dimension in Schein's model, inclusion, “concerns the social fabric or interpersonal domain of organizational life” (Van Maanen & Schein, 1977, p. 19). How well included a member is in an organization depends on how others view the member’s importance and how well they understand the culture of the organization (Van Maanen & Schein, 1977). Harder to visualize than the other dimensions, the inclusion dimension involves a member moving towards the center of an organization (possibly through the hierarchy) but within a
functional area. In short, the newcomer must pass through certain tests before more valuable knowledge is shared and they are deemed an insider (Van Maanen & Schein, 1977).

When the three dimensions are layered together they form a cone, with height and dimension dependent on the hierarchy and functions within as the boundaries that must be crossed become more visible and complicated (Van Maanen & Schein, 1977). Organizations must decide who can cross these boundaries. The crossing of a hierarchical boundary may be based on merit, past performance, and time in a role, while a functional boundary is based on skills or competencies, and an inclusionary boundary will be based on the “fit” within an organization (Van Maanen & Schein, 1977). These boundary crossings are particularly stressful for the member just before and after the crossing; it is not uncommon for this process to change a member in some capacity. Additionally, the inclusionary boundary may be of importance to members in lower ranks of the hierarchy, given the inward movement necessary to cross this boundary (Van Maanen & Schein, 1977). Boundaries within an organization serve as guidelines for how a member understands a role, the tasks required within that role, and the requirements a member must meet to move beyond.

**Individual responses.**

If a member must cross boundaries to take on a role and become a member of an organization, this individual will have a response to this process. According to Van Maanen and Schein (1977), each role consists of a knowledge base that contains solutions to problems regularly encountered, a strategic base that provides the rules for choosing a solution, and a mission that is connected to the organization and other roles. As a newcomer learns a role and crosses boundaries, their knowledge base, strategic base, and mission most likely changes throughout the process (Van Maanen & Schein, 1977).
The newcomer’s response to this process is important to how they understand their role and the organization (Van Maanen & Schein, 1977). Van Maanen and Schein (1977) characterize a newcomer’s response to the process of organizational socialization as two extremes: custodial or innovative. A newcomer may accept the knowledge, strategies, and mission of their new role “as-is” and not question anything; they are learning as a custodial response (Van Maanen & Schein, 1977). However, a newcomer could also question the knowledge shared or refuse to limit themselves to the strategies already in place to perform the role. This response is viewed as content innovation, as it often results in changes to the knowledge and strategies employed by a role. The final response, role innovation, involves a newcomer questioning the mission of the role and actively seeking to make a change (Van Maanen & Schein, 1977). These responses to the knowledge, strategies, and mission employed in a role are informed by the way in which a member is socialized to an organization and a role.

**Tactics of socialization.**

To socialize a new member of an organization, certain strategies or tactics are employed. These tactics, described by Van Maanen and Schein (1977) as “the ways in which the experiences of an individual in transition from one role to another are structured for him by others in the organization” (p. 34), can be employed at any point of an individual’s transition across a boundary to a role, but are primarily used at the beginning. The tactics may also be used in any combination, or not used; the organization is free to decide what tactics to use (Van Maanen, 1978; Van Maanen & Schein, 1977). The tactics employed, and not employed, have consequences and bring about particular results. The seven socialization tactic dimensions are collective vs. individual, formal vs. informal, sequential vs. random steps, fixed vs. variable, serial vs. disjunctive, investiture vs. divestiture, and tournament vs. contest.
**Collective vs. individual.**

The manner and degree of socialization of individuals, either on their own or in groups, constitute the collective and individual socialization tactics (Van Maanen & Schein, 1977). Collective tactics are used when groups are facing a similar transition and are put through a common set of experiences. Individual tactics are employed when a single person is brought on board and must experience the transition alone (Van Maanen & Schein, 1977). In collective tactic, the group can commiserate through these similar experiences and share what has been learned. Resources are pooled from everyone’s experience to create a collective and more homogenous perspective (Van Maanen & Schein, 1977). An individual, however, experiences the transition alone. As a result, this new member will have an individualized change that is dependent on the relationship between the new member and any person(s) training and/or leading the individual through the transition (Van Maanen & Schein, 1977). Individual tactics of socialization are more likely to be employed for more complex roles, where there is one incumbent, whereas collective tactics are used when a larger number of individuals are performing similar roles. Collective tactics are most likely used at functional boundaries and promote a custodial response while individual tactics are used for hierarchal boundaries and the response depends on the desire of the individual leading their training (Van Maanen & Schein, 1977).

**Formal vs. informal.**

Formal tactics of socialization segregate the newcomer from the other organizational members as they are trained for their new role and serve to reinforce their status in the organization (Van Maanen & Schein, 1977). Informal tactics, on the other hand, do not place much emphasis on the new member’s role and the new members are not segregated from other
members of the organization (Van Maanen & Schein, 1977). Formal tactics are focused on the status of the individual coming into the role, placing heavy emphasis on the values the new member develops during their transition (Van Maanen, 1978). Van Maanen (1978) states that “formal socialization processes are often only the ‘first round’ of socialization” (p. 22) while informal tactics come once the new member can perform their role. Formal tactics are typically employed at hierarchical and exclusionary boundaries when a newcomer is taking on a new status or when the newcomer is taking on significant risk; instilling a custodial response (Van Maanen & Schein, 1977). Informal tactics are used at functional boundaries, where negligible risk is involved and can foster a custodial or innovative response in the individual depending on the individual leading the training (Van Maanen & Schein, 1977).

**Sequential vs. random.**

Transitions that lead to a defined role and specific status often employ sequential socialization tactics, a series of steps or experiences that are designed to increase knowledge of that role and status (Van Maanen, 1978). On the other hand, nonsequential, or random socialization, often takes place all in one transition and may be a bit ambiguous or continuously changing (Van Maanen & Schein, 1977; Van Maanen, 1978). With sequential socialization, the way in which the knowledge builds at each stage is of importance, especially if the newcomer is expected to go through a formative change. A logical progression of how knowledge builds is necessary for the new member to come to understand their role and status (Van Maanen & Schein, 1977). Of importance to both sequential and random socialization tactics are the agents who facilitate the transitions. If new members sense a disconnect, they may exploit the opportunity or may find themselves in a situation of missing both skills and understanding (Van Maanen & Schein, 1977). Random tactics of socialization are more likely to encourage
innovative ideas than sequential tactics (Van Maanen & Schein, 1977). Not surprisingly, sequential tactics are associated with hierarchical boundaries and custodial responses from individuals. Functional and inclusive boundaries are associated with random tactics (Van Maanen & Schein, 1978).

**Fixed vs. variable.**

Fixed and variable tactics of socialization refer to the timeframe associated with the steps of transition (Van Maanen & Schein, 1977). Fixed tactics have a timeline that has been communicated with the new member, indicating when the transaction will end, whereas variable tactics consist of a timeline that has not been fully communicated with the new member, if at all (Van Maanen & Schein, 1977). Variable timetables can create frustration and anxiety, but they also allow an administrator to heavily encourage the behavior of the new member. Behavior is encouraged by the administrator as a carrot for some yet-to-be-seen transition to the next step with no determined end date (Van Maanen, 1978). Variable tactics are most likely to be associated with custodial responses, as the instability inspires conformity in the newcomer (Van Maanen & Schein, 1977). Fixed tactics are more likely to relate to hierarchical boundaries and innovative responses (Van Maanen & Schein, 1977).

**Serial vs. disjunctive.**

Serial tactics refer to the process by which “experienced members of the organization groom newcomers who are about to assume similar kinds of positions” (Van Maanen & Schein, 1977, p. 59); it is a way to guarantee that the organization will not change over time (Van Maanen, 1978). Disjunctive tactics are employed when there is no predecessor for that role or no one in a similar position (Van Maanen & Schein, 1977). Individuals in this situation find themselves without a role model and someone to understand the unique problems faced in the
transition (Van Maanen & Schein, 1978; Van Maanen, 1977). In some cases what appears to be serial can, in fact, be disjunctive. For example, as mentioned by Van Maanen and Schein (1977), the case where a 25-year-old is promoted to project manager and is viewed as exceptionally good and bright, but a 50-year-old in the same position is viewed as mediocre and is to serve a mentor to the younger newcomer. The serial process becomes disjunctive when the newcomer is not able to take the mentor seriously and may know more than the mentor. Serial tactics are associated with inclusionary boundaries but may be used at functional and hierarchical boundaries “which are seen by those in control of the process as requiring continuing of skills, values, and attitudes” (Van Maanen & Schein, 1977, p. 62). At the same time, disjunctive tactics are seen at functional and hierarchical boundaries where continuity is not needed (Van Maanen & Schein, 1977).

**Investiture vs. divestiture.**

The processes by which a newcomer’s identity is confirmed or denied are called investiture and divestiture tactics of socialization (Van Maanen & Schein, 1977; Van Maanen, 1978). Investiture strategies support the newcomer’s characteristics and the desires of the organization to build upon and use the skills already possessed (Van Maanen & Schein, 1977). Divestiture tactics “seek to deny and strip away” certain skills and characteristics of the newcomer (Van Maanen, 1978, p. 33), leading to a custodial response. It is no surprise that divestiture tactics instill the continuation of certain dynamics within an institution whereas investiture is likely to bring about innovation.

**Tournament vs. contest.**

Discussed by Van Maanen (1978), tournament and contest strategies are based on the abilities and differences of the members of an organization. Tournament strategies allow the winners of a transition to move forward while those without the skills to move forward become
stagnant or move further down in the organization (Van Maanen, 1978). As the tournament winners continue to move forward, so does their training. The training becomes more advanced; it is not the same as the training others receive. Contest strategies; however, assume each new member starts out equally to all others and that one setback does not result in the loss of opportunities (Van Maanen, 1978). In fact, contest strategies allow for members to assist each other and to develop a “more cooperative and participative spirit among people in an organization” (Van Maanen, 1978, p. 31).

**NACADA Core Competencies of Academic Advising**

NACADA established the *concept of academic advising* and the *core values of academic advising* in the early 2000s to guide advising programs and advisors. In late 2017, NACADA released updated versions of those two foundational documents as well as a guide to *academic advising core competencies*. The competencies “identify the broad range of understanding, knowledge, and skills that support academic advising” (Farr & Cunningham, 2017, p.3) with the intent of guiding the development of advisors (faculty and professional), supervisors, administrators, trainers, and researchers (Farr & Cunningham, 2017). NACADA provides a concise handout on their website as a resource to those responsible for academic advising to be used as a model for use by advisors for self-assessment and evaluation, by faculty and administrators to understand contribution to teaching and learning, supervisors and managers to identify areas for staff development, and by trainers and researchers to guide further research in the field (NACADA, 2017a). This handout is a quick reference, though a more in-depth guide is available for purchase, which was used throughout this study.

The core competencies are based off three components of advising – conceptual, informational, and relational – highlighted in many of NACADA’s publications, especially those
focused on advisor training. The conceptual component consists of “the ideas and theories that advisors must understand to effectively practice the art” (Folsom, 2015, p. 6), such as definitions of advising, student development theories, and the history of advising. The informational component “refers to the knowledge that advisors must gain to guide the students at their institution” (Folsom, 2015, p.6). The relational component is the “communicative skills and interpersonal approaches advisors must build, including those critical to establishing advising relationships with students” (Folsom, 2015, p.6).

**Conceptual component.**

The core competencies in the conceptual component are the least likely to be found in advisor training, for both faculty and professional advisors alike. While foundational, these concepts tend to be a bit more abstract and are often seen more different than the day-to-day role of advising. The core competencies for the conceptual component include understanding the history and role of advising in higher education, NACADA’s core values, theories relevant to advising, advising approaches, the outcome of advising, and perspectives on equity and inclusivity (Farr & Cunningham, 2017).

**Informational component.**

Readily found in most training programs for advisors, the informational component focuses on the knowledge of the advisor. This component relates to the day-to-day, in the trenches work with students. The informational core competencies include knowledge of the mission and values of the institution the advisor works within, that institution’s curriculum, degree programs, policies, procedures, and additional matters of privacy and confidentiality. Also included in this component is the advisor’s knowledge of campus resources, technology, and student demographics (Farr & Cunningham, 2017).
**Relational component.**

The skills an advisor must have in order to build relationships with students are the foundations of the relational component and related competencies. Competencies include “articulat[ing] a personal philosophy of academic advising” (Farr & Cunningham, 2017, p. 18), the skills and tools used to develop rapport and foster relationships – being respectful of others, the ability to facilitate effective advising appointments, assisting a student in understanding the “why” of curriculum, being able to guide student through decision-making and planning, and assessing self and the practice of advising.

**Working Together**

These two frameworks are based in different fields of study, but ground this study in diverse ways. At the root of both frameworks is the authors’ desire to comprehend how someone develops and understands a role. The NACADA academic advising core competencies offer a conceptual view that is specifically focused on the competencies necessary to be an advisor and to support advising broadly. Van Maanen and Schein's organizational socialization theory serves as the theoretical view that describes the relationship between tactics of socialization and the responses elicited by newcomers as they take on a new role.

To bring these two frameworks together, the NACADA academic advising core competencies are used in data collection and analysis that explores the importance of competencies identified by new advisors, advisor trainers, and advising/student support center directors in the development of new advisors and their importance to understanding the role of an advisor. The competencies are also used to explain how the institution views advising. Organizational socialization is the lens and language used to understand the desired response of new advisor development (innovator or custodial), the tactics used to foster the response, and
how well this response aligns with the NACADA *academic advising core competencies*. This is all done to better grasp how organizational culture can support and/or impede advisor development.
CHAPTER TWO - METHODOLOGY

This study focuses on advisors, advisor trainers, and advising administrators, as well as the materials used to describe advising at the institution, in order to explore how the organizational culture at a four-year research institution in the southeastern part of the United States supported and/or impeded the development of new advisors. To first look at how advisors understood and developed in their role, this study used NACADA academic advising core competencies and organizational socialization to structure the data collection and analysis. Secondly, this framework was used to compare advisor development in relation to advising standards within three separate colleges at the institution. Qualitative research principles and methods were used to collect and analyze the data as it related to the following research questions:

1. How can organizational culture support the development of new academic advisors?
2. How can organizational culture impede the development of new academic advisors?

A Qualitative Focus

A qualitative research approach was selected for this study because of the focus on the interactions of daily life and the meanings attributed to them – essentially social phenomenon (Marshall & Rossman, 2011). In post-positivism tradition, as defined by Glesne (2011), research becomes the means to predict, or “make generalizations about social phenomena, to provide explanations about their causes, and to create predictions concerning those phenomena” (p. 7). Observations and carefully designed experiments based on theory are the primary focus of interpretivist qualitative research (Glesne, 2011). As such, it was necessary to interact directly
with new advisors and develop propositions, methods, and analysis based on the theoretical framework to fully understand new advisor development and their own interpretations as well as and how organizational culture impeded and/or supported this development.

**Case Study**

Case study researchers are interested in how participants experience the world around them (Dyson & Genishi, 2005) and “‘how’ or ‘why’ some social phenomenon works” (Yin, 2014, p. 4). This includes the “desire to understand complex social phenomena” (p. 4) and describe them in real-world context (Yin, 2014). This desire perfectly situated the researcher’s aspiration to understand how organizational culture can support or impede the development of new advisors. Additionally, case studies rely on multiple sources of evidence to better understand the case and the phenomenon being studied (Yin, 2014). Multiple sources of evidence further support the post-positivist perspective as these sources provide further causal outcomes of response to the phenomenon. This study employs both the space of the university and the viewpoint of the advisors as well as the language used to define advising and its processes, including the written (and often unwritten) mission and vision statements, training materials, policies, and procedures.

Designed as a descriptive, embedded, single case study, the “case” was a four-year research institution in the southeast United States and the phenomenon was the development of new advisors. The units of analysis were the three separate colleges at the selected four-year institution. Baxter and Jack (2008) stated that the strength of an embedded case study was, “the ability to look at sub-units that are situated within a larger case [because it] is powerful when you consider that data can be analyzed within the subunits separately (within case analysis), between
the different subunits (between case analysis), or across all of the subunits (cross-case analysis)” (p.550).

**Embedded, Single-Case**

As an embedded single-case case study design, the focus was not only on the single institution but also on the multiple advising centers embedded within the institution. It was important to understand both how the organizational culture in college the new advisor works in supported or impeded their development as well as the ways the institutional organizational culture was involved in that development. Three colleges were selected as units of analysis for the study – the College of Business (CBA), the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS), and the College of Engineering (COE).

**Descriptive**

The environment at the selected institution was one of decentralized advising with no guiding force, which is not uncommon in American higher education institutions. However, with the study institution’s large size and multiple colleges, all with varying advising models, a case study was ideal to understand the “how” and “why” of new advisor development when colleges are left to their own devices. A descriptive case study both encouraged the articulation of what was known in a contemporary setting about the phenomena and supported the exploration of propositions and questions related to the phenomena (Yin, 2014). The development of propositions, important to the post-positivist perspective, may be based on theories, personal experiences, empirical data, or other sources and increased the feasibility of the study (Baxter & Jack, 2008). The propositions furthered the post-positivist approach by providing a way to gauge the causal relationship and language to describe the outcomes of this study. The propositions for
this study were based on the researcher’s own personal experience and the theoretical framework:

1. Certain actions and choices bring about development in certain ways (from organizational socialization) and;
2. Expectations and defining a role in ways that conflict with professional standards may confuse what it means to be in particular roles (NACADA core competencies).

**Situating the Theoretical Framework**

Described previously, NACADA *academic advising core competencies* and organizational socialization serve as the framework for this study, from both the purpose and questions to the analysis. Using two frameworks supported the scope of the study and assisted in exploring gaps and contradictions (Glesne, 2011). The NACADA *academic advising core competencies* was the primary means to understand the development of new advisors as the competencies identify the characteristics and skills deemed necessary to perform this role. However, the core competencies only work to identify. They offered no insight on how to develop or understand an advising role. It was important to keep in mind that even as each institution defined and developed a unique advising culture, these NACADA *academic advising core competencies* are considered the professional standards. Additionally, the core competencies, although recently formalized, had long been included in advising literature related to training and development. Notions of these competencies would have been included in data collection and analysis even without the recent formalized version due to the researcher’s familiarity with advising literature and the researcher’s desire to provide a common advising language for the study. The core competencies were also crucial in the development of the propositions guiding data collection and analysis.
Organizational socialization, on the other hand, does offer a means by which to recognize how an individual came to understand and assume a new role or position. Given that the study was approached through a post-positivist lens it was important to have a theory in order to develop propositions related to the phenomena in question, new advisor development, and to provide a common language by which to gauge how development could occur. Yet, organizational socialization offers no commentary on the development of specific skills and characteristics. As such, organizational socialization is the lens and language by which advisor development, based on the core competencies, was studied. Organizational socialization also described the development of the advising culture in each college and at the institution.

**Methods**

This qualitative case study focused on the development of new advisors at a large research institution in the southeast United States. The researcher used interviews, focus groups, and document analysis to better understand new advisors’ development. Given that the researcher approached this study with a post-positivist perspective the use of multiple settings, participants, and data collection and analysis was important to make generalizations about new advisor development.

**Settings**

This study took place at a large research university in the southeast United States. The institution was selected due to the substantial number of professional advisors and advising centers on campus, as well as the researcher’s familiarity with campus advising structures. The institution has decentralized advising procedures and definitions, determined by each college, and employs a mix of professional and faculty advisors. Essentially, each college is free to develop and foster a culture of advising unique to their interpretation of advising. Of note,
professional advisor education and background are not standard across colleges; advisors may or may not have attended NACADA conferences (either annual or regional). The mixed models found at this institution provided a fascinating overview of how new advisors developed without the need to visit multiple institutions for multiple perspectives which further assisted in evaluating the two propositions that guided data collection and analysis.

The Southeast Research University (SERU) enrolled approximately 38,400 students in fall 2018; of those, a little over 33,000 were undergraduate students. SERU has seven degree-granting colleges and one school, with each housing an office or center for advising. All degree-granting colleges at SERU employ professional advisors; the one school only uses faculty advisors. Two of the colleges strictly use professional advisors while the five other colleges use a combination of both professional and faculty advisors. Outside of the degree-granting colleges, a student success center employs advisors/success coaches who advise undeclared and conditionally admitted students. Across the nine colleges, schools, and centers, there were approximately 41 professional advisors at the time of the study, not including directors who may also serve in an advising role. Of those professional advisors, at least 15 could potentially fit the definition of a new advisor, but outreach to the three colleges selected indicated the number of new advisors was higher.

Three colleges were selected for this study due to their unique advising structure and history – the College of Business (CBA), the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS), and the College of Engineering (COE). The business college (Appendix A, Table 2) was the first college at SERU to employ professional advisors and established a professional advisor only model over twenty years ago. The business college has a large staff (over 20 members; 10 are advisors) and a high advising caseload, with over 8,400 undergraduate students in the college. CBA uses a
variety of advising methods to meet the needs of its students – one-on-one thirty-minute appointments, freshman compass course advising (advisors met with the 80+ students for a quick sign-off for registration), group advising (a week of several hours long quick advising sessions where students waited in line to meet with an advisor), and express advising (two and a half hour blocks of first come, first served advising offered once a week).

Established over twenty years ago, The College of Arts and Sciences uses both faculty and professional advisors (Appendix A, Table 3). The college has recently moved to using professional advisors only for first-year students; after that, faculty advises students in their major. At the time of the study, the college was still navigating this transition. The CAS advising center is also responsible for advising all pre-law and pre-health student, regardless of major, as the student navigates the necessary courses, application process, and any other requirements. Like the College of Business, CAS also has a large staff of close to twenty individuals in its advising center, with at least half of those serving as an advisor. The center offers walk-in advising (five to ten-minute session for quick questions), open advising (a three-week period during peak advising, with sessions that can last five to twenty minutes), and one-on-one thirty-minute advising appointments. Given the recent transition to a first-year advising center and the cross discipline advising in the pre-law and pre-health programs, the center was not able to provide an estimated student to advisor ratio. However, CAS had roughly 8,300 enrolled undergraduate students at the time of the study.

The College of Engineering (Appendix A, Table 4) made the move to professional advisors just over six years ago, struggling through this transition with high turnover. Although advisors have various caseloads depending on the major they advised, COE estimated the student to advisor ratio as 800:1 with close to 5,600 enrolled undergraduate students. To meet the needs
of their students, the center offers E-advising (an email form ideal for students with a plan already in place), group advising (class visits for quick registration sign-off), drop-in advising (much like E-advising but conducted in a short, five-minute or less, face-to-face interaction), and one-on-one twenty-minute advising appointments. The selection of these three colleges within SERU supported the embedded, descriptive, single-case case study design as it allowed comparison across the units as well as an understanding of the larger university structure of advising.

Participants

This study focuses on the experiences of professional advisors who are new to the role. Professional advisors are defined as “individuals who have been hired to focus primarily on advising activities that promote the academic success of students, with additional attention to general student development at the institution” (Self, 2008, pp. 267-268). Professional advisors are more likely to have a greater connection to the mission of advising, exposure to extended training programs, and involvement with organizations related to advising or student affairs than faculty advisors. In addition to new advisors, seasoned advisors, advisor trainers, and directors of advising centers participated in this research. SERU’s website was used to identify individuals that might fit the roles further described below. A request to participate was sent to each advisor via email, with the language of the role being changed as needed. Of the thirty-four individuals contacted, twenty-eight participated in the study (Table 1).
Table 1. *Research Participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Director</th>
<th>Trainer</th>
<th>Seasoned</th>
<th>New</th>
<th>Focus Group - NEW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College of Business (CBA)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (-1)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Arts and Sciences (CAS)</td>
<td>(-1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3 (-2)</td>
<td>4 (-1)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Engineering (COE)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4 (-1)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**New advisors.**

New advisors were selected as the focus of this study as they are still in the process of understanding their role and thinking through what advising meant to them. Organizational socialization is most powerful in the early parts of a new employee’s exposure to their role. New advisors recruited for this study earned at least a bachelor’s degree, worked full-time with their primary role as an advisor, and were an advisor for three years or less (preferably at only one institution). Preference for recruitment were those individuals whose title states “advisor,” but given the wide range of reported titles in previous research (Aiken-Wisniewski, Johnson, Larson, & Barkemeyer, 2015), coaches, coordinators, student services specialists, and the like were also considered.

Fourteen new advisors (out of a possible sixteen) were interviewed in this study. One new advisor in CAS and another one in COE declined the interview invitation. CBA had six new advisors participate, CAS had four participate, as did COE. All the new advisors in the College of Business had completed a master’s degree due, in part, to the center’s teaching requirement. One advisor in CAS and one in COE had earned a bachelor’s degree; all others had a master’s
degree. At the time of the study, the new advisors time in the role ranged from nine weeks to three years and four months (Appendix A, Tables 2, 3, and 4).

**Seasoned advisors.**

Seasoned advisors have been in the primary role as an advisor for four or more years. Individuals that have been in a role for several years often help define the culture of the organization to the new members. Seasoned advisors are able to provide insight, in hindsight, on their own development process – what competencies they now find valuable, what they recall from their early training and development, and the role of the university in their development and that of new advisors.

Of eleven possible seasoned advisors, nine were interviewed. One advisor in the College of Arts & Sciences declined the interview and the other, also in CAS, did not respond to the outreach. Four seasoned advisors from the College of Business, three from the College of Arts & Sciences, and two from the College of Engineering participated in the study. Only two seasoned advisors had not earned a master’s degree; one in CBA and the other in COE. Seasoned advisors in CAS all had numerous years of advising experience with few working in other positions prior to their advisor role whereas the seasoned advisors in CBA and COE had a wide range of prior experiences in higher education and other areas (Appendix A, Tables 2, 3, and 4). The seasoned advisors in the College of Engineering had the least amount of years in the role in comparison to CAS and CBA.

**Advisor trainers.**

Individuals responsible for developing and coordinating training for new advisors were included in this study as they are responsible for the new advisor’s introduction to the profession. Understanding the advisor trainers’ definition of advising and approach to training played a
significant role in gauging how organizational culture supported and impeded the development of the new advisor, decision on what to include in advisor training, and the tactics of socialization administered. Advisor trainers were seasoned advisors that had been formally, or informally, assigned the task as part of their job duties.

In all three colleges, the advisor trainers also served in other capacities in the office – director of a program, assistant director, or advisor. None of the colleges at SERU have an individual that is solely responsible for training advisors. While CBA has two individuals that co-coordinated training, only one responded to the interview invitation. One advisor trainer from each college participated in the study. All three advisor trainers had earned at least a master’s degree; one had earned a Ph.D. All had served in an advising role for five or more years, with advising being their only professional experience in higher education. The maximum time in the role was fourteen years with the minimum at four years (Appendix A, Tables 2, 3, and 4).

**Advising center directors.**

As with the advisor trainer, the director of an advising center is responsible for the new advisor’s introduction to the profession. However, the director not only defines advising but also guides the mission, vision, and goals of the advising center. The center directors’ understanding of advising is crucial to the development of a new advisor as their view shapes that of the office. Of the three possible advising center directors, only two were interviewed. The third director, in the College of Arts and Sciences, scheduled an interview, but canceled and did not respond to follow-up requests. The two directors interviewed, one from Business and the other from Engineering, had both been in their respective college for over twenty years in the same or similar roles (Appendix A, Tables 2, 3, and 4).
Data Collection and Analysis

For this qualitative study, the methods of data collection were semi-structured interviews, a focus group, and collected documents such as vision and mission statements, advising guides, and training manuals to explore the development of new advisors at the institution and college level (Appendix A, Tables 2-10). Analysis of interview transcripts, focus groups transcripts, and documents were completed by using the frameworks of organizational socialization and NACADA academic advising core competencies. Although observations are often employed in case studies, they were not used here, as the researcher was not concerned about advising conversations, but rather, the advisor’s interpretation of their development.

Primary data collection sources.

To gain insight into how new advisors developed in the context of the institution and colleges, it was necessary to work directly with the advisors. As described in Appendix A, Tables 2-5, this was accomplished through a focus group and interviews. Between the twenty-eight interviews and one focus group, 1,702 minutes of recorded data were collected with at least 5,000 minutes of transcription and a total of 520 pages. The interview is, according to Kvale and Brinkmann (2009), “where knowledge is constructed…an inter change of view between two persons conversing about a theme of mutual interest” (p. 2). The interview allowed the researcher to hear from the participants about what is happening in their own words (Dyson & Genishi, 2005). In-depth, hour-long, semi-structured interviews, with specific protocols for each group (Appendix D) permitted follow-up on unclear responses or responses that might stimulate further probing. Following the post-positivist approach, this gave access to multiple perspectives of individuals in the same group and pointed to some patterns of thought for the group that could be generalized and provide explanations (Glesne, 2011).
Interviews with 14 new advisors focused on first-person development of the purpose of advising and how they came to understand this. These interviews were conducted primarily in the new advisor’s office, with one taking place in a campus coffee house. There were six new advisors interviewed from CBA, four from CAS, and four from COE. Please refer to Appendix A, Tables 2, 3, 4, and 5 for further information on the individuals interviewed and the focus of the interviews.

Nine seasoned advisors were interviewed, during which they were encouraged to reflect on their own development, the competencies they deemed necessary to be an advisor, and how the college and institution differed in understanding and development of new advisors. Given their time in the role and on campus, seasoned advisors were readily able to highlight any support or impediments. As shown in Appendix A, Tables 2, 3, and 4, four seasoned advisors from CBA were interviewed, three from CAS, and two from COE. Many of the interviews took place in the seasoned advisors' offices, with two taking place in a campus conference room.

Each college had at least one advisor that served to train new advisors, for a total of the three advisor trainers (Appendix A, Tables 2, 3, and 4). Interviews with the advisor trainers focused on how advisor training was constructed in their college and how the college or university was involved in the training process. All three interviews were conducted in the advisor trainer’s office.

The two advising center directors (Appendix A, Tables 2, 3, and 4) were interviewed to better understand their view on advising, what they perceive is happening with advising at the college and university level, and how this may affect advisor development. Both advising center directors’ interviews were conducted in their respective offices.
Additionally, every new advisor interviewed was invited to participate in an hour and a half long focus group, though participation was not required. Four new advisors elected to participate; two from CBA and two from CAS (Appendix A, Table 5) with ten new advisors electing not to participate. The participants in the focus group represented diverse educational backgrounds, both job family levels of advisors, and none had worked as an advisor for more than two years. The focus group was conducted in a small classroom in one of the campus buildings when classes were not in session. By following up the interviews and document analysis (discussed further below), focus groups created the collective voice of new advisors by offering them the opportunity to discuss with others how they each understood advising – what informs it, how they developed it, and the challenges presented by the institution. A focus group was ideal to bring forth a range of viewpoints on this topic with the intent of not reaching a consensus, but instead, to express areas where they may conflict (Kvale & Brinkman, 2009) as each college had its own advising culture. Additionally, the focus groups brought the conversation back to the larger case, the university, by bringing these different perspectives together.

**Secondary data collection sources.**

It was also important to analyze the documents that supported advising at the institution, such as published mission or vision statements on advising, university websites, advising policies and practices, and any other documents that related to advising on campus. 813 pages of secondary data sources were collected from websites and participants (not including recorded data transcripts); 211 pages from CBA, 138 pages from CAS, 179 pages from COE, and 285 pages from SERU. The interpretation of these documents played a vital part in the socialization of a new member to the organization. If the university had advising organizations or committees,
it would have been beneficial to review the meeting minutes, constitution and bylaws, or any other documents developed by groups to gauge the collective understanding of advising and to break down the political, personal, and educational philosophies that feed such programs. Although the Southeast Research University does have an advising organization, SEAA, the researcher was not able to obtain documents related to the group despite multiple requests.

Documents such as these served to support, expand, and challenge the understandings (Glesne, 2011) that the advisors may communicate. Such documents are “quite rich in portraying the values and beliefs of participants in the setting,” but it is necessary to be cautious in their use as they are never transparent (Marshall & Rossman, 2011, p. 160). Additionally, it is crucial to note that, as mentioned by Yin (2014), although relevant to almost every case study, documents are not without bias and written with a specific purpose in mind. To address this issue, the documents and the researcher’s interpretation was a point of discussion during the focus group.

The College of Business provided numerous documents (Appendix A, Table 7) for this study. An advising manual, updated summer 2018, contained the office's mission, staff, information on curriculum, policies, and advising protocol. This document was shared by the advisor trainer via email, as were sample advising training schedules. The advisor trainer also provided a link to the assessment new advisors completed as part of their training process. Finally, the college’s website was mined for information on advising.

The College of Arts and Sciences was also able to provide numerous documents (Appendix A, Table 8) and had a robust advising website that included frequently asked questions (FAQs), in-depth information on scheduling appointments, and special sections on pre-health and pre-law advising. The advisor trainer shared an advising manual, last updated in 2016,
during the interview. The CAS advising manual contained information on the office mission, advising technology, professional development policies, and campus resources.

The College of Engineering readily provided numerous resources pertaining to advising in the college (Appendix A, Table 9). The advisor trainer shared the office’s advisor handbook, training schedule, and advising checklist via email. The handbook was like that of CBA and CAS in terms of content. However, the checklist stood out as it included sample questions to ask students and a guide on various components to include in an appointment. While waiting in the COE advising center lobby, the researcher obtained a copy of the college’s advising guidebook given to students at orientation. A search on the college’s website for information on advising included a previous version of the advising guidebook given to students at orientation.

In general, documents pertaining to advising at the University were obtained from a variety of sources (Appendix A, Table 10). The updated advising document from Project Success was shared by a former colleague of the researcher, as were the task force and advisor’s perspective documents. The CAS advisor trainer shared the organizational charts. After scouring the SERU website for the advising hub mentioned in a handful of interviews, the researcher contacted one of the advisors that had mentioned the site to obtain the link. The site was not linked to the main SERU site nor was it a result in the search function. Finally, the researcher searched the student newspaper website to see what articles might be available that share the student’s perspective on advising.

**Data analysis.**

The analysis of data is crucial to “try to identify and gain analytic insight into the dimensions and dynamics of the phenomenon being studied” (Dyson & Genishi, 2005, p. 81). Without this component of the research study, the interviews, focus groups, and documents are
no more than description with little understanding of how this phenomenon matters and is interpreted by the participants (Dyson & Genishi, 2005). Particularly important for this case study, as it was an embedded study, was the analysis of the data at both the institutional and college level.

**Codes.**

After focus groups and interviews were transcribed, itself a means of analysis as it allows the researcher to “mull over the meanings of what we hear and type” (Dyson & Genishi, 2005, p. 71), all data – transcripts and collected documents – was analyzed using codes developed from NACADA academic advising core competencies (Appendix A, Table 13) and the settings, responses, and tactics of socialization explored in the framework of organizational socialization (Appendix A, Table 12). The researcher also created a general code guide during the initial read through of the transcripts and documents based on themes that did not relate to the competencies or organizational socialization (Appendix A, Table 11).

The general codes arose directly from the transcripts as the researcher recognized themes, differing perspectives, common concerns, and contradictions during an initial read through of each interview. These codes were developed prior to the creation of the codes from organizational socialization and core competencies in order to provide an initial perspective on how new advisors developed without the influence of the theoretical framework. This process also allowed the researcher to begin identifying common training approaches and competency use without the influence of the defined theoretical framework. Center history, the role of an advisor, the qualifications of a “good” advisor, office culture, and university culture are a few of the many codes that were created during the initial read through (Appendix A, Table 11).
Using organizational socialization (Appendix A, Table 12) as a guide, the researcher created codes for each boundary, response, and tactic based on the original text from Van Maanen and Schein. While this process generated numerous codes, it was important to account for each boundary (functional, hierarchical, inclusion), response (custodial and innovation), and tactic as the initial read-through (when the general codes were created) of all interviews indicated each boundary, response, and tactic was present in some capacity. The tactics, in particular, required the creation of not only a definition to guide the coding but also the creation of particular words, phrases, and messages to look for. Again, the definitions and phrases to look for were developed directly from organizational socialization literature.

The NACADA academic advising core competencies codes (Appendix A, Table 13) were based on the conceptual, informational, and relational concepts with special attention paid to the nuances within each area. The codes were created from the numbered perspectives within each competency using the core competency handout and published guide. Additionally, definitions were simplified to ease the coding process. The researcher also developed codes that indicated when the participant saw no value in a competency, or an aspect of it, and for competencies mentioned outside of the directed competency discussion. Although it would have been possible to discuss advising without the use of these competencies given that every participant is an advisor, the codes created from the competencies allowed for a common language by which to analyze the data. The use of the NACADA academic advising core competencies for codes brought in a nationally recognized platform and understanding of advising that extended credibility to this study.
**Analysis Process.**

Although the interviews, focus group, and documents were coded individually, the analysis was conducted as a convergence of all the data (Baxter & Jack, 2008) and focused on linking the data back to the earlier two propositions so that it could respond to the two questions guiding this study. Linking the analysis back to the propositions gave focus to the theoretical framework and the priorities of the research (Yin, 2014). The researcher built an explanation on how tactics bring about development in certain ways as well as explained how expectations and definitions of a role that conflict with professional standards may confuse what it means to be an advisor. This follows the explanation building analysis described by Yin (2014).

Analysis was conducted first on the interviews and focus group and then the collected documents; over 1300 pages total. The general codes were generated during the first read through and the development of the codes was an ongoing analysis process. The researcher also kept a notebook nearby to make notes as each group of college interviews and the focus group was read through for the general codes. A similar process followed for the organizational socialization and core competency codes with one significant change. Since these codes were developed using the theoretical framework and propositions, the researcher read each group of interviews and the focus group with a particular purpose in mind and certain words or phrases to search for. As such a system of color coding was employed to make it easier to identify what code was assigned to a particular section of text. Notes were also created for each group of college interviews and the focus group. The researcher then reviewed the notes created for each code type to begin identifying common themes, experiences, and other possible generalizations. A Word document was then created and the researcher sorted the identified text within each code by college (ex: C by CBA, CAS, COE, and SERU). The collected documents were then read
through by each code set for each college with notes made during each read through. These notes and text were then combined with the analysis of the interviews and focus group. Essentially each interview, the focus group, and collected documents were read through three times, one for each code set, with notes developed at the time of the readings. This information was then used to identify common themes, experiences, and other possibilities to address the propositions and research questions.

Using the organizational codes as a tool of analysis for the interviews and focus group, special attention was paid to how the desired response of a new advisor is brought about through tactics of socialization employed by the institution and centers. These tactics were analyzed for the role they were perceived to have in each new advisor’s development as well as how each tactic was employed by the institution (within the advisor’s department, university-wide, or some other entity). Tactics were also analyzed for what response (innovator or custodial) was elicited by the new advisor. The NACADA academic advising core competencies codes helped in understanding how a new advisor comes to know their role and the value placed on professional standards. The core competencies were also instrumental during the interview analysis process in identifying where perspectives on advising converged and diverged among advisors and the different colleges. Those areas of convergence and divergence proved valuable in identifying how SERU organizational culture supported and/or impeded the development of new advisors.

Organizational socialization was used to analyze the documents and better understand how organizational culture can support or impede the development of advisors based on the core competencies. This was then contrasted and compared within and against each advisor’s experiences and advising definitions. The documents collected were analyzed against the NACADA academic advising core competencies to see how each competency is addressed by
the institution or college in a more public manner and how the university perspective served to inform that of the college. Given that this study was an embedded, single-case case study, the analysis was carefully constructed to explain the propositions not only at the college level but also at the university level.

**Trustworthiness and Validity**

To ensure the validity and trustworthiness of the data collected from the interviews, focus group, and collected documents, it was important to employ the methods of triangulation and member checks. Member checks ensure validity and trustworthiness by allowing the participants to review what the researcher has interpreted and to “correct the researcher’s (perhaps not quite accurate) representation of their worlds” (Marshall & Rossman, 2011, p. 42). The transcripts from each interview were shared with each participant along with a request for feedback and additional insight. Of the twenty-eight participants interviewed, none responded with any feedback and only one responded with a “thank you.”

Triangulation, which uses multiple data sources, methods or theories in a study, allows for a richer context in which to display results (Marshall & Rossman, 2011). Triangulation ensures the validity and trustworthiness of a study because of the multiple points in which the data is either checked against or collected. In a sense, it makes the data more robust and strengthens the conclusions drawn. The use of multiple methods – interviews, focus groups, and documents – and data sources – advisor types, training manuals, articles, and websites - allowed for a richer context through the wealth of data collected and the multiple perspectives that brought to light consensus and discrepancies. Additionally, the use of two theoretical perspectives – organizational socialization and the NACADA *academic advising core competencies* – allowed multiple points and themes throughout to check the multiple
perspectives. For this study, triangulation and member checks were particularly important as how the advisors perceived their development is of focus.

**Summary**

To better understand how organizational culture impeded and supported the development of new academic advisors, it was necessary to develop an embedded, single-case, descriptive case study designed to explore the perspectives within each of the three selected colleges and the university. NACADA *academic advising core* competencies and organizational socialization guided the development of codes used to analyze the data collected from twenty-eight interviews with new advisors, seasoned advisors, advisor trainers, and advising center directors; a focus group; and numerous collected documents.
CHAPTER THREE - RESULTS

The results from this study on the development of new advisors, presented below, are preceded by a recap of the methods and participants. The results are first organized by each of the three colleges with further sections on each college’s advising culture, organizational socialization tactics, and use and/or knowledge of the NACADA core competencies. Followed by representations of how organizational culture at SERU supports and impedes development and the institution’s advising culture. Guiding the data collection and organization of the results were the following research questions:

1. How can organizational culture support the development of new academic advisors?
2. How can organizational culture impede the development of new academic advisors?

And the following propositions:

1. Certain actions and choices bring about development in certain ways (from organizational socialization) and;
2. Expectations and defining a role in ways that conflict with professional standards may confuse what it means to be in particular roles (NACADA core competencies).

Methodology Summary

To answer the research questions, qualitative research methods were used in the study. The primary method of data collection was through in-depth, semi-structured interviews with new advisors, seasoned advisors, advisor trainers, and directors of advising centers. A focus group with a small subset of the new advisors was also held. Finally, various documents that pertain to advising from each college and the institution were collected. These items included
advising syllabi, training manuals, websites, and student newspaper articles. All data was
analyzed using codes created by the researcher from the NACADA academic advising core
competencies, organizational socialization theory, and general themes within the data.

Participants

The Southeast Research University is comprised of seven degree-granting colleges and
one degree-granting school. For this study, three colleges at the institution were selected: College
of Business (CBA), College of Arts and Sciences (CAS), and the College of Engineering (COE).
Both the College of Business and the College of Engineering employ only professional advisors
for their undergraduate students. The College of Arts and Sciences use professional advisors for
first-year, pre-health, and pre-law undergraduate students and faculty advisors for undergraduate
students with a declared major in their second year and beyond.

Directors of advising centers, advisor trainers, seasoned advisors (more than three years
in the role), and new advisors (three years or less in the role) participated in the study through
interviews and, in the case of new advisors, a focus group. A small subgroup of new advisors
participated in the focus group (Appendix A, Table 5). Twenty-eight individuals participated in
interviews with four new advisors also participating in the focus group. As seen in Appendix A,
Tables 2, 3, and 4 most professional advisors employed by these three colleges have earned a
master’s degree (roughly 86%). Of the advisors, three have earned a doctorate; all in the College
of Business. Additionally, CBA is the only college that requires a master’s degree for advisors as
their advisors are all required to teach a first-year seminar class for undergraduate business
students. The advising staff in CBA student services worked in the office for an average of 6.1
years (maximum is 29 years, 6 months; minimum is 4 months). The CAS student services
advising staff worked in the office an average of 4.1 years (maximum 11 years, 6 months;
minimum is 8 months). Finally, the COE advising staff worked in the office an average of 5.2 years (maximum is 25 years; minimum is 9 weeks). Of the twenty-eight advisors interviewed, only ten indicated advising experience prior to their current role, but several had been in previous higher education roles such as athletics, libraries, faculty, or orientation.

Results

Borrowing a framework from Tierney (1988) to explore culture; this study explored each advising center’s culture through history, environment, mission, socialization, information, strategy, and leadership. First, the culture of each college is discussed to provide greater insight into the use of organizational socialization and NACADA academic advising core competencies in each college and at the university. Then, Van Maanen and Schein's organizational socialization theory is employed to better understand the desired response of newcomers, boundary crossings, and the tactics used in the development of new advisors. Finally, the NACADA academic advising core competencies are applied to each college to better understand what is viewed as necessary to serve as an advisor. To protect the confidentiality and privacy of the participants and SERU, sections of text collected from websites and other documents have been altered, if they can be found online or in databases, but still reflect the intention and meaning of the text.

College of Business

The College of Business is unique in that it is one of the oldest advising centers at SERU and has employed professional advisors for several decades. The college prides itself on the business education offered to students, being a model advising center, and providing numerous educational opportunities outside of the classroom.
Advising culture.

“The office culture is one in which we have a common goal of serving students with sometimes differing opinions on how to achieve that…I would also say there is a little bit of a culture of frustration based on caseloads that we have to see.” - Brian

As one of, if not the, oldest advising centers at Southeast Research University, the College of Business advising center prides itself on being the model for advising on campus. The office was founded in the 1970s. According to Barry, the director of the CBA advising center who has worked in the college for close to thirty years, a proposal was made in the 90s to allow the office to advise all students from start to finish. By 1996, the retention rate from first to the second year had increased to 96%.

The advising center is split between two physical locations. Two distance learning advisors and an administrative assistant are in a smaller office suite around the corner from the larger center that houses the remaining staff. The larger location has ample waiting room and phone chargers, with advisor offices surrounding the waiting area that encourage students to stop by to speak with their advisor in a collegial environment. Additionally, CBA is one of the few colleges that requires advising for all students each semester (with the exception of summer).

Within the last five years, the office worked as a group to establish a new vision and mission; this included establishing core values and student and advisor outcomes. The vision statement focuses on how the center “contributes to student development and success,” as well as the desire to be known as a model advising center at SERU and elsewhere. The mission further expands on contributions to student development, establishing the center as “supportive, inclusive environment for students as they navigate their individual undergraduate experiences at Southeast Research University.” The mission places an emphasis on working with students
through a partnership that is designed to encourage the growth of the student – personally, academically, and professional – while also “empowering them to become accountable to themselves and others.” However, Jimmy, an academic advisor II that has been in the office for just over two years, shares that “I don’t think everybody takes that holistic approach we like to tell people that we do.” This perspective was shared by a handful of other advisors in CBA.

Although further explored below, it is important to highlight that the socialization of the office is generally viewed in a positive light. Riley, another academic advisor II that has been in the office for two years, said “our office, I feel like, is very good about letting each advisor be themselves.”

Information shared with students is accomplished in a verbal capacity via one-on-one conversations. There is little information available on the center website nor is any information given to the students beyond an advising worksheet at the end of an appointment. New advisors are mostly exposed to this information via a new advisor manual and when they shadowed other advisors during training.

The primary strategy of the office is to manage the number of students the best they can, since all undergraduate CBA students must be advised every semester. Scott, an academic advisor I with prior advising experience, but has been in the office for only four months, said that his main role is to “help cover 8,000 students.”

The director of the office, Barry, places a great deal of importance on the individuality of each advisor’s approach to advising and the contribution made to the office. He stated, “everybody’s role can be viewed as the same and different…. ” Riley expressed her appreciation for this freedom, saying “my perspective and my approach to advising is much more relational as I said but there are other advisors who are not.”
Organizational socialization.

“Being new, I think can only be measured in time. And being green is measured by depth of experience. Not that either one of those things are necessarily. Well, one of those is quantifiable, one of those is not. I mean we’re talking about quantitative versus qualitative.” – Brian

Despite, or maybe because of, being one of the earliest founded advising center on campus, the College of Business advising center has gone through multiple iterations of how new advisors are socialized to their role. The overview below provides insight into the boundaries encountered and crossed, desired response, and the tactics used in the CBA advising center.

Boundaries.

For the advisors in the center, there are four hierarchical boundaries – associate dean, director, advisor II, and advisor I. All advisors must have at least a master’s degree when hired and the boundary crossing from advisor I to advisor II is based on time in the role whereas the associate dean and director positions are only available when vacated.

Also across the hierarchical boundary are the functions of those in the role. The functional boundary for associate dean, director, advisor II, and advisor I all vary in the daily tasks, teaching load, and coordinating responsibility level. All advisors manage a caseload of students, teach at least one freshman compass course, and have a coordinating responsibility. Barry views himself, when it comes to advisor development, as stating “I would say what’s called an overseer. I wouldn’t be the actual functioning person.” An advisor at the director level and one at the advisor II level are both responsible for advisor development.

The inclusionary boundary crossing takes place around a year when an advisor has experienced most of the events in the office. According to Foster, a new advisor that has been in
the office for seven months, “It’ll probably take a year... Especially once I start my coordinating duties.” Every participant from CBA shared in this view which was touted by the director, Barry, as an important part of learning how to be an advisor.

**Response.**

Many of the advisors spoke of wanting a new advisor to be highly prepared for student interactions and explained the crucial role training takes in this. Barry, the director, shares that training would “be taking a really academically qualified person to the point where they are comfortable with the student culture, the office culture, the curriculum, and the different avenues, different resources of assistance for a student.” Matilda, an academic advisor II that has been in the office for six years, explained she was expected to be comfortable with students, “I think the expectations were to like learn what I could. And to, you know, observe and sit in to be comfortable.”

This response is a result of the tactics employed during training. However, when the reasoning behind training and the duration was shared with the new advisors, the result was a much deeper custodial response. One of the six advisors that experienced training with the former advisor responsible for training Jimmy shared that

But because of the person [that trained me] and I interacting, I think it helped me develop my own skills and my own questions that I do ask students and kind of the direction I took. Because I could of come in with a different mindset and thought ‘this is just scheduling classes’ and not really ever understood that if there had been less training and less time I spent with those of you who take that more holistic approach.

However, Greg, an academic advisor II with six years of experience in the office, stressed the need to have new advisors quickly ready to interact with students. The deeper understanding of
the role is appreciated, but according to him, “what we have to do is we have to get them hired. Get them in here. Get them trained as fast as we can and get them in there. Go. Start.” Several seasoned advisors also expressed concern with getting new advisors ready to meet with students sooner rather than later.

Besides the custodial response to be comfortable with students and able to share information, some new advisors also demonstrated innovator responses related to frustrations with the office. Carl, a new advisor with seven months of experience, was frustrated by the clarity of information shared with distance learning students and planned to explore other ways to share information. He responded that

I think that another thing that I’ve been trying to do is find ways to just make information more available and more clear to students. And these connections have kind of given new ways to start researching and finding out, okay, what are some of them, what are some of the bits of information that I want to send out.

Additionally, Riley became frustrated with her role and the lack of options to explore what she felt her strengths and interests were in. Her response was an attempt to be a role innovator. She felt that “there are things that I’ve wanted to do that I feel like maybe someone else in the office is doing and isn’t necessarily interested in sharing that responsibility.” The remaining new advisors expressed a custodial response to socialization.

**Tactics.**

Depending on the time in which a new advisor begins training, their socialization may either occur individually or as a collective. If a collective approach is used, training sessions and campus visits may occur in tandem with all other training, such as shadowing, role reversals, check-in visits, and subsequent development opportunities occurring at an individual level. Kat,
who has been a distance learning advisor for four years, shared that the collective aspects of her training were some of the more beneficial because she was able to experience it with a new distance learning advisor. She said

    I think, like, because [Olivia] and I went through it at the same time and she had never advised either. But she had taught some so that was good. That was very beneficial to me. So, like, we would go sit in there together and then we could talk about stuff. What applied to us with distance learners and the difference versus campus.

    Formal tactics were encountered during the initial training exercises of conversation on majors and curriculum, technology training, and NACADA overviews; with the informal structure of shadowing other advisors following. The current training structure, put in place by an advisor who is no longer employed at the center, was a complete overhaul, according to Jasmine, an academic advisor II with nine years of experience who currently coordinates training. All of the new advisors had a formal experience, according to Jasmine, of “in-depth; at least three of five had an in-depth conversation about what advising is. Having article, reading those, discussing, dissecting. Things of that nature. But also visiting campus partners, which is wall all five of them did.” Greg also shared that training included

    Sitting with advisors. It included going to different organizations and office on campus to be exposed to different, what the university offers as far as our students and our employees. And then it was advising time and I think I really just jumped into it and had to get going.

    Kat appreciated the formal followed by informal structure, stating “It’s good to know when you have something set. You have planned out what’s going on. There is some, I think, it’s some good downtime but not too much downtime.” In an additional formal tactic, new advisors were
given a handbook that, according to Bianca, a new advisor with close to two and a half years of experience, included “information about staff members, the curriculum for each major, policies; how to navigate certain programs like Degree Works or OnBase, and then the advising articles.” Also included were policies, procedures, campus resources, and course listings.

Informal tactics followed the formal tactics to socialize the new advisors. All of them had the opportunity to shadow through the more structured aspects of training and many continued beyond that time. This was also a large part of many of the seasoned advisors training periods. Brian, an academic advisor II that has worked in the office for just over fourteen years, shared that his training years before consisted of shadowing with very little information on what advising is and how the office viewed advising. He shared that his training was “Primarily sitting in on other advisors’ appointments. Getting a feel for the prerequisite structure. Contact points for resources or to direct students, but there wasn’t a ‘this is what the office’s philosophy is.’” The recently established training protocol was a marked difference from what had occurred in the past according to Barry and the seasoned advisors.

The steps taken during the early stages of development were often sequential in the College of Business. Knowledge was expanded over time, starting with general curriculum, then majors, and finally double majors and more complicated programs as well as other scheduled conversations and training components. New advisors were given a calendar of scheduled activities for the weeks of their training. An online assessment was given to the new advisors a few weeks into training to determine their next steps. Foster stated that

I was given the test. I would say I was given an open book maybe at the three-month mark. And then I was given, let’s see, I took the open book on Monday. I took the closed
book on like Thursday…They went back and hit on some things. If I had anything I was confused on we just started hitting on those after the test.

Prior to the assessment, the training calendar indicates a pattern of information shared through time on their own to read, meetings with campus partners, and shadowing; this was followed up with conversations with an advisor or the trainer. However, one new advisor did not see the sequence in their training experience. Carl said that “My onboarding felt very unstructured at times… But it didn’t feel very structured. So, I think if there was a structure I wasn’t aware of it.”

After crossing the boundary from not employed in the office to employed, the next boundary is crossing from new to no longer considered new. The consensus in the business advising center was that this took place around the one-year mark; a fixed tactic at an inclusionary boundary. The director, Barry, shares that “I have said, since day one, that it will take an individual one calendar year to take a deep breath and say, ‘I feel good about being here’.” His reasoning is that they have experienced each semester, each major event in the office, and a good number of students in crisis. Each advisor seemed to be aware of Barry’s thoughts on the transition from new to no longer new. Scott, a new advisor, disagreed, stating that no longer being new would take much longer. In his opinion, he would no longer feel new around three to four years, “I mean, advising, you’re helping someone grow from when they get out of high school to when they’re looking for a job. Until you have that full spectrum of seeing someone grow you really don’t kind of notice it.” Carl also felt that the inclusionary boundary crossing was variable, and not fixed, due to the level of knowledge he had obtained and how well he could answer students’ questions. He stated that
I still feel uncomfortable with some of the academic-y stuff of advising because I don’t have a strong background in that. So I think one aspect of it, it’s not that, it’s not known, but one aspect of it will maybe be when I feel comfortable answering a question about what my advising philosophy is and I’m not just kind of making stuff up and scrambling a little bit…And I think another part of that will be when I have settled on a way that I’m trying to have interactions with students because right now it’s very hodgepodge.

An advisor crafted the training process, with all advisors asked to participate, either through shadowing opportunities or specific conversations, a serial tactic. Kat, in particular, appreciated the conversations with other advisors and said that “…sitting in with advisors, which was probably hands down my favorite thing because that’s usually how I learn. I like to see the different ways and you know you just form your own from that or you know obviously pull from.” Carl also saw value in working with fellow advisors to better understand the curriculum and how to assist students in planning out their schedule. To do this, he shared that he “…went through the curriculum and I just pulled a bunch of files from people and just tried building out a bunch of plans to graduation and taking them to different advisors during some downtime asking to look through them.”

However, the new advisors also shared that they often would hear conflicting information from the other advisors they interacted with. Matilda, reflecting on her time in training, admitted that “I know when I was new every person I met within the office would say like well so-and-so does it this way but weren’t supposed to do that. And so-and-so said this, but we’re not supposed to and so-and-so….” Even those discrepancies could be helpful to new advisors, as Jimmy found “that allowed me the opportunity to see how other advisors did their jobs and how that may or may not fit with what I envisioned my method to be.”
Under Barry’s leadership, the office embraces the individuality of each new hire so they may incorporate their strengths into the office. In fact, every participant from CBA expressed pleasure in being able to bring their strengths to the advising process and not being forced to advise in a particular way. Carl found this investiture tactic to be beneficial as he developed within the advisor role. He said that Barry made it very clear that individuality was important because “we don’t assign advisors [and] that it creates space for students to find advisors who're advising philosophy gels well with what they’re trying to get out of it”.

Riley agreed and stated that

We’re all very, very different and we can all bring that to the table on how different advisor who advise very differently and who personalities are very different and hobbies and interests and whatever. We can all be very effective advisors and do a good job at what we do, which is serving students.

**NACADA core competencies.**

*“These are goals. This is utopia.” – Barry*

The business college advising website highlights the advising center’s view on advising, with a statement that concludes that effective advising is a partnership based on the students’ needs and the office is committed to “working with students through personal interactions and utilization of University resources to develop a plan based on their academic goals.” According to Foster, the office is well aligned with the core competencies and other aspects of advising. He says “you know we're definitely on point with advising. I think we will be if you compared us to anyone else in the country; I think [we] will be on par with them. Not to toot our own horn.”
Informational.

Information, and the ability to share it was mentioned as an important aspect of being an advisor by several members of the CBA advising center. The training manual was information heavy and was coupled with a lengthy training program. However, the advising website was sparse on information and had an incorrect staff listing.

All of the advisors were quick to highlight how important meeting with other campus constituents was to their development. Matilda expressed that meeting with campus resources allowed her to not only understand their services but also to better share with her students where the service was located. She found that “because I was new to campus, it really helped me to leave the office and understand where things were and where I was sending, where I would be referring a student to.” Many of the new advisors went on to state that understanding the curriculum was at the heart of the role. Scott indicated that the basic knowledge an advisor needed was

I mean your basic just curriculum, kind of the policies and procedures of the school. Obviously, that's it that was like the base of. Because that's the one if you don't know that it doesn't really matter what you tell the students if you don't know your information. So obviously, whatever institution you're going to be at, you need to know down to the minute details of how the curriculum works.

A large focus of the office was on sharing the correct information with students. Barry states that training provides “all that information then have [the new advisors has] to turn around and disseminate it in the proper manner to the students.” Brian shared this emphasis when he stated that training was concerned with new advisors understanding the curriculum in order to not make errors. For him, “The primary concern, I think, was to make sure that we’re not making
any curriculum errors or planning errors that, maybe some other things like resources and extracurriculars would be things that you pick up kind of along the way." However, the focus on correct information had some advisors expressing concern with the amount of information required for the job. Kat expressed it best when she states that “…my insecurities are so high, and I was terrified of screwing somebody over. Like that is like the ultimate worst to me, just thinking I’m going to do somebody wrong.” Jimmy wanted to provide students with the best information possible because of the investment they were making in their future. He declared It's just that I am; I want to make sure that I have all the knowledge to provide students with the resource that they deserve. They come here, most of them, want an excellent education and they're paying a lot of money for it and I don't want to direct them down the wrong path. I keep saying direction and direct and, but I don't want to, I don't want there to be something that I don't know that then prevents them from doing something that they want to do

_Relational._

The informational and relational components were mentioned together by several advisors, Riley felt that it was necessary to balance the two when interacting with students. But for me it's about really balancing the informational and the relational; reading what the student needs. And I really believe every student needs both of them, the informational and the relational, and for the most part I can get both of those with every student.

Carl also felt this balance was important because students sometimes need to understand their options, not only regarding academics but also life outside of college. When he works with
distance learning students, he explains that this balance is often crucial to the student’s ability to move forward with their degree.

I'm like, sometimes, students whether or not it's just they're struggling in a class and they just need to get through it. And you know helping them realize like ‘OK it's not ideal but if you get a D in this class you can move on.’ Or if they've got a lot of other stuff going on in their life helping them think about ‘OK you need to just drop these classes because it doesn't make sense for you to stick with us.’

According to the CBA advisors, the relationship is more than academics. Brian stated that their role is to “guide a student through curriculum, extracurricular activities, personal, pre-professional issues in their quest to earn an undergraduate degree. Advocate for them when necessary. Constrain them when necessary.” Bianca shared that the advisor who trained her helped her to ask questions that took the conversation beyond the curriculum. The trainer instructed her to “just [be] nosy. I feel like I had a really good trainer who was like ‘Bianca you have to ask questions.’ And it's uncomfortable, like, that silence is uncomfortable.” She went on to explain that sometimes it was necessary to sit there in silence, which can be awkward, but that it is necessary to ask questions that are not about the curriculum. To the students’ credit, she said that once the awkward silence is over, students “for the most part, they're willing to just talk about themselves and their family and all that stuff.”

Jasmine sees the role of an advisor as someone who is there “is to assist the student and walk with the student and partner with the student. So, within that partnership, you’re going to be walking with them from day one to the time they walk across the stage and even after…. An important part of “walking” with the students is understanding what the student needs. Jasmine develops this process from the moment she interacts with a student.
You call your student. From there you’re going to talk to them, not just dive straight into like ‘What classes? What were you thinking?’ But ‘Hey! How are you doing?’ And looking at body language and talking about ‘Okay. Are you thinking about study abroad or an internship or are you going to the career fair if you’re a graduating senior?’

However, building the relationship seemed to be learned more by doing, and failing, than reading and learning through the training process from the perspective of several seasoned advisors. Greg, in particular, felt that he learned by trial and error. He confessed that “it was situations where I’m like ‘I don’t know what to do about this’ so I would immediately go to my supervisor and say ‘Student in my office. Here’s what’s going on. What do we do?’” Brian agreed with this, pointing out that it is important for new advisors to not see the typical conversation with a student and to see how another advisor responds. He felt that

The best opportunities for training come, honestly, when students have problems or their atypical situations. Students who are struggling academically require some sort of investigative advising; let’s call it that…Because most of this job, I believe, is problem-solving. And when students don’t have problems, or they don’t convey problems to you things seem pretty straightforward. I mean, when things go to script, we basically know the script. And it’s very easy to convey the script, so to speak, to new advisors. Bianca experienced this first-hand when the advisor responsible for training her asked her to participate in a role-play scenario as a student in crisis.

So, there's one scenario that I don't think I ever forget. A colleague who had been here for five-plus years acted as a student and it was great, at first, because of course it’s just mellow and students come in with no issues but then all hell breaks loose and you know they[‘re] crying or they have an issue or they can't pass classes or their GPA is low or
they have financial issues and it's stuff [like] that. I say it's eye-opening because you realize that students have a lot of problems and I feel like you have to be like for yourself you have to be open with that kind of stuff.

Bianca also found it necessary to foster relationships with students, even when they are not around. If a student misses an appointment or she has not seen them in a while, she will send a quick email to see how they are doing. Meanwhile, Foster prepares early for his appointments and looks at the student’s picture before greeting them. Before each appointment, he explained that he goes to their profile, “so that even when I go out there and I have to go take a restroom before my next appointment when I come back in I know their faces I'm saying, ‘Hey Joey’ or ‘Hey Tiffany come on in’.” They were the only two advisors, and new one’s at that, that mentioned fostering a relationship outside of the advising appointment.

To continue the development of advising and themselves, an aspect of the relational competency, advisors in CBA are on a rotation to attend national and regional NACADA conferences, encouraged to participate in campus committees, and develop new initiatives. Carl found, as a new advisor, that attending a conference early on really helped him understand his role in distance learning advising and think through some areas he was concerned about related to marginalized identities. He said

So, I'm able to go I was able to go to NACADA this year, which was great, and learned a lot. Met some interesting people. I'm hoping that there'll be some follow-up conversations there. Really interesting conversation with some people from UF online about wondering what it means to think about issues of race or other marginalized identities when working with online students that you don't see.
Yet outside of these experiences, Riley expressed frustration with the professional development offered and the role the center played in her development. Riley did not view the CBA advising office as offering any professional development beyond NACADA and struggled with continuing her development as an advisor. She said that

      So, it's not that I necessarily need someone checking in on me to make sure I know what I'm doing. But there's no professional development. And that's something that would be nice to just continue growing and developing as an advisor. And I don't feel like that exists in our office. So, ongoing, probably not much since probably after the first nine months to a year that I was here.

      \textit{Conceptual.}

The College of Business advising center website provides students with an advising syllabus that includes an advising vision, mission, expectations, and yearly goals. The new advisor manual also adds in values and outcomes, yet none of the advisors referenced these documents. Additionally, the provided example training schedule indicated a conversation on NACADA core values and the concept of advising, but the advisor responsible for that conversation no longer works in the office. However, the advising website does state “We recognize that you are an individual and therefore encourage you to take intellectual risks while developing a relationship with faculty and staff mentors who can support you as you pursue your academic opportunities at Southeast Research University” – all important components of the conceptual core competency.

      Barry, the director, confessed that he is not familiar with the NACADA pillars, saying, “I would be assuming the pillars of academic advising are dealing with the advisor development in concert with student development and how that’s assessed on each side as well as combined.”
However, Jasmine, the advisor responsible for training, is familiar with them and shared why the pillars are included in advisor training. The NACADA pillars are included in training so that new advisors understand “the background pieces of what academic advising was, what it is currently, but then also where it’s going.”

Jasmine also shared that one of the expected outcomes of advising is to not screw up. Specifically, she stated

From there, the expected outcome of advising. Basically, it’s not just so we’re not going to screw up. You’re going to help the student. You’re going to partner with them and basically, walk with them from day one to graduation, the way our model here in this office is set up.

A few of the advisors expressed dismay with the conceptual competency. Brian, a seasoned advisor, struggled with the concept of the core values, sharing “I would not put a whole lot of value in that because values, you can’t force values. People don’t necessarily share the same values.” Carl, himself a history undergraduate major, was not able to connect with the history of advising, finding that it posed no questions and, while valuable, did not hold his interest. He stated that “in terms of the history of the academic advising, it seems more likely just want us to know where we come from. And it's valuable but not very interesting”.

Finally, Jimmy expressed consternation when it came to the conceptual competency. He feels that he just does what he does regardless of what NACADA might recommend. He shared

Because I just do what I do. And maybe I do what I do based on something that at some point I've read, or I don't. I don't know why I do what I do. I just do it. And so, I think that's why I have issue with the theory component. Like even in the training that we had here. Only because I just don't see the point. It's kind of like studying history to me. I
don't like history and I don't see the point learning about it. It's in the past. But then it
goes. I can see like. We. You know you study history, so you don't make the same
mistakes. So, I can see the benefit. I just don't like [it]. It just doesn't work for me. So
that's what I got out of that.

Carl, on the other hand, is seeking out more knowledge in this competency and finds the
conversations lacking. He would like to learn more about theory related to advising to guide his
conversations but found that there was a “difference between what NACADA was trying to
present and the way things that are approached here is that there isn't a lot of emphasis on theory.
I haven't had a conversation about advising theory with anybody in the office really.” Riley, who
was hired around the same time as Jimmy, found value in discussing the discipline and
philosophy of advising because she did not have prior working experience in advising or higher
education.

College of Arts and Sciences

As a long-established center, the CAS advising center serves as a model to the newer
centers on campus, often leading the way in innovative advising practices on campus. The center
explicitly takes a stance on advising as more than course registration, evidenced by the statement
below in their advising manual

Academic advising is more than course registration, but it seems advisors always discuss
courses, their sequences, or students’ grades in courses during almost every advising
session. No matter what the original purpose of the planned or unplanned meeting
involves, the topic of courses for the next semester always comes up.
Advising culture.

“I would say it’s almost like three different cultures...Pre-health is a lot more rigid because they have to be. I feel like we’re [general advising] sort of the free spirit. Like, yeah, come on in. We’ll see you. And then pre-law is somewhere in the middle.” – Gwen

Although the exact date the office was established is not certain, advisors in the CAS advising center made it clear that the center has been around for at least twenty years. Though once focused on advising all students in Arts and Sciences, the center recently made a concerted effort to focus solely on advising first-year students and transfer students in their first semester. Undeclared students have been moved to advising in the Student Success Center, resulting in the re-establishment of the office’s centralized identity.

The office is in a building central to campus and is fairly easy to access. However, advisor offices are on two hallways behind glass doors, with students only able to access them if the advisor escorts them. The office walls do not extend to the ceiling, making the use of noise machines necessary to block out conversations and protect confidentiality. Additionally, one hallway houses the general CAS advisors and the other houses the pre-health and pre-law advisors. According to Abigail, a pre-health academic advisor I that has been in the role for almost two years,

So, this side of the hall is very mostly Type A. Premed, the typical, what you would think as a pre-med student. The other side of the hallways is more just general. A little bit laid back. I feel like we always are juggling 17 things. So, we’re just not always on the same page in this office. What works for them doesn’t work for us and what works for us doesn’t work for them.
This split has resulted in the development of multiple missions that guide the purpose of the office. The main mission of the center explains the office’s role in student success through advising, pre-law and pre-health programs, and experiential learning. While this mission specifically states that the center serves CAS student, it is understood that the advisor, especially the pre- programs, will interact with students in other colleges. The advisors characterize the overall mission of the office as: “...ultimately graduation,” “…to support students and meet students wherever they are in their journey,” or “…everything in our power to give a student something to walk away with.” Some advisors believe that this means advisors are employed for handholding or did too much for the students.

**General advising mission.**

The first-year advising program in CAS seeks to increase the success of students during their first year by encouraging them to create academic plans, explore career options, and identify co-curricular options, all while recognizing the unique needs of each student. The general advisors tended to mention spending time getting to know students beyond their academic needs and expressed a willingness to work with any student regardless of what they needed.

**Pre-health advising mission.**

The pre-health advising mission is focused on preparing students and alumni to enter the medical field. The team specifically focuses on medical school preparation and exploring career options. Abigail, the sole pre-health advisor that participated in this study, relied more on the pre-health advising organizations for assistance with understanding the role than she did the NACADA standards. As a result, she viewed her role as very different from that of the general advisors in CAS, who more closely aligned with NACADA standards, and often discussed the
office as ‘us vs. them.’ She stated that the conversations and understanding of the two roles were different because

…like the pre-professional office or I know at least the pre-health office, we have to have those tougher conversations. It's not as easy as ‘oh you're not doing well in your history class. You probably shouldn't be a history major. Let's change to psychology.’ Ours is more ‘you're not doing well in your sciences, but you want to be a doctor?’ So, our conversations are a little bit harder.

**Pre-law advising mission.**

The mission of the pre-law program, like the pre-health program, is on the career development of students interested in pursuing law as a career field. The program offers any student at SERU advice on which courses to take for preparation, LSAT assistance, application process support, and other opportunities.

A telling statement on the conflicting missions of the office was shared by Sarah, an academic advisor I that has been in the office for eight months. She said,

I would say it's both compassionate and also intense. I think it's compassion that we all know the struggles we go through with different students or with the sheer amount of work that we have to do not just in the office but with the office. We all have that basic understanding of we're in this together. We are also intense and that we are kind of mini-silos in a way for this office in particular because we have a pre-health silo. We have a pre-law silo. We have general as a silo. To go back to the individual needs that each area is serving. We don't always have the same goals. We don't always have the same route.

The multiple missions are further complicated by the divide between faculty and professional advisors. Kamala shared that not only are there multiple missions within the center, but that the
academic departments also each have their own perspective on advising, with many focusing on advising as registration.

Information is an important aspect of being an advisor and here, is shared primarily through verbal interactions. Information comes from various campus resources to the advisor who then shares it with the student. Advisors are responsible for assessing the accuracy of the information and how it is shared with the student. Miles, an academic advisor II who has been in the office for over eleven years, says the amount of information that they are required to know is overwhelming. Conversely, Cory, director of pre-law advising who has worked as an advisor for seven years with just over three of those within CAS, has embraced the information and come to enjoy “being the person who has answers. You know, they’re coming to you for answers. Embrace that role of the expert.”

The strategies employed by the office vary depending on the type of student – first-year, pre-law, or pre-health – and the needs of the student according to the majority of CAS advisors. According to Miles, “the curriculum of the college heavily influences the experiences that students have.” Cory, offering the pre-law perspective, describes their strategy a bit differently

Because, obviously, law school was an intermediate step to what our real goal is right? Being employed, being an attorney, whatever that’s students goal is. There’s still work to be done at that point. There is a path. There is a step. A tangible step there in the student’s path. It makes it a little bit more direct than what I would say a general advisor is doing.

The language used by the advisors on the advising website and in the center’s publications are geared towards how students understand their experiences. The website is littered with simple sentences and questions meant to grab your attention, such as “Check out
how to get involved,” “Want to track your progress and academic plans?” and “Find out when our special academic policies come into play.”

The director of the office was not available for an interview, but Alexis, an academic advisor II that has been in the center for close to two years, shared a positive view on the leadership of the college’s perspective on advising, saying “we’re highly appreciated. And it’s beginning to be shown. And I will say that for the school as well. I think you know within the school I think more emphasis is being placed on academic advising.”

Organizational socialization.

“To sort of help them understand what their time here looks like.” – Gwen

Advisors in the College of Arts and Science encounter multiple points of boundary crossing, a desired custodial response (with a few innovators sneaking in), and an individual and formal tactic approach to training.

Boundaries.

The hierarchical boundaries advisors encounter in CAS are as follows: academic advisor I, academic advisor II, assistant director, director of pre-law advising, director of pre-health advising, director of general advising programs, and the Assistant Dean and Director of Student Affairs. As with CBA, advisor I and II are determined by length of time within the role while all other positions are not a promotion line and only available when vacated. Along with the hierarchical boundaries are the functional boundaries divided by caseload, teaching load, oversight of special programs, and supervisory capacity. The director and assistant dean positions have reduced caseloads, teaching responsibilities, and supervisory responsibilities. Advisor I and II have higher caseloads, may teach, and may serve on committees. The
inclusionary boundary, as expressed by the majority of the CAS participants, is based on the level of trust the other members of the office have in an individual.

**Response.**

The desired response of the boundary crossing and tactics is a custodial one focused on embodying the role of an advisor who is able to connect with students and share knowledge, but is not afraid to ask questions. Carol, the director of general advising programs who has been in advising for 18 years, but only in the director role for a year and a half, shared that she does want new advisors to

Feel confident when they do start advising then, not only that they have connected with people in the office. They are comfortable asking questions if they don’t know the answer and not feeling like this authority figure or this person who’s supposed to know everything in that conversation with that student.

Cory’s goal for new advisors taking on the role is “to get them to the point where they can help students.”

Given the multiple missions for advising prevalent in the CAS center, new advisors often found themselves struggling with this response. Alexis, a general student advisor, felt that the center encouraged multiple perspectives, saying “I think it’s more of, once again, people having their own ways of doing things and you just have to find what works for you, right?” In agreement, Gwen, an academic advisor II that had been in the center for a little over a year, says

For instance, in general, my view, and I say that because I think a lot of ways Carol trained me, I had never done this before. We sort of view advising as we will help any first-year student and really students beyond that. But you know that’s sort of what we
think. Other people in the office, and again it’s not right or wrong, are a little more
traditional; I want to focus on my alpha split.

Tactics.

For the most part, the development of new advisors in the College of Arts and Sciences is
an individual process, as it is rare for multiple advisors to be hired at the same time. The multiple
advising missions also lend to this approach such as when Gwen was hired. She shared that the
split between general, pre-law, and pre-health advising led to the office being siloed. She shared
that, “You know, everyone’s doing different things but because everyone is so busy and because
of those three areas has such a different focus. There’s not always as much overlap as you would
think.” The new advisors in pre-law and pre-health also shared a similar disconnect from the
general advisors and an individual approach to their training.

The development of a new advisor begins with a formal training process followed by
informal interactions and professional development opportunities. The early stages of training
may vary by experience and role, according to Cory, who stated “with first-time advisors, that’s
slightly different. You need a little bit more structure and a little bit more guidance probably to
help you.” First-time advisors are given a training manual that contains information on policies
and resources, they participate in scheduled meetings and take part in shadowing opportunities.
Alexis shared that she was provided with a schedule

      When I got here [Carol] had, what am I going to call it, like day-to-day activities for me
to do. So, it was meeting with people. You know meeting with different offices around
campus. Getting to understand what they do and how it’s connected to what we do. A lot
of shadowing my fellow advisors.
Specifically, Carol designed the training process for general advisors to cover as much information as possible and to build knowledge over time. After the new advisor is introduced to the office and given the manual, they train on the various technology used and other aspects before they shadow advisors. This setup works in the favor of the center and new advisor because “when they start hearing these things, they know what we’re talking about. So that’s the first couple of days; get to know the office.” Although Alexis appreciated the scheduled activities and the manual, she felt that the process needed a few more formal aspects, especially since she was completely new to advising. She noted a need for more on the practice and purpose of advising, “maybe it is something we need to do personally but you know things like the Pillars, you know, understanding the theories of academic advising and particularly for people like us. I’ve not done this before.” Other new advisors, however, expressed appreciation for the current training model.

The training process for pre-health and pre-law advisors appears to be more informal than general CAS advisors. Abigail, who had worked previously in the office in a different role, found her pre-health training to be different than a general advisor that started around the same time as her, saying “since I had been in the office I kind of know kind of what, how the office functioned. I mostly took turns sitting with the three [pre-health advisors] for the first week or so or whatever.” Sarah, the new pre-law advisor, found that her supervisor’s approach to training was more of a partnership; to her, “part of the challenge there was just learning what our relationship would be like. The way I would describe it is more of a partnership than necessarily he’s the supervisor and I’m the supervisee.”

With this informal approach, advisors in pre-law and pre-health were more likely to have random steps to take on the role of an advisor, as opposed to the general CAS advisors. Cory’s
introduction to advising in the office consisted of meetings where he was guided by what he felt he needed for his role. He says “it’s really just sort of a buffet where you can choose to fill in the gaps of what you felt like. That was generally what my onboarding looked like.” Meanwhile, Carol developed a sequence for general advisors to encourage knowledge building. The sequence was important because “you can tell them stuff, but if they have no frame of reference they really don’t know what you’re talking about. So, you’ve got to give them the information and let them read it; get a little bit of knowledge.” She followed up access to information with time to see how information is relayed in practice for new advisors to fully understand the curriculum and how to interact with students. The new general advisors “go through observing it. Tying things together. Then we have conversations about what the questions are related to whatever…” She also saw the core competencies as a sequential tactic to develop in the role of an advisor; starting during the interview process.

So, in looking at the core competencies when I am training a new advisor, I would start with, through the interview process, more of the relational. Informational is something that would be emphasized in the early part of it…And the conceptual would be something they would have an opportunity to learn more about two ways – [conference or campus professional development].

Crossing the boundary from new hire in training to new advisor now practicing was variable depending on the advisor, though the advisors indicated it was typically around six weeks (roughly when training would end for the general advisor). However, the boundary crossing from the new advisor to no longer new elicits a variety of responses from those interviewed. For a handful of advisors, it was a fixed time of a year where they were able to go through “all the processes of an office” as shared by Carol. However, the clear majority stated
that it was a variable boundary that depended on a wide range of factors. For Gwen, she felt she
will no longer be a new advisor “When I can make it a whole week without asking a question.”
Kamala, an academic advisor II that has worked in CAS for close to twelve years, viewed the
boundary crossing as when an advisor begins to take on leadership roles and shares ideas. Alexis
thought that it would likely take her longer than a year to not feel like a new advisor. Sara
determined that she was no longer new, despite having been in the office for only a short while,
due to her prior experience and having gained the respect of the office.

I’ve been doing those for two and a half years but I’m definitely new to SERU. I’m still
new to this environment. But people don’t treat me like I am. That’s the funny part…I get
the feeling from a lot of my coworkers that I’ve earned their respect for the work that I’m
doing now.

Other advisors guide the development of new advisors, whether through formal
shadowing sessions, casual conversations, or working together on projects; a serial tactic. In fact,
Cory shared that the entire office participates in some capacity, “the role of the office, point out
or establishing what each individual can contribute to that onboarding process.” Kamala viewed
her role as one where “you know if you hear something you might afterwards say ‘You know I
heard this. This is what I might do.’ Just kind of come alongside and help sort of mold them.”
Miles also supported this perspective and the value of everyone being involved and assisting the
new advisor, “whether it’s through a one-on-one appointment with just a new advisor and myself
or with the new advisor attending several advising sessions with me or coming by to attend this
session with me and the students”.

The office appears to support and value the unique characteristics of each new advisor; an
investiture tactic. Abigail shared that each advisor is encouraged to develop their own approach
and advising philosophy. Alexis added that she was encouraged to be in an environment where you are not judged for not having knowledge, needing assistance, or demonstrating a different perspective but supported through those struggles.

NACADA core competencies.

“Most of them are what we do on a day-to-day basis. Even though maybe we don’t, you know, we’re not trained in doing it but I think we do it in sort of a haphazard unintentional way.” - Kamala

The advising manual for the Arts and Sciences advising center includes a link to the NACADA core values of academic advising, a large component of the conceptual competency. Gwen, having no background in advising prior to taking on this role, found value in exploring the core competencies.

I was never trained as an advisor before working as one. And I feel like a lot of people who come into this role, you know, they have their masters in like Higher Ed or Counseling. They may have worked like a student intern and I don’t have that. So, like I cannot possibly tell you the history and role of academic advising in higher education.

Informational.

Being knowledgeable is the hallmark of being an advisor, so it is no surprise that every CAS advisor placed a high value on the informational competency. Carol felt they focused more on this competency than the conceptual competency. To Cory, “establishing that baseline knowledge base before you just jump into the water and start seeing students is important.”

Kamala expressed the importance of information, due to her perception of advising as teaching.

Who teaches them the curriculum, teaches them how to use the tools that they need such as Degree Works, Banner, schedule builder, any of those kinds of things? An advisor
should be someone who can help them locate resources and help them be autonomous in their own academic career.

Informational competency is also important because it lends credence to the role and instills confidence in the advisor according to some of the more seasoned advisors and directors. Cory shared that when he first started “the advice that I got was to not even carry yourself with confidence, but to just exude knowledge. Exude the fact that I know what I’m talking about.” Miles viewed students asking him questions as a vital part of his role and one that he enjoyed. When a student asks him a question he feels honored, stating “I perceive that is you see when you ask me a question you see me, to some extent, as an expert and so you honor me with your question.” Carol further instills this during new advisor training because “knowing all that, that’s kind of like the primary thing you’re getting into the job for, is an information purveyor and listener to get [the student] going in the right direction.”

Advisors also felt the pressure to continually increase their knowledge so not to mess up a student’s future while also helping students navigate all that is available to them; especially every new advisor. Alexis “would rather ask questions than give out wrong information. Screw them up” while Sarah imagined that “it is an overwhelming amount of information that I think especially for first-generation students. We can be a super helpful resource.” She added, “here, I think it’s more dealing with a large university that it’s easy to get lost. Easy to miss information.” Sarah also found herself reading books on personal statements and law school applications to better understand the differences between pre-law advising and general advising.

Since CAS also has faculty advisors, it is important for the new advisors to understand how a faculty advisor differs from a professional advisor as well as how each department interacts with students during the advising and registration process. Carol has spent time working
with each department “to streamline that and make it more uniform; we’re working with our faculty just currently to kind of mandate that they see students for registration between certain dates based on the university’s registration times.” Despite this, faculty advisors, according to Kamala, are not invested in advising the same way as professional advisors within the office. Faculty advisors, in her opinion, “know their majors very well but that’s probably all they want to know. And that they don’t want to learn gen ed. They don’t want to learn all the requirements. They want to send them back to us.”

The College of Arts and Sciences website is heavily tied to the informational competency with the wealth of information that is shared. It is a student-friendly page with a lot of individual pages which contains focused information on advising opportunities (down to specific dates), what is expected of the student in an advising appointment, a frequently asked question page, and a page just for parents with minimal institutional vocabulary.

*Relational.*

The CAS advising website shared an article from Miles on how to choose a major; it includes a section about why a student should build a relationship with advisors and faculty. Alexis is also a strong believer in building a relationship, finding that it is a large part of advisor development

It’s fine for you to know every single thing about, you know, advising and you know how it was created. Now the conceptual information and things like that, but if you don’t know how to pass that information across to people that you are trying to help then it’s of no use…If you have all the information and you don’t have the avenue and the relationship you know to be able to disseminate that and it doesn’t. It’s not helping anyone.
How to best develop this relationship varies with each advisor. Carol models her interactions with incoming students around sharing information to let the student know that she is interested in them. Her goal is to “come across as somebody who is genuinely interested. Actively listening. Reflecting.” That way, the students knows that she understands where they are coming from and “…the conversation blossoms into what needs to be to effectively help that person. And that can happen in a minute.” Carol is also quick to email a student that has missed an appointment.

If they’ve missed an appointment, I always like to e-mail and say ‘Hey! You missed your appointment today and I was really looking forward to talking to you. I hope everything’s okay. Is there anything I can help you with by e-mail?’ Just reach out to say hey we’re paying attention.

Miles strives to make himself available to his students, “more specifically trying to, you know, be available as much as possible. Trying to be empathetic. Place myself in their shoes. I think also by, you know, will I feel necessary sharing a little bit about myself.”

However, there is this perception in CAS that the skills on how to talk or relate to students cannot be learned. New advisors shared there is not much training provided on how to speak with students. According to Abigail, she did not have any training on speaking with pre-health students, but that she was not too concerned about her ability to relate to them. She sought common ground with the students, saying “I always like to talk to them at first and be like ‘okay so where are you from? Blah Blah Blah’” because she did not want the student to think “I’m sitting here telling you ‘Oh you’re terrible. You failed all of your classes.’ Instead, I can ease them into the conversation.”
Miles was one of the few advisors that mentioned the difficulty in sharing the logic and purpose of the curriculum with students because “many students do not see the point or the purpose of taking these classes. They want to go straight into a major or minor course, into professional specific course.” Gwen was concerned that this is an area the center is not focusing on because they always do not always have the time to address the purpose of the curriculum with students.

I think one thing that again jumped out is from relational is promote student understanding of the logic and purpose of the curriculum. Because I think that that’s something that’s really lacking. And I wish we had more time to talk to them about why they are doing what they do.

Professional development is highly encouraged in the office through an in-house program where advisors are eligible in a 1% bonus if they participate in twenty hours of professional development opportunities. Alexis appreciates that “we do have opportunities to evolve, to be involved, and grow as individuals.” Gwen suggested that the professional development hours were helpful because it “forces you to get out there and do things that maybe at first you wouldn’t think, you’re like, I just need something and this fits in my schedule. You sort of realize that this is really helpful for me to know.” Advisors in CAS have the opportunity to attend NACADA conferences and serve in leadership roles in the organization, participate in SEAA, and attend other conferences or institutes based on their role in the office. However, not all advisors participate in these opportunities and at certain times in the semester, it can be hard to find the time. Gwen shared

The struggle is that especially in the thick of the semester could be a little bit like Groundhog Day. You wake up, you come in, you see students, and there’s that. And
when you’re so busy like that there’s not always the opportunity to plan longer term things. To work on projects. Because you’re sort of in crisis mode all the time.

At the same time, Gwen also shared that the center saw professional development as something important based on the support given in the office. She felt that she was supported in “dreaming big about the things that you want to do and the things you can do.” Few other advisors, especially new advisors, expressed such deep appreciation for professional development.

**Conceptual.**

The conceptual competency was brought up when discussing the purpose of advising, student types, outcomes, and approaches to advising by only a handful of advisors. The history of advising and *core values of academic advising* were mentioned by Carol and Kamala when they defined the purpose of advising. For Carol, the core values demonstrated to a student “genuineness. Trust. Caring. Belongingness. You’re in the right place.” While Kamala felt that a great understanding of history would further explain “that advising is about more than just registration and that ultimately our job is to help freshmen transition from high school to college.”

The outcomes of advising were also mentioned a few times by advisors in CAS. Cory stated that it is imperative to work with students so “each semester you can set one small goal. So, being more adult. It’s probably not an effective way but just growing.” Abigail shared that an outcome of advising should be options, especially when working with the pre-health population.

Well, you are telling someone that their dream of being a doctor is more than likely not going to happen or going to take a lot longer than they wanted it to. So, you have to be, like I said earlier, be honest with them but also give them, like, plan B.
Theory and advising approaches were heavily discussed by Carol and Kamala. Carol admitted that the office is not discussing approaches as often as they had in the past. At one time, the center would discuss an advising model at staff meetings, including why the advisor selected it and how to use the approach in practice. The conversations were important, according to Carol, because the advisors were able to develop a “basket of tricks.” An increased focus on approaches and theories during the training process was advocated for by Kamala to strengthen their response to students and how to ask questions. Kamala said that

What I would like to see is that advisors are trained in advising theory. That they’re training in, you know, different methods. That they’re trained in questioning; how to formulate good questions and open-ended questions.

However, Alexis, while she saw value in advising approaches, viewed them as something that comes naturally and not thought of every day. To emphasize this point she said, “once again going back to the theories. I implement this theory every single day but I’m not sitting there thinking ‘oh I need to practice self-authorship today.’ It just comes naturally.”

When discussing approaches, Sarah thought the office wanted to be one way, but in practice, it was actually another way. She contributed this to the number of students the office serves.

It’s less hands on. It’s more, I would say prescriptive and more leaning on the developmental side than the intrusive or holistic side. I think we want to be a holistic but because we serve so many students we don’t always have that deeper conversation that I’m used to doing.
While Carol promoted the appreciative advising approach within the office so that students felt comfortable in the office and open to “asking questions and not feeling judged. Because if that happens all those things can open up to be a path for help.”

**College of Engineering**

As a relatively new office, the College of Engineering advising center made for a fascinating study when compared to the other two colleges. The culture is still in flux, yet the advisors present more varied understandings of *NACADA academic advising core competencies* when compared to the other college advising centers.

**Advising culture.**

“There are some people in our office who would say that our expected outcome is that our students graduate when they’re supposed to, successfully. Other advisors in our office would say that the outcome is that our students feel supported and encouraged through their time here.” - Liz

The COE advising office was founded in early 2010’s after the current director and former dean made a proposal for a professional advising center. According to the director, Phillip, who has worked in the college for over twenty-five years,

It wasn’t that the faculty were doing a terrible job. It was just evolving so much. Our enrollment back prior, fifteen years ago, it was about eighteen hundred students. Now the College of Engineering has about 6,000 students. Big change.

Those big changes included not only the growth in enrollment, but also the technology used in advising and the increasing university focus on retention and student success. At first, there was pushback from faculty about hiring professional advisors, but Philip says “now they don’t want to touch it. But I think that’s because they’ve gained confidence in our advisors as professionals.
That they know what they’re doing.” On the advising center’s website, an overview of the history of the center is provided as well as references to NACADA and O’Banion’s seminal article on advising, but these references were not on any other website pages or provided documents.

The center is in a recently renovated space with larger offices (some vacant), a conference room, waiting area, and more. This is a significant step up from the previous spaces the center had occupied, where advisors had shared an office or were separated by cubical walls. Some see this renovated space as a signal that the administration in COE is paying attention to advising and making it a priority. The center currently employs eight professional advisors. Despite this, the advisor to student ratio is high, at 800 to 1, and the office is not able to meet with every student for one-on-one appointments.

In writing, the mission of the center “is to educate students on the importance of academic advising” and to develop a partnership with the student while assisting them in designing and achieving their goals. The vision of the office also states that students advising in COE will gain “confidence in their knowledge of their curriculum, their ability to create and execute their academic plan, and their potential for success.” Students, parents, and other stakeholders can find this information, with a few select words changed out, on the college’s website, advising guidebook, and in the orientation guide available online. The orientation guide includes a syllabus that further develops the partnership, or ‘relationship,’ as it is referred to in that guide, by adding advisor and student expectations.

When speaking with advisors, most state that this is the purpose of advising, but the researcher is choosing to interpret this as an understanding of the mission, a process well beyond simply choosing classes. As Philip states, “it’s really coaching that student to, in my opinion, to
understand where they are academically, career-wise, and to assist them in planning their career.” Holden, an academic advisor II that has been in the office for over four years, says the role “would be to help students transition to college life, and set their plans to obtain their degree, work with them as they develop, and be there if they need any type of resources.” Both Holden and Phillip’s statements echo the published mission and vision of the office. However, Doreen, an academic advisor I that has been in the office for four months, takes a different view.

We function as a pin clearing office. So, although our mission says that we’re here to help students, we’re here to do that and do what we need to do, our function at its core is pin clearing. And culturally, that causes some disruption. So, depending on the time of the semester, depending on the day, our culture can be very supportive, very enthusiastic, and very helpful. But other times of the semester, it's very much you can see that the core function of the office is to clear pins because the College of Engineering requires advising every semester.

Every advisor in the center, when asked about their role, mentioned graduation, timely graduation, or planning for graduation as part of their purpose.

Socialization focuses on the information received and how the new advisor uses it. According to Phillip, “a good [emphasis added] advisor can pick up on, again, things outside of just what classes you are to take.” This is further explored below.

Information is particularly important to the COE advisors; some view this as a primary aspect of their role. Primarily shared through conversation, with a focus on collaborating with each other, information needs to be correct and follow the policies and procedures of the office. Sharing correct information is how they gain the respect of the Engineering faculty. According to Doreen, a new advisor, “our office really likes rules and I think that our office uses those kinds
of things. So almost all informational and a little bit of relational to set very black and white boundaries.” However, Phillip also sees opportunities for the staff to collaborate and share information, saying “they talk to each other all the time because there are always similarities of what’s going on. You know they need to know the curriculums for all of the departments.” The COE advising website also contains a whole section on the advising process with very procedural language.

Closely related to information, the strategy of the center could be best described as accuracy in information to facilitate timely graduation. Liz, an academic advisor I that has been in the office for little over three years, says it best; “I think, because of the number of students we see, our main focus is just going to be making sure they all meet their degree requirements in the timeframe that they want.” Another aspect of the strategy is to focus on the students. According to John, an academic advisor I that had been in the office for nine weeks, “I think that the phrase you’ll probably hear is that we’re going to stress that advising is teaching. We’re going to be a student-focused student center.”

Phillip, the director of the College of Engineering advising center, does not advise students, but looks for advisors that are “…committed to the advising process of working and developing students…A good advisor is going to really commit themselves to student development.” The advisors in the center look to the assistant director for guidance on advising protocols and issues while the director serves as an advocate with higher administration. However, Liz shares that despite this advocacy

My experience has been that I don’t feel like the higher-ups outside of our office understand. I think everybody in our office has a good grasp on what we do and what we’re expected to do. Outside of our office, at a Dean’s level or even beyond that, there
isn’t really any real understanding of what we do and what our purpose is other than make sure students are registered correctly.

**Organizational socialization.**

“...it takes anywhere from nine months to a year to train the average advisor to be really competent, in my opinion. And it’s still an on-going kind of a learning curve because curriculum’s change all the time, the rules change, all that. But I feel very comfortable after nine months to a year that a new advisor is really ready. And sometimes its sooner because it all depends on the experience that advisor had.” - Phillip

As with the other colleges, the COE new advisor organizational socialization process tends to involve hierarchical and functional boundaries, a custodial response, and numerous tactics.

**Boundaries.**

The office has four levels of hierarchical boundaries – director, assistant director, academic advisor II, and academic advisor I. Functional boundaries closely mirror the hierarchical boundaries at the director, assistant director, and advisor roles. The director, Phillip, shared that his role is “anything dealing with student records falls under my area as director of engineering student services” whereas Munroe, the assistant director who has worked in the office for three years, but has prior advising experience, advises “a small caseload and supervise seven advisors.” However, these boundaries are not without tension, as Liz shared

When I started, we had just created the coordinator position. When [Wanda] left, Munroe stepped into that role. It’s kind of messy. Within six months of that, of her stepping into that coordinator position, she was given the assistant director position that was created for her. I don’t know. I think as she’s been learning how to lead and manage, we’ve also had
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to learn how to submit to that. We get referred to as lower level pretty often. There’s tension there.

The inclusion boundary appears to be a less stressful boundary and one that was easy to surmount. Munroe, the assistant director, finds that “the advisor is no longer new, I guess, once they have that confidence and they have that knowledge base to be successful. They feel comfortable.” Jessica, an academic advisor II that has been in the office for a little over a year, shared that she felt very welcome early on and it did not take long to feel like part of the center. To her, “it feels like I’ve been here forever. So, we’ve kind of formed a little bit of a family and it just, I don’t feel new”. All of the new advisors expressed that they already felt like a valued part of the office.

**Response.**

The desired response, as a result of boundary crossings and tactics, is a custodial one. New advisors are to embody the role of advisor as viewed by the college and to not make mistakes. According to Phillip, “I want them to be proficient in their area. To understand what advising is.” For Doreen, the understanding of the role is based on sufficient knowledge in the curriculum, policies, and procedures so as to not make a mistake and that if a “mistake is made it is a student taking responsibility for it and not something that was kind of our fault.” Many new advisors expressed a similar perspective on not making mistakes and fitting the idea of an advisor for COE. Munroe designed the training process to demonstrate the ‘ideal advisor,’ as defined by the office, “I felt like there just needed to be some structure and some education on what a quality advisor should look like.”

These ideals are reinforced through the advising handbook, which includes specific ways to email students and a dress code of wearing a name tag at all times are detailed. At the end of
the training process, a new advisor is expected to “… hit the ground running. So, the goal is to be able to train them up to where they are comfortable being able to communicate with students and know the proper procedure to follow.” Shuri, an academic advisor II that has been in the office for four years, further explains that the training process is meant “to provide the most, the best quality advising experience for our students. That’s what we want to do.”

Despite this, one advisor exhibited a somewhat innovator response to the tactics they encountered. Doreen, in particular, was more of a content innovator when she realized post-training that her role needed to be performed in a different manner than the training referenced. She shared that a negative occurrence after training was the realization that

‘Here’s the rulebook but we only follow 75% of them because we don’t have the time to do the other 25%’…so negatively, it's ‘here’s the rulebook, follow these’ and it's not until you really get in and start trying to follow them that you realize how unfollowable some of them are.

As a result, she sought ways to rectify these discrepancies and change her role to best suit her student's need.

Tactics.

The COE advising center has a detailed training schedule for all new advisors; although the interviews indicated it has had multiple iterations in the short history of the center. A sample training calendar, provided by the office, shows an individual, formal training period with a sequential structure and serial interactions.

In the COE advising center, it is very rare for multiple advisors to be hired at the same time, allowing for an individual tactic as opposed to collective. In fact, Munroe shared that she meets with each new advisor one-on-one several times during the training period “to basically
kind of present them the handbook and kind of give them an overview. I also read and talk through and work through examples about the entire handbook and given them an opportunity to ask questions.”

This individual approach, coupled with an advising culture focused on the accuracy of the information, has led to the adoption of formal tactics, which are later expounded upon and undone by informal tactics. The advisors have certain experiences they must go through during training, such as meeting with department chairs and campus resources, shadowing other advisors for a certain amount of time, and several one-on-one conversations with the assistant director related to the role of an advisor, policies, and procedures. Holden shared that

When we hire new hires, they get at least two weeks to four weeks of shadowing other advisors. They’ve got a set schedule at looking at different things in advising. They meet with different offices on campus like with the registrar’s office, scholarships, co-op. In his opinion, this setup, “with a more formal training and longer training that can help them have a better step,” is important to the development of new advisors.

The formal process is followed by an informal period during which the advisor practices what they learned throughout the formal process, with supervision from Munroe. At this point, new advisors meet with students for appointments, but according to Munroe they are “fewer and kind of spread out. And then at that point, I would still be kind of supervising and communicating, you know, ‘tell me about that appointment and how that works’.” However, this informal period often unravels around what the advisor learned during the formal process. Doreen indicated that although she learned “the rulebook” in training almost immediately after she realized that only a portion of the rules were followed in practice and some were “unfollowable.”
However, this structure, at least the initial formal structure, is relatively new to the office. When Munroe started in the office three years ago, the training she experienced was three weeks long with no structure and relied heavily on her previous advising experience. At the time, she spent a lot of time with her direct supervisor and “was given a binder, kind of ‘read through this’ and because I had prior experience to advising in a different institution I kind of felt like I knew what I was doing.” Liz also stated that her training as a new advisor was more informal and mostly took place on the job. She stated that “I trained in experience. I did not really have any training when I started. I sat and shadowed [Wanda] for about a week and then started seeing students.”

Only a handful of the advisors in COE had prior advising experience; very different from that of CAS and CBA where many advisors had previous experience. For those with previous experience, they had more random and skewed steps in assuming the role of advisor. The more recent advising hires; however, experienced very clear steps in assuming the role of an advisor. As mentioned before, the new advisors had specific meetings, scheduled shadowing sessions, targeted conversations, and activities to participate in prior to meeting with students on their own. Shuri felt that these were all necessary steps, but that it was also important to have the advisors meet with students early

Because now that we’ve had two new advisors come in this semester, watching them now both advising students on their own already or, at this point, have to watch this it's like, there’s only so much they can observe. There’s only so much they can ask questions about what they see you do. But then they have to actually get that experience of doing it.

These sequential steps assisted the advisor in crossing the boundary from “in-training” to “in practice.” This boundary passage often occurred within the month of training; a fixed tactic.
The boundary passage of no longer being a new advisor was assigned via various requirements and timelines by the advisors in the office, making it a variable tactic. For some, it was a year on the job, an important timeline to Shuri, who stated “I feel it in a year’s time you have completely, you’ve mostly seen everything there is to see.” However, John felt that he would no longer be new once

I have gone two days without asking Shuri a question. I think that you that there’s gonna come a point where you realize that, I don’t know if there’s a timeline, but there’s a point where you realize ‘I know this,’ you know.

Doreen felt no longer new in the COE advising center, despite her short time in the office, because within her previous advising experience at another institution “I was the new advisor even up to the point that I left. If was you don’t make an appointment with Doreen, you make an appointment with the new advisor.” Despite this, she had been in the previous role for over two years.

Another fixed boundary passage is from academic advisor I to academic advisor II. All advisors are hired as an academic advisor I and are automatically promoted to academic advisor II, according to Phillip, after certain criteria are met. Any titled boundary passage after this is variable as there is not a career ladder for advisors beyond academic advisor II. Phillip found himself “always concerned about growth for our advisors. You know, and opportunities to grow beyond the advisor I or advisor II…We have now instituted an advisor II status. We need a III.”

While Munroe designed the advisor training process, all advisors in the office participated in some manner beginning with the interview process. Munroe was very intentional in establishing a relationship early on with potential advisors and the center during the interview process. Due to this, she said, “I like for our advisor to be able to meet with all the candidates
Philip praised encouraging current advisors’ participation, “I mean she just doesn’t train them herself. The other advisors are also involved in training new advisors because they shadow them as well.” The shadowing process was where new advisors were able to see various styles of advising and begin to identify their own, yet these varying perspectives could often conflict. Jessica argued that the varying perspectives could be helpful, but that “I do feel like there are sometimes certain people in this office that are a little bit more closed minded and are not, may not be as open to new ideas and perspectives.” Despite this, the advisors were quick to support each other and provide further information. In fact, John was pleased that Shuri would “…come in daily and usually every morning and every afternoon and just checking in on me…Everybody’s been good about asking questions, are always answering questions.”

Despite the formal set-up of the training process and the rigid structure on how to answer emails, mark flowcharts, and follow the policies, the center is focused on investing in those they hire by using what they bring to the table; an investiture tactic. Munroe worked hard to better understand the needs of the new hires because

You have to learn how that person receives information. Because not every. There’s not like a cookie cutter way to train someone, right. You have to meet them where they are. Cause some people might be more visual and some might be more practical.

For Jessica, this was evident in her training and how the office allowed her to start seeing students a bit earlier. She appreciated that the office took the initiative in “training me on what I needed to know, but kind of letting me do my own thing and figure it out myself. Because I’m not really a by the book type of person”.
NACADA core competencies.

“I think in our office, we use a little bit of all three competencies but most of what we do comes from informational. Because of knowing the curriculum and the degree programs and building, having that campus community.” – Shuri

The College of Engineering advisors had a habit of unintentionally, and a few intentionally, ranking the core competencies with informational and relational consistently viewed as one and two and conceptual at the end. In fact, some advisors in COE indicated that they are able to build relationships with students because of the information they provide. The office created an advising checklist that includes aspects of all competencies, but only a few referred to it in conversation. This checklist included questions to ask students at various points in the conversation. John specified that “informational [was] heavily [represented] in the advising manual…I think relational you saw a lot more in the job shadowing…And then from the conceptual standpoint, I think there’s some this has been it’s there a little bit through meetings.”

Informational.

The advising manual provided to all new advisors is heavy with information. It contains all the policies and procedures the office follows, at both the college and institution level, but also guidelines on emails, how to record student interactions, course requirements, and the office mission. For many of the advisors, being able to accurately provide information on the items listed, and many others, was a large concern. To Holden, this was of the utmost importance

Because this is somebody’s future. And the way tuition is now. The cost. You know you don’t want to give bad advice. You don’t want the student to have to take an unnecessary
class because taking an unnecessary class could mean $3000…Because the most, the more accurate information you can give them the better off they’re going to be.

Liz found that students expected their advisor to be knowledgeable on degree requirements and curriculum; at times, almost to the extreme. She felt that students “expect us to know policies and procedures of the institution almost more than we sometimes should. I think they expect us to know the ins and outs of the Registrar’s office, the financial aid office, and the scholarship office.”

Having this knowledge, according to Liz, allows the advisor to serve as a resource to the student; the more training they have the better they can pass that information along. Phillip also places a high priority on the information the advisors possess, especially the curriculum, “I can’t overemphasize that. You have to get this right. There’s not a lot of room for error in advising, in my opinion.”

The importance placed on gaining knowledge and passing on information for many of the advisors was a defining aspect of the role, a way to convey confidence (or question it), and a point of pride. Munroe laughingly declared that

So, we’re competitive. We’re learners. So, we quickly marked up our flowcharts and it was so good because we got to put into practice, like, we know our content. We know our material. Like, give me a blank piece of paper I can draw you out a flowchart and help you plan out courses to graduation. Like, we try to make sure that we know that information like the back of our hand.

Liz went on to state that advisors are meant to be resources for students. In order to fulfill that role, knowledge and training are important because “the more information we can pass on to them the better. The confidence goes a long way in the interaction you have with students.”
However, students that return with questions can shake the advisor's confidence in their knowledge. Shuri found herself pondering that knowledge one day when she “had a student this semester I saw four times and that made me think ‘What am I doing wrong?’ But it’s just that he had multiple questions.”

**Relational.**

Mentioned often by the advisors in COE, the relational component of advising was established early at orientation, as evidenced by the advising syllabus included within the orientation packet found on their website. However, the advising guide displayed in the lobby did not have a focus on the relational aspect. It primarily included the informational component.

Nevertheless, the advisors each spent a significant amount of time discussing this area. Phillip encouraged the advisors in the office to engage with the students because

They’re really open to talking about, you know, personal things going on in their lives. And you never know. You never know. We have students who are coming in and who sometimes, an advisor can pick up that this may be a psychological problem that student may need to be referred to the counseling center or whatever based on some conversations that they are having.

Munroe makes sure that advisor-student relationships are discussed during training, nonetheless, Shuri discussed that training needs to be expanded to include a “component of training for all advisor, just period, about how to handle students when they decide to [share] something really personal to you about that.”

Another component of the relational competency is planning and conducting successful advising appointments. Doreen was the only advisor in the entire study that questioned what is meant by ‘successful,’
Number four stands out – plan and conduct successful advising interactions. The success word is what stands out. Because what makes a successful advising appointment interaction? If a student gets registered or if a student better understanding? And then how do you measure that?

John embraced planning and did his best to make the meeting productive by reviewing flowcharts, making notes, and asking other advisors questions before his appointments with students. Before a student comes to his office, he wants to be able to say “‘here’s the flowchart already marked up.’ I’ve already made notes on my advisor sheets because I don’t know why they’re coming in. I’ve looked and their past advising sheets.”

The final part of the relational component includes furthering the understanding of advising and the development of advisors; Phillip hopes advisors viewed relational as important because “I’m a strong believer in professional development. And that’s how you grow in this field.” Advisors shared that they were encouraged to attend SEAA meetings and NACADA conferences. Despite these opportunities, Phillip worried they were not doing enough to develop the advisors and encourage growth;

I’m always concerned about growth for our advisors, you know, and opportunities to grow beyond the advisor I or advisor II. And we place a lot of pressure on them. And I wonder from a contradictory standpoint are we really giving them the confidence that if ‘I want to make a career out of this what are my opportunities for growth?’ You know because sometimes you can get just stuck in this ‘Okay I’m an advisor II and masters but what is it from there? Right. What’s next?’

Furthermore, the caseload complicated the ability for advisors to effectively access their understanding of the relational competency due to lack of time with students. John expressed
frustration that “while you would love to have this relational and you’d love to kinda have, you
know, sometimes you’ll only have, you know, during the thick of it, some students are only
going to see an advisor for seven minutes.” However, Munroe found that in those longer sessions
it is important to “find a way to meet the student where they are and make them feel like they are
being heard in that twenty minutes, for that twenty minutes they have someone on campus to go
to and talk to.”

Conceptual.
The conceptual competency was overtly discussed the least. The director of the office,
Phillip, admitted to not being aware of the NACADA pillars of advising and indicated that he
relied on Munroe to share that information with the advisors. Munroe developed the more
formalized training structure and included the *core values of academic advising* in the handbook
because

> It was something that was lacking, just the knowledge base of what advising is. So, I felt
like there needed to be a foundation of what is advising and then what does it look like.
What should it look like and how can I get to that point where I’m doing what I need to
do to be a quality advisor on this campus.

During their training and prep time, advisors are encouraged to explore the NACADA website
for further information to apply to their practice. However, Shuri shared that she wished her
training had included more information on advising theory. Holden, also a seasoned advisor, felt
the same, seeking conversations and time to “actually, you know, read and, you know, review
some of the theories. And kinda sit and read over theory and realize ‘Hey how does this relate to
me? How have I used this in the past? How can I use that?’.” Doreen frustratingly expressed, “I
don’t think people realize that there is theory with it and how much it’s rooted in student
development, theory and interpersonal relationships and all kinds of things.” Jessica found the conceptual to be a less relevant component of her practices because

   Like we’re not looking at a NACADA website every day trying to figure out what the core values are. You kind of just hone into that on your own and you figure it out on your own and you just do it, I feel like. Rather than actually looking into that to see what that actually means.

She further shared that although the competency is important, “I don’t feel like people are researching the history of advising just on a whim. Or you know looking at theories.” She added that its value was relegated to interview preparation or when developing a personal advising philosophy.

**Southeast Research University**

Founded in the early 1800s, and serving as the state’s flagship institution, Southeast Research University prides itself on being a model to other institutions in teaching, research, and athletics.

**Culture.**

“I would have trouble defining what the culture is because it does feel so different. I don’t think that that’s necessarily a bad thing; I think that it is very likely that an engineering student needs a different type of advising than a finance and economics double major in business.” - Cory

Advising culture can be a bit complicated on a large campus with a decentralized model. The responsibility of advising varies from college to college, as does the purpose. Additionally, there is no single understanding of advising at SERU. Carl, a new CBA advisor, confessed “I don’t feel comfortable speaking on a university level. Advising is organized on the college level. I don’t think there’s a clear university perspective.” All the participants agreed that the advising
cultures vary depending on college as the students have different needs and different curriculum with new advisors being more hesitant to describe the university perspective. Jessica felt that its “one of those things that varies as well just from college to college. And we all function, I feel, in such different capacities.” Miles, an advisor in CAS, compared the cultures in his college and that of CBA

‘This is what you have to have. You need to be on time. Don’t waste my time. Have a good break. I’ll see you next week.’ That has groomed those students to be able to take care of themselves like they probably should in terms of becoming more responsible and having some skin in the game. Whereas, and this is just a broad brush I know I’m using, if I told a student in Arts and Sciences ‘you need to be on time, don’t waste my time,’ many of those students would get mad. Many would call Mama. Mama would call.

Kat, a CBA advisor, knew many of her colleagues were frustrated with the state of advising at SERU and hoped new advisors were shielded from the frustration. She said “Well, I would almost say ignorance is bliss because they don’t know. I think the people who have been here, especially longer than me…I think it’s more disappointing for them…because, especially, if you’ve been fighting for it so long”.

As far as any of the advisors participating in this study know, there has never been a centralized advising center at Southeast Research University. The colleges have long been left to define advising as leadership saw fit, assign the role as needed, and to train as little or as much as they wanted. However, a few years ago, after a visit from NACADA consultants, upper administration began to move towards a centralized advising component that never made it to fruition. Barry, director of CBA advising, shared that campus-wide advising is a “work in
progress…That tragic culture [from prior attempt at a student success center] is being torn apart and reenergized...But I think it puts challenges on the office.”

The locations of advising vary by college. All three of the colleges in this study held advising primarily in a centralized office (centralized to that college) or in faculty offices. In addition to varied locations, the environment can be further impacted by how independent each college functions. Matilda, a CBA advisor, found that “because colleges operate kind of independently in terms of how they advise students, and so there’s not uniform definition of advising from a university level. There is no consistency across colleges with advising.”

This becomes obvious when advisors were asked about the university advising mission and how they would define the culture. A committee on campus worked a few years ago on vision, mission, and goals for advising at SERU. The resulting document can be found on an advising hub website that is currently not active. The vision states

The Academic Advising team strives to support the development of our students by using effective and innovative high-impact practices. Southeast Research University aspires to be on the cutting edge of advising by transforming student-advisor partnerships that enable students to become valuable citizens of the world.

The mission states

Through evidence-based advising strategies and internal assessment, advisors cultivate intentional interactions with students that help them make the best choices for achieving their academic, personal, and professional goals. Advisors work with students to identify their individual needs and values to develop academic and co-curricular plans while teaching them strategies to think critically and be resilient.
Kamala, a seasoned CAS advisor, believes the university still struggles with the purpose of advising, as did other seasoned advisors. In her opinion the university views advising as registration, although “I have seen a change in culture in the last few years that we’re getting more and more able to realize that advisor is more than registration.” Furthermore, Alexis, a new CAS advisor, defined the culture of advising as “to reduce what’s called the lack of completion rate, for lack of a better term. You know, we as academic advisors who play a very important role in that.”

As with the environment, how members are socialized varies by college. Training structures have similar components, but the purpose and execution are different. The timeline also varies. Despite this, advisors participating in this study did share that the University was getting better at communicating the importance of advising. Carol, an advising director in CAS, who is active in the campus advising organization, believes that “Southeast Research University is beginning to recognize the importance of advising in retention of students. And success of our students.” Cory shared that the advisor-created advising mission and vision were not shared across campus.

It exists. It’s just not widely recognized and acknowledge and pointed to. Well, I remember we are part of groups that of establishing a mission state, establishing a vision. All these things. I don’t remember, and I’m a pretty good email checker, I don’t remember a big rollout to colleges…It came and went. It didn’t seem to sink in.

Information on advising is shared on various websites, reminder emails, and college-based publications. The advising hub website cannot be found via a search; the link must be shared. It was last updated in spring 2018 and uses a picture of someone that is not an advisor on
its main page. Student opinion pieces and SGA platforms available via the student newspaper website tend to focus on the informational aspects of the role.

This attitude is similar even amongst professionals on campus. Bianca expressed frustration with a colleague in another department in CBA that did not understand the advisor role.

Yes! She was like ‘Oh I thought you just did registration in the office.’ Me and [Jimmy] just look like ‘Girl, just come down to our office and see what we do. Do you see these students wrapped around this office?’ That's great that university has over 8,500 business students. That's awesome. But we also have other things going on. So, I feel like that just goes back to the university where we actually do. And people not understanding that ‘hey we're not just having a five-minute conversation to do registration and we're not just advising students. We are getting to know them and their families and building a relationship and coordinating duties and committee stuff.’

As shared by Cory, a director in CAS, the advising strategy at SERU is, to a degree, “how can we use each other to make this overall institutionally more effective.” Other advisors shared that the advising strategy was to simply manage the influx of students and to not mess up.

According to Phillip, director of COE advising, university-wide advising leadership is, “I think it’s developing...But I think only recently. I think in the last eight years that I believe faculty, the administration has taken advising seriously. Prior to that, I don’t think it took it that seriously.” Carol also shared this perspective, stating that administration was beginning to pay attention and listen to advisors, evidenced by partnerships between student and academic affairs.

So, therefore, they're understanding the role that this plays through advising. It's not just course registration. And I think the people that really thought and maybe it was that way
30 years ago and that's how they kept thinking. They've kind of found something else to do. So now we have people who understand that approach better and are more like ‘of course’ and willing to listen. ‘What can we do to make it work better?’ And they want to. They do. They just need the guidance. It's less of ‘Hey. That sounds like a great plan. Let's do this without asking the people who actually have to implement and work with it.’ They're asking. They're doing a reverse role and its grassroots up.

Regardless, Holden still finds that upper administration is not focusing on advising. He said, “I don’t think they’re devoting the resources or the time. Because, you know, the university, if they wanted something done, it could get done.” Many other advisors, especially those not in leadership positions, expressed similar thoughts.

Support.

“If the advisor wants to or is encouraged to do so. Again, it’s not something that the university is mandating or forcing people to do or is like providing some type of structure for it. There are opportunities there if someone wants to reach out.” - Cory

The advisors in this study mentioned several ways that SERU offered support to advisors; new or otherwise. Renewed SEAA support, participation in the Project Success advising initiative, creation of a job family, college-based training, and being left to their own devices were all seen as positive measures of support.

Carol and Kamala praised the professional development support the University offered advisors through SEAA and Project Success though they were two of the very few that offered this praise. Kamala stated, “I think having Project Success and having those discussions and speakers coming in, that’s a positive change and that shows that someone is taking notice of
advising.” When addressing SEAA, Carol expressed her belief of the support SERU has offered stating

They are fully supporting the Southeast Research University Advisors Association, SEAA, by funding lunch for these meetings. So, people tend to participate more to come in and hear and get information when they’re fed. They are supporting us in that. They are supporting us with campus partnerships through [other offices] and the divisions with getting webinars that are associated with SEAA meetings to encourage knowledge, growth, and just personal development.

Additionally, Project Success was responsible for the creation of an advising retention initiative that included committees responsible for creating an advising vision and mission and advising hub; all mentioned previously. The hub provides advisors and students with advising resources through special portals for each group. The hub also includes a semester advising spotlight that was last updated spring 2018, DegreeWorks tutorials, advising timeline, and SERU resources. These were viewed by the advisors aware of the website as great resources for all advisors but especially those new to the position. Whereas the creation of an advising vision and mission was viewed as an attempt to establish a common understanding of advising. This common perspective was viewed by the advisors aware of the document as a way to support the development of new advisors and those currently in the role by expanding the campus definition and importance of advising.

The ability to transition to advisor II after a certain amount of time in the role was viewed as measure of support by new advisors in CAS. Though mentioned by the new advisors in COE and CBA, the new advisors in CAS were particularly appreciative of the advisor II promotion opportunity and deemed it as a signal of their growth and the support of the university.
Training was viewed as a supportive measure for new advisors. Though it is developed within each college, the advisors generally viewed the University as allowing and encouraging training to take place. Gwen shared that advisor training across campus appeared to be strong as she has yet to encounter a student that had been misadvised by another advisor – “it seems like everyone, you know, is pretty well trained in what they do. I have not run into really any issues like people coming to us from another college who have been mis-advised in their college.”

Related to the college-based training, the advisors less involved in leadership positions and SEAA (over half of the study participants) were appreciative of the University allowing the colleges to develop advising as the college saw fit. In their view this hands-off approach allowed the college to not only address the unique needs of the students in the college but to also support the advising staff as the college saw fit without unnecessary oversight.

**Impede.**

“I have yet to understand this university in the sense that they want the absolute, they want excellence in everything, but they’re doing it in terms of staff on a skeleton crew.” - Jasmine

Expressing frustration and discussing the not so great aspects of the university seemed to come easier to some of the advisors; especially the seasoned advisors and advisor trainers. Many expressed that administrators lack awareness of the value, lack of an advising mission and centralized component, no common training, and increased student numbers made it hard to develop in the role. Additionally, frustration with the advising hub website, advising job family, and the FLSA possible implementation were mentioned as hampering development.

Most advisors expressed frustration with administration and imparted some of the difficulty of developing within their role to the administrations’ lack of understanding of the value of the role. Jessica, a COE advisor, articulated a lack of administrative awareness of
advising when she explained, “and it could just be here in the college, but I feel like there’s not always a clear understanding of how important we actually are.” Bianca, an advisor in CBA, was similarly frustrated with the administration when she stated

But the university as a whole does not understand this. They don't understand that ‘Oh it's not just curriculum;’ we're trying to build a relationship. And I feel like if the university followed this piece of paper, I feel like they will only see certain things on this paper [referring to core competencies guide], like, let's see, legal guidelines on advising practice, including privacy regulations and confidentiality. I feel like someone in a senior associate dean of students, I don't know, position would look at that and say ‘Oh that's great. That's good that you all do that.’ But would totally overlook facilitate problem-solving, decision making, meaning making, planning, and goal setting. I don't know. I just feel like that would be the difference. They would look at, for lack of a better word, what saved their asses instead of what we actually do.

Matilda pointed out that the University struggles to invest in faculty development, much less advisor development; “I think they should invest in advisors regardless but, I mean, we don’t even have a faculty teaching and learning centers, so I think if we’re not investing in faculty… They tend to come first in a lot of things.” Jasmine took a rather scathing perspective on the understanding and value placed on advising when she shared

Once again, it’s coming back down to the value…There’s a difference between accepting someone and tolerating someone and right now I feel like I’m just being tolerated. And so, it's not just that they don’t accept me, like me as a person, but looking at my role, what I do, what I bring to the table, what we do for the students on this campus. It’s literally coming down to do you value me?
Along similar lines, several advisors pointed out a lack of clear advising vision and mission for the University as a whole, not at the college level. Cory was a proponent of a centralized perspective because it took some pressure off the colleges to define and operationalize a vision and mission. In his opinion, SERU developing and setting a vision “takes a little bit of onus off each individual college to create these thematic mission statements that are leading the charge.” Kamala also saw value in creating a centralized perspective and highlighted the work of Project Success as a starting point, but went on to express frustration with it not being implemented; “I don’t know why it hasn’t kind of trickled down that this is the advising statement. And I think that’s sort of if the campus is lacking anything, it’s this cohesive, unified approach to advising and things like that.” Barry, director of CBA advising, best expresses what the competencies are and where SERU is in reaching them as a unified approach to advising [These are] utopia in academic advising. Will we ever reach that? No. I don’t want to be the pessimist saying no but I also want to say you’re dealing with. I said at the beginning this university is still a work in progress. Change with regard to academic advising. I don’t think we’ll ever reach the point where we’ve succeeded. The only way they, administration, views success is when that student goes across the stage. That’s success to them. You know success in our eyes is yeah, ‘we got him across the stage,’ but are they going to be a real representative of the type of product of this institution heading into the world. No matter what their discipline is.

The advisors also disagree on the direction of the university advising culture. Some indicate there have been positive changes while others say there has been no change with even others express disappointment with missed opportunities. Doreen, who has worked at another institution as an advisor, expressed frustration with the university perspective she noticed in her
few months in COE and said, “we can make, we can say pretty things and do pretty things, but it may not result in pretty things.” Kamala also expressed frustration with the university after not seeing the recommendations from a NACADA consultant visit or the resulting task force effectively implemented.

I think my final thoughts would be that there is so much more that this campus, and our college, can be doing in regards to advising. There’s just more. And it doesn’t always have to be this grand overhaul. It can be small things that, you know, go a long way. Carol, who is responsible for general advisor training in CAS and the president of the campus advising association, however, saw a more positive change in the advising culture at SERU over the last few years. In her opinion, the university was starting to take notice and recognize the value, as evidenced by funding lunch for SEAA meetings and promoting partnerships with student affairs offices. She was one of the few that expressed any positive changes.

Related to a lack of common perspective, seasoned advisors expressed concerns regarding the lack of a central advising component, be it an administrator or office, to support advising campus-wide. The Student Success Center, alluded to in the discussion on the SERU advising culture, was initially thought to have been established to centralize certain aspects of advising and to work with specific student populations. The actual incarnation was very different than expectations; as such; it faced turmoil and mistrust resulting in missed opportunities to further advising on campus in a more centralized manner. Kamala, as did Holden, indicated a central entity would be valuable to new advisor development through the creation of a common training program based on the common perspective. Holden also mentioned that at one time SEAA was planning to develop a common training for faculty and staff advisors but he was not sure what happened to that initiative.
Advisors that were aware of the advising hub website, which was only a handful of the twenty-eight interviewed, expressed frustration over access issues. Shuri, an advisor in COE that served on the committee, was surprised when she accessed it in her office during the interview and found a white screen. Her frustration was clear when she said, “I know we went live on this thing because we talked about it in SEAA…and it might have an actual URL, but I don’t seem to remember what it is.” Riley mentioned that she attempted to look for the website herself after being made aware of it, but was unable to find it.

Again, kind of hard because I don't really, I don't think our university has a very clear cut. I think there are people within the advising community in our university who are trying to get there. We had a central advisee website that went live and then it was not. I looked it up the other day and it was gone. So, I think there are people trying to get there.

Directors and advisors also highlighted the recent creation of an advisor job family; academic advisor I and academic advisor II. Phillip expressed concerns over the salary structure and worried about the advisors in COE; “I’m concerned about the morale and making sure particularly those who have been around for a while who’ve done this. I don’t think they’re compensated at the level that these newer ones are coming on.” Kamala further expressed this concern

I think it is bad for morale. I think it shows that the work that we’ve done in the past has not been rewarded. You know, the sort of grunt work that we’ve done with very few people. Nobody realizes that we’ve laid the groundwork. You know the foundations for the groundwork and the foundations for other people to come along. It’s, you know, it’s kind of disrespectful. And this is bad for morale.
Further complicating the creation of the job family was the possible change from exempt to non-exempt as part of the FLSA. Holden articulated the concern from the advisors when he mentioned:

We were, the advisors, were going to go to non-exempt and that would mean we’d be hourly. And that was just because we didn’t meet the, I think the minimum salary was a little over $48,000, to be considered exempt or there could have been special provisions put into place where you have a lower salary. And they went with the ‘we’ll just make them hourly.’

Overwhelming student numbers came up several times in conversation. Jasmine, a CBA advisor, highlighted the continued growth of enrollment and the challenge it brings to advising. She emphasized that the continued growth in enrollment posed challenges to serving students and left advisors feeling stretched. Brian also alluded to this when discussing how colleges had to develop multiple ways to advise when each student required to meet with an advisor and how students were no longer being treated in an equitable manner.

**Summary**

The advisors in this study displayed an incredible passion for their role and a strong desire to see the students they interact with succeed. The cultures in each college were varied but each reflected a similar desire for students to develop and succeed despite there not being a set university advising mission. Additionally, the boundaries, responses, and tactics were similar across each college. The informational and relational core competencies were the most often discussed and highly valued in practice, with only a few articulating the value of the conceptual component. The advisors also expressed various levels of perceived support at the university level.
CHAPTER FOUR - DISCUSSION

If advisors are to support the development of college students, and thus increase retention and timely graduation, then a focus on advisor development at the university-level is crucial. However, that support must begin with a critical reflection on the culture and understanding of advising at an institution, how these perspectives may differ from advising standards, and how advisors develop at the institution. This study explored how organizational culture at a four-year research institution can support and impede the development of new advisors by using organizational socialization and NACADA academic core competencies as the framework.

Study Overview

Southeast Research University (SERU) was the research site for this study. SERU is a four-year institution located in the southeastern part of the United States. The institution consists of seven degree-granting colleges and one degree-granting school. At the time of the study the university had a decentralized advising model allowing each college and school to establish who advised, how advisors are trained and developed, and the way advising procedures are created. Essentially, each college is free to develop and foster a culture of advising unique to its interpretation of advising.

To better understand how organizational culture at a four-year institution supported and impeded the development of new advisors a qualitative, descriptive, embedded, single-case study was developed. The case was that of the four-year institution, the phenomenon studied was the development of new advisors, and the unit of analysis were three selected colleges at SERU. The College of Business (CBA), the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS), and the College of
Engineering (COE) were the three colleges selected. Each college had an established advising center with professional advisors, varied perspectives on advising, and history unique to the culture of the college.

The research questions guiding this qualitative, descriptive, embedded, single-case case study were

1. How can organizational culture support the development of new academic advisors?
2. How can organizational culture impede the development of new academic advisors?

To further support the research questions and guide the descriptive case study, the following propositions are based on the researcher’s personal experience and the theoretical framework

1. Certain actions and choices bring about development in certain ways (from organizational socialization) and;
2. Expectations and defining a role in ways that conflict with professional standards may confuse what it means to be in particular roles (NACADA academic advising core competencies).

Two frameworks were used to better understand how organizational culture supported and impeded the development of new advisors. The NACADA academic advising core competencies were the primary means to understand the characteristics and skills necessary to perform the role in order to explore the importance of the competencies as identified by participants, how competencies assist in understanding the role of an advisor, and how the institution view advising. Organizational socialization was used to explore advising culture in each college and at SERU, the desired response of new advisor development, and what were tactics used to foster the desired response.
Twenty-eight individuals – including new advisors (three or less years in the role), seasoned advisors (more than three years in the role), advisor trainers, and advising center directors – were interviewed, four new advisors participated in a focus group, and hundreds of pages of documents – such as advisor manuals, mission and vision statements, and student newspaper articles – were analyzed using codes created from the NACADA academic advising core competencies, organizational socialization, and a set of general codes created by the researcher. What follows is a discussion on the propositions that supported this study and the research questions guiding it, implications for practice and future research, study limitations, and conclusions.

**Propositions**

Yin (2014) introduced propositions to case studies as a means to “direct attention to something that should be examined within the scope of study” (p.30). The propositions serve as a guide for the data to be collected and how the data are then analyzed. As the framework for the study organizational socialization and the NACADA academic advising core competencies were considered during the creation of the propositions and subsequent data collection and analysis. Before responding to the research questions, it is important to visit the propositions to better understand what was studied in the scope of the study.

**Organizational Socialization**

The first proposition relates to organizational socialization and states that certain actions and choices bring about development in certain ways. Each college followed a similar pattern of tactics and subsequent desired response. The training each new advisor encountered, regardless of college, consisted of individual, formal followed by informal, mostly sequential, fixed, serial, investiture tactics that led to a custodial response. Across all colleges the desired response was an
advisor that was comfortable engaging with students, knowledgeable of the curriculum, and were “ready to go once” training had concluded. The custodial response was strongest amongst those that had the purpose and duration of training shared with them prior to commencing that process.

All of the choices made throughout the training process sought to have the new advisor ready to interact with students and prepared to be an “ideal advisor.” The deliberate decisions regarding conversations held, offices visited, and interactions with seasoned advisors served to re-inscribe the “ideal advisor” as defined by each college. Any development that occurred after the training period was left up to the advisor. At no point was the university mentioned as being directly involved in the actions and choices made beyond leaving those decisions up to the individual college.

**NACADA Academic Advising Core Competencies**

The NACADA *academic advising core competencies* serves as the background to the second proposition; expectations and defining a role in ways that conflict with professional standards may confuse what it means to be in a particular role. Where advisor trainers in colleges were overt on the inclusion of NACADA *academic advising core competencies* in training and encouraged further education, the new advisors displayed a closer alignment with the competencies. In the colleges where the NACADA *academic advising core competencies* were not an overt part of the training or the new advisor had more of an affinity for another professional organization, the competencies held little value to new advisors. As a result, many of the new advisors expressed differing views on the role of advising with some highlighting course registration and others expanding the definition beyond that.

The two propositions that directed what needed be examined in this study were supported by the data collection and subsequent analysis. Each college made certain choices and produced
particular actions to bring about the desired custodial response. Additionally, it was found that
new advisors placed varying value on the core competencies and therefore how they understood
their role depending on how much the competencies were stressed during training. For each
proposition, the college was found to have the greater impact on development. SERU only
served to allow the colleges the leeway to establish development as they saw fit.

**Research Questions**

This section discusses how organizational culture supported and impeded the
development of new advisors; the two questions that guided this study. Key takeaways from the
data from the three colleges embedded in the study were used to better understand the role of the
culture in new advisor development.

**Support**

During the time of this study, the Southeastern Research University supported new
advisors in various means. The campus advising organization offered support as did a campus-
wide advising initiative by providing opportunities for education. Additionally, the creation of an
advisor job family, college-based training, and the centers being left to their own devises were
viewed as part of the support necessary to develop new advisors.

**Advising campus organization.**

Long established at the institution, the campus advising association, SEAA, was placed in
high regard by many of the advisors in this study. SEAA brought advisors and other campus
partners together to discuss concerns, participate in professional development, share ideas,
articulate curriculum and program changes, and recognize advisors. New advisors saw SEAA as
a way to meet advisors from other colleges and to learn more about the university. In turn, these
connections allowed the new advisor to provide greater support to their advisees through
additional information and access to more resources. SEAA also supported the development of new advisors by hosting NACADA webinars and training from campus partners, which new advisors did not have access to in their respective college. Again, this provides the new advisors with more information and resources thus increasing their confidence in their interactions with students.

One director mentioned the value of SEAA in recognizing the contributions of advising to campus through a yearly award. SEAA, with the support of academic affairs, recognizes one faculty and one professional advisor each academic year for contributions made to advising. This was viewed as an indication of value from the University and that it encouraged new advisors to continue to develop in their role. Finally, the current president of SEAA felt that the organization was gaining greater prominence on campus through various partnerships and the support of academic affairs, which in turn strengthened the profession. The increased prominence meant advisors were included in more conversations, especially for those new to the role.

**Advising initiative.**

Project Success was developed as an initiative to address retention concerns at SERU. Following the creation of the advising task force document, as well as the creation of the Student Success Center, academic affairs developed an advising initiative associated with Project Success. The advising initiative was established to address concerns raised from the NACADA consultant visit; this advising taskforce consisted of faculty and professional advisors. The initiative developed an advising vision, mission, and outcomes that was intended to guide all advising at SERU. Additionally, the group was charged with developing further projects, including an advising website and training. The advising initiative group was viewed as a step forward for advising at SERU and an additional signal of the value of advising.
New advisors, in particular, were supported through this initiative through professional development opportunities, discussions on the purpose of advising, and the development of projects. For the new advisors able to participate in the advising initiative the process served as a professional development opportunity because they were able to engage in conversation with senior leadership, faculty, and other advisors thereby strengthening their communication skills, fostering connections, and learning about advising in other colleges. Through the hosted conversations and presentations through the initiatives the new advisors were exposed to multiple perspectives on advising, historical and theoretical overviews of the profession, and insights from seasoned advisors they may not have had elsewhere. Of concern to the initiative was the training and continued development of advisors, especially new advisors.

**Job family.**

After the NACADA consultant visit, and the creation of the task force document, the university developed a job family for advisors. From what was shared during interviews, and the focus group, advisor I and advisor II positions were created to better facilitate the hiring process of qualified advisors and encourage growth in the role. The creation of these roles also changed the salary structure for advisors, with a pay raise when promoted to advisor II. Advisor I is the base level for all advisors hired, regardless of whether the position requires a bachelors or master’s degree. The level of advisor II is achievable, but not mandatory, after a period of one year if the advisor has a master’s degree, and two years if the advisor has a bachelor’s degree. The decision to promote to advisor II is up to the center in which the advisor is employed.

The creation of these two positions was viewed as positive by new advisors because the advisor II position gave them something to strive for by furthering their education or continuing to work at the institution. Additionally, some of the new advisors saw this as an indication of the
value the institution was placing on advising thereby increasing their commitment to learning more about their role and the value they placed on the position.

**College-based training.**

SERU does not prohibit colleges from developing training protocols for advisors, be it professional or faculty, nor from providing professional development opportunities. Each advising center director and advisor trainer shared that the colleges were able to establish the training protocols they deemed necessary to serve the role for their particular college. This hands-off approach was viewed as a positive support because it allowed the college to tailor training towards the specific academic requirements and policies within that college, advising policies and procedures, and the advising approach of the college. As such new advisors were trained in a way that crafted the desired response of that college without confusion from outside perspectives.

Additionally, each college was able to set aside funding to send advisors to various conferences to support the development of advisors. CAS and CBA, in particular, liked to send new advisors to NACADA conferences as soon as possible to support their development. Participation in conferences exposed new advisors to colleagues across the United States, encouraged them to learn new practices and bring them back to the office, and allowed time to reflect on the role of advisor. Without the financial support from the University, these opportunities would not be possible. However, these support mechanisms are ultimately offered by the colleges and the advising centers with no mandates from the university.

**Left to own devices.**

Seen as critically important to the development of the new advisors, the hands-off approach (hinted at above) SERU took towards advising was viewed as allowing a lot of
autonomy for colleges to craft what worked best for the students in the college. As a whole, SERU provided broad support for the development of new advisors by creating an advisor job family, allowing the colleges to develop training and leaving those advisors to their own devices. Additionally, the continued support of the campus advising organization and the creation of an advising initiative demonstrated to new advisors the purpose of the role. These actions demonstrated the value of advising to the institution and created more opportunities for advisors to develop. In turn, new advisors had increased access to advisors in other colleges and campus resources, which improved the support the new advisors could offer to the students they encountered.

**Impede**

The organizational culture at SERU impeded the development of new advisors by upper administration not recognizing the value of advising or advisors, not supporting a common advising perspective, lacking in a central advising administrator or center, not providing a common training or professional development plan, and student enrollment outpacing the hiring of new advisors. Additionally, the creation of an advisor job family and advising hub were seen as impediments to new advisor development.

**Not recognizing value.**

Development of new advisors was impeded by advisor perceptions of the value placed on advising by upper administration – deans, provosts, and the president – and how those individuals understood the role of an advisor. Few new advisors could describe advising outside of their college, much less a university-wide view of advising. As a result, few were able to share what they thought higher administration might think of advising outside of their college. Only those new advisors that had been involved in the advising initiative were able to offer any
insight. Seasoned advisors, advisor trainers, and advising center directors, however, were able to articulate strong perspectives on how upper administration viewed advising. A handful of participants shared that administration viewed advising in a positive light and offered their support. Unfortunately, the majority shared that administration had little understanding what advising was beyond course registration and, as a result, paid little more than lip service to the role. These varied perspectives show a disconnect in what is shared with new advisors and what is understood by others. These perceptions serve to impede new advisor development because issues within advising are not addressed, or even seen, by upper administration and new advisors could be left disappointed with their role as they continue to engage with others across campus.

No common advising perspective.

Every single advisor in this study mentioned the lack of a common advising mission at SERU while also praising each college for having their own perspective. The contrast is interesting because although each college claims to be different, they all have similar cultures and desires. Every office strives for “good” advising with minimal errors and each has a mission that is focused on the development of students and their success. The strategies are similar in that they try to see as many students as they can with information shared from the university/college to the advisor and then to the student. What differs between each college is the practice of advising and the curriculum that is discussed. The challenge at this university, then, is establishing a common ground without each college feeling like there is a need for a complete overhaul.

The lack of a shared mission on advising was seen as an impediment to new advisor development. The lack of a shared mission was viewed as confusing to new advisors as they began to interact with other advising centers and students from other colleges. Various degree
requirements and academic policies aside, no common thread often created an “us vs. them” mentality, push and pull on whether advising is course registration or more, and disagreement on who should advise. For a new advisor these often-conflicting perspectives created moments of indecision, questioning of their purpose, and confusion on the role which hinders their continued development in the role.

**Lack of central advising component.**

Also related to no shared advising mission was the lack of a central advising office or, at least, administrator to guide the practice on campus. Without this central component, any developed advising mission or vision is not carried throughout the entire university and assessment is haphazard at best. A central office or administrator could serve as a cheerleader of sorts for advising and, according to the task force documents, provide guidance to the colleges, develop additional training and further professional development, and oversee advising assessment. While possibly not viewed as having a direct impact on the development of new advisors by the new advisors in this study, some seasoned advisors disagreed, sharing that without those items from a central office or administrator, the role could become stagnant and provided no further growth. Additionally, the lack of a central advising office was seen as a hindrance in how the colleges worked together to support students; in turn, new advisors were less aware of changes across campus or resources.

**No common training.**

Beginning projects related to advisor training, but not seeing them through, impeded the development of new advisors at SERU. While the university provides training through human resources on tax forms, university services, and a few other university-based items, there is no university-wide advisor training. SEAA, at one time, offered faculty advisor training and was
exploring a university-wide SEAA created advisor training via an online platform. As such, training on a central advising mission, common policies and procedures, as well as the NACADA pillars of advising could go a long way in impacting development of new and current advisors at SERU. When discussing the NACADA academic advising core competencies, most new advisors were aware of them on a surface level, but only a small amount indicated engaging with them during training or as part of further development, especially the conceptual component. Additionally, no advisor could point to an instance where intervention from the university further exposed them to the competency. All understanding of the competencies started and ended at the individual college level.

**Advising hub.**

Another project that was started, was an advising hub created, in part, by Project Success’ advising retention initiative, which was passed on to SEAA. The site was created and is active, however, only those who know the specific URL can even access it. The site was designed as a central hub for advising resources for advisors and students. However, the lack of recent updates and the inability to access the site was seen as a negative. Without this quick reference tool or any easy place to point students for more information, advising centers are left to put together their own resources, if they choose to, and new advisors must further learn to navigate a large website for the necessary information they need. All of this takes away from valuable advising time and development time for new advisors. Additionally, many saw this hub as yet another signal that the recognition of advising on campus only goes so far.

**Job family.**

Viewed by the new advisors as an indication of value and support, advisors that had been employed prior to the creation of the job family saw it as a less than desirable slap in the face.
Although the seasoned advisors were instantly promoted to advisor II with an increased salary, there were no further growth opportunities. New hires for advisor I were also brought in at a higher salary base than previous new advisor hires, again, hinting at a higher institutional value but also seen as demeaning by long-serving advisors. Additionally, the job family ends at advisor II offering no further growth opportunities which could lead to stagnation in the role.

**Increased student enrollment.**

Student numbers were also viewed as an impediment to new advisor development by many of the advisors and directors in the study. With increased enrollment across the university, yet little to no increase in professional advisors within colleges, many centers had an advisor to student ratio well above the NACADA recommendation of 1 to 350-400. The College of Engineering had advisors with a caseload of over 800 while the College of Arts and Sciences had a hard time gauging their caseloads because of the various students that met with their advisors – pre-health, pre-law, undecided, first-year, and upperclassmen. These high caseloads cultivated an environment where new advisors often struggled to balance required student meetings while also learning more about their role. This struggle was further complicated by the pressure to be knowledgeable, not make mistakes, and ensure students graduated on time. With such a high caseload and the pressure to make sure students graduate new advisors often indicated they placed more value on gaining information and being able to share it then to think more deeply about their practice or further explore advising perspectives. Without the opportunity to delve further into the advising role, new advisors are at risk of becoming stagnant. By not supporting the further hiring of new advisors, or restricting enrollment, the organizational culture at SERU impeded the development of new advisors.
Advisor development is impeded when there is not a clear campus understanding of the role of advising nor a central advising administrator or office to guide advising centers in developing training or practices. It is further impeded when new and seasoned advisors view upper administration as not valuing the role, when there are too few opportunities for growth, advising initiatives are not followed through, and growing enrollment numbers far outstrip the hiring of new advisors. When training and practice are left up to individual colleges, it is not surprising that a mentality develops where every college view themselves as separate and unique or that advisors view upper administration as not understanding what they do.

It is clear that organizational culture both supports and impedes the development of new advisors sometimes with the same approach. For example, the job family was perceived by new advisors as something to strive for and a signal of value while seasoned advisors shared that over time it created resentment and stagnation. Or the lack of a central advising perspective and office; to some this hands-off approach allowed autonomy in the role and the ability to mold new advisors to the needs of the college. Organizational culture also served to impede development by inhibiting the education on advising approaches, creating confusion, and fostering an “us vs. them” mentality.

**Recommendations**

The recommendations below for advising practice and further research are based on the findings and discussion. Recommendations for practice include revisiting the created advising mission and carrying out across campus, providing development opportunities for administrators, and identifying ways for colleges to share information and learn from each other. Research recommendations include adding additional colleges and exploring other institution types.
Practice

To enhance the development of new advisors at the university level, increasing their effectiveness and ability to support students within their colleges, the following recommendations are made. These recommendations include revisiting stagnate initiatives, promoting current practices, and providing further opportunities to share information.

The advising retention initiative via Project Success developed an advising, mission, goals, and other important components to advance advising across campus, yet few individuals mentioned them in this study. In fact, only those who were involved in the process were aware of them and neither of the advising center directors mentioned them. The university needs to revisit the original documents, through the advising retention initiative out of Academic Affairs, and then develop a plan for implementation. The documents do not provide a perspective too unlike what the three colleges are currently doing, but the documents do offer further guidance. Implementing a central advising mission and vision does take some of the onus off of the colleges, as previously mentioned, but most importantly it provides the common ground needed to begin a wholesale evaluation of all aspects of advising on campus. Coming at advising from a common language and perception serves to further develop the function, establish more succinct practices, and provide a base from which to assess advising.

Academic Affairs administrators at SERU need to revisit the documents created by the NACADA consultants and task force to address the increased student population concerns, lack of job growth, and a central advising component. These three impediments, and many other items, are fully addressed by both documents with multiple recommendations for each. With the initial research and proposals already completed the documents merely need to be updated to
reflect current enrollment and financial constraints. This task should be taken on by academic affairs in partnership with the colleges and SEAA.

SEAA then needs to use these central advising components to circle back to the campus-wide advisor training and hub. Campus-wide training and access to a website will go far in providing resources to new advisors and offering continued development. Although colleges and centers can add additional components as necessary to address the needs of their specific advisors and students, the campus-wide training will need to consist of the overall mission and outcomes of advising, campus-wide policies and practices, and introduce new advisors to advising literature and perspectives. Once the introductory campus-wide training is developed, SEAA will need to work with academic affairs and the colleges to provide continued development opportunities for advisors of all levels. This could be modeled after advising certificates and/or advising levels seen at other institutions, such as the University of Georgia, Utah Valley University, and the University of California-Davis. The goal, regardless of whether it is modeled off another institution or not, should be the continued education of advisors beyond their first year. A deeper analysis of advising approaches and theories, continual development of a personal advising philosophy, and creation of a development plan are a few of the many topics that could be explored in the additional development process. Advanced job growth, raises, and promotions should be tied to this program to encourage new advisors to continue to explore their role and innovate advising practices.

Many of the advisors shared that they often did not have the time, or encouragement, to reflect on their practice or why they make the choices they do in their role, nor what their practice means in relation to the NACADA academic advising core competencies. Some advisors indicated that they were not sure why they asked certain questions when engaging with
students. As such, the researcher proposes that advising training programs would benefit from including reflective and reflexive practice into the training and continued development of advisors. Keevers and Treleaven’s (2011) case study at a counseling center provides a strong argument on how reflexive practices can be used to shape the responses of those in the center and the practices of the center.

Each of these recommendations would demonstrate the value of advising to those in the role yet it is still of major importance for administrators to understand and recognize the value of advising. As has occurred at SERU in the past, starting initiatives and creating taskforces only go so far without the full support of administrators behind those efforts. Equally important is the process of those on the ground working with administrators. As such it is recommended that academic affairs administrators are involved in revisiting the task force documents; not that they simply read the updates but are active in the discussions on the recommendations that were made and the updates necessary five years after the creation of the initial documents.

**Future Research**

Future research on this subject would benefit from expanding participants and institution types, further exploration of the causality of the identified supports and impediments, along with exploring additional approaches. In continuing with this exact study, it would be necessary to include the other colleges and centers that employ professional advisors at Southeast Research University, such as the College of Education, the College of Nursing, the College of Communication and Information Sciences, the Student Success Center, and the School of Social Work. This would further test the propositions and add further insight into the development of new advisors. It is also recommended to explore the development of new faculty advisors at
SERU using the same theoretical framework to compare the differences between those two experiences.

Expanding to other institutions of various sizes and types, or even similar types, is an additional recommendation for future research. This study focused on a single institution and while it can be assumed that advisors are facing similar situations across the Nation, it is also highly probable that there are institutions that provide stronger support for the development of advisors. It is important to highlight the experiences of those at other institutions to gain a larger picture of the development of new advisors.

A deeper dive into the supports and impediments of new advisor development within organizational culture would benefit from taking each identified mechanism and further exploring causality and outcomes. The current study takes a broad view of development, providing findings and practice recommendations that address larger concerns. The next step should be to take each, or maybe a grouping, to further identify the cause of the support and resulting outcome of development with attention paid to power, political, and cultural influences.

Additionally, exploring other theoretical frameworks would provide beneficial insight to those aiming to either improve their understanding of advisor development or to refocus the efforts on their campus. In particular, examining the Dreyfus method to better understand the transition from novice to expert could provide a depth of understanding on the knowledge valued by advisors and how the level of expert is obtained. Anticipatory socialization, occurring prior to entering the role, could be beneficial for understanding advisor development since many new advisors do not have prior professional experience in higher education or a master’s degree in the field or a related one.
Limitations

This study encountered many limitations that could have expanded the results. The following are some of these limitations. Not every individual in each college that fit the participant requirements were involved in the study. The director of the advising center in the College of Arts and Sciences did not respond to a request to reschedule a canceled interview. This perspective could have been helpful in further understanding the advising culture in the college as well as how advisors are developed. This missing perspective also made it difficult to compare the leadership aspect of Tierney’s exploration of culture to the other colleges. Additionally, at least one advisor in each college elected to not participate in the study. While the majority of advisors in the three colleges were interviewed, a fuller perspective would have been helpful. Participation in the focus group was also limited, with only four of eleven new advisors participating. Although the dialogue was fruitful, as seen previously, only two colleges were represented – the College of Business and the College of Arts and Sciences. As the youngest advising center on campus, the College of Engineering likely would have offered some interesting insights.

Another limitation of this study is the lack of participants not in an advising role. The perspective from faculty, other administrators, and those in upper administration could have contributed to analyzing how the advisors perceived support from the university. Many of the advisors in this study commented on how they believed administrators viewed their role and the value they believed was placed on advising. Talking directly to administrators to better gauge what the administrators’ state as their perception could have helped to unfold how the university organizational culture supports and impedes the development of advisors a bit further.
Additionally, this study only focused on the experience of new advisors at one institution. Experiences of new advisors at other institutions may differ but could also parallel what was experienced at Southeast Research University. It is important to explore the experience of advisors at other institutions to draw parallels in experience but also explore the differences.

**Conclusion**

This study demonstrates that an organizational culture with a decentralized advising model that offers little to no guidance on advising does support and impede the development of advisors in numerous ways. New advisors are supported at this institution through the professional development opportunities hosted by the campus advising association, opportunities to participate in a campus-wide advising initiative that encourages interaction with campus constitutes, a job family that awards time in the role, and colleges having the freedom to establish advising practices, missions, and training specific to the needs of the student population. However, the development of new advisors is impeded by a lack of perceived value by administration, no common advising perspective or central coordinating body, no campus-wide training, incomplete advising initiatives, and increased student enrollment. These actions, or lack thereof, do little to advance the knowledge of a new advisor, encourage innovation, or provide growth after training is completed.

When the administration does not appear to acknowledge or understand the value of advising as more than course registration roadblocks are created that make innovation, moving the practice towards a more holistic perspective, and promoting advising as a legitimate career path difficult. Innovation, an expanded perspective, and career path are vital to the continued development of all advisors, not just new advisors. Additionally, as the new advisors in this study demonstrated, new advisors are often less aware of these dynamics and seasoned advisors
may shield them in an effort to keep the new advisor from becoming jaded. This is in large part the effort of advisor trainers. The knowledge of the trainer in relation to advising research, approaches, and practices have a significant effect on advisor development – it serves to guide how the advisor understand their role. At the center of these concerns is the matter of common ground at an institution. With multiple perspectives, unclear value, and less knowledgeable trainers it is difficult to foster a common ground that serves to guide all advising efforts.

Finally, the notion of organizational culture supporting and impeding development is truly two sides of the same coin (or maybe a double-edged sword). The freedom of the colleges to develop advising practices that best fit the needs of the student enrolled requires some level of autonomy. Yet without a guiding mission, advising ends up with multiple, sometimes competing, perspectives that cause confusion and stagnation. It is also difficult to separate out the development of new advisors without directly addressing the campus-based advising issues. Advising development is entangled not just on the college level and that of the individual advisor but it also includes campus practices, those that relate directly to advising and those that do not, and campus culture.

Engaging in critical reflection on the development of advisors at an institution is important to the continued success of students and the health of a university. These individuals are uniquely poised in their interactions with students, guiding not only course decisions but also engaging students to reflect on how they are spending their time at the university, their motivation for attending college, and how a student can move forward when plan a, b, or even c, do not pan out as expected. The role of the advisor extends into the role of a mentor, guide, navigator, family, and someone who walks the college experience with the student. Despite this,
little attention is paid to their development, outside the scope of the college in which they are employed, at Southeast Research University.

However, it is not as simple as defining how organizational culture supports and impedes the development of new advisors at an institution. What was seen as support by some, such as the creation of a job family, was seen as an impediment when the opportunity to advance is limited. The same can be said for the creation of a central advising mission. Many in this study viewed the development of such a perspective as a positive venture, as it would take the onus off the colleges, further assist students in navigating the university, and provide greater support for new advisors. However, others viewed this as a potential impediment if it took away the autonomy of the advisor in developing their own style to interact with students. At SERU, the overwhelming response was that the colleges went to great lengths to support new advisors in their development whereas the University did little more than offer support for advisor-led organizations and initiatives. Many of the advisors saw SERU impeding the development of new advisors through increased enrollment, which reduced advising to course registration and limited time to explore the role, and a lack of understanding from upper administration. Despite this, the advisors in this study remain hopeful and steadfast in their commitment to assisting students in succeeding.
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Appendix A - Tables

Table 2. *College of Business (CBA) Advising Structure and Participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advising</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approx. 8400 Undergraduate students</td>
<td>All majors in college.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student to advisor: 700 to 1</td>
<td>Three majors advised by department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No faculty advisors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not assigned advisees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advising Center established 20+ years ago.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group advising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Express advising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freshman course advising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One-on-one appointments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jasmine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matilda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bianca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jimmy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3. College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) Advising Structure and Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advising</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approx. 8300 Undergraduate students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student to advisor: unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All majors in college with focus on first-year students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty advisors second-year and beyond.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk-in advising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open advising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-on-one appointments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising center established 20+ years ago.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Time in role</th>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Degrees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>Advisor</td>
<td>Director of Advising Programs</td>
<td>18 months</td>
<td>Advising (18 years total)</td>
<td>B.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trainer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M.Ed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cory</td>
<td>Seasoned</td>
<td>Director of Pre-Law advising</td>
<td>3 years, 3 months</td>
<td>Advising (7 years total)</td>
<td>B.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamala</td>
<td>Seasoned</td>
<td>Academic Advisor II</td>
<td>11 years, 6 months</td>
<td>Advising (20 years total)</td>
<td>B.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles</td>
<td>Seasoned</td>
<td>Academic Advisor II</td>
<td>11 years, 6 months</td>
<td>Advising (14 years, 6 months total)</td>
<td>B.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M.Ed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abigail</td>
<td>New Advisor</td>
<td>Academic Advisor I</td>
<td>1 year, 10 months</td>
<td>Office Associate</td>
<td>B.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexis</td>
<td>New Advisor</td>
<td>Academic Advisor II</td>
<td>1 year, 9 months</td>
<td>Military</td>
<td>B.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwen</td>
<td>New Advisor</td>
<td>Academic Advisor II</td>
<td>1 year, 2 months</td>
<td>College librarian, Faculty</td>
<td>B.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MLIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>New Advisor</td>
<td>Academic Advisor I</td>
<td>8 months</td>
<td>Advising (2 years total)</td>
<td>B.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M.A.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4. *College of Engineering (COE) Advising Structure and Participants*

### Advising

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approx. 5600 Undergraduate students</th>
<th>All majors in college.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student to advisor: 800 to 1 (varies by major)</td>
<td>No faculty advisors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assigned advisees based on major.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Center established six years ago.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E-advising</th>
<th>Group advising</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drop-in advising</td>
<td>One-on-one appointments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Time in role</th>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Degrees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phillip</td>
<td>Director of Advising Center</td>
<td>Director of COE Student Services</td>
<td>25 years</td>
<td>Minority academic program</td>
<td>B.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munroe</td>
<td>Advisor Trainer</td>
<td>Assistant Director of COE Student Services</td>
<td>3 years (with promotions)</td>
<td>Advising (5 years total)</td>
<td>B.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holden</td>
<td>Seasoned Advisor</td>
<td>Academic Advisor II</td>
<td>4 years, 6 months</td>
<td>Buyer</td>
<td>B.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shuri</td>
<td>Seasoned Advisor</td>
<td>Academic Advisor II</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>Financial Aid</td>
<td>B.B.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M.Ed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doreen</td>
<td>New Advisor</td>
<td>Academic Advisor I</td>
<td>4 months</td>
<td>Advising (2 years, 7 months total)</td>
<td>B.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica</td>
<td>New Advisor</td>
<td>Academic Advisor II</td>
<td>1 year, 2 months</td>
<td>Adjunct instructor, Admissions</td>
<td>B.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>New Advisor</td>
<td>Academic Advisor I</td>
<td>9 weeks</td>
<td>Recruiting, youth minister</td>
<td>B.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liz</td>
<td>New Advisor</td>
<td>Academic Advisor II</td>
<td>3 years, 4 months</td>
<td>Financial Aid</td>
<td>B.A.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Time in role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alexis</td>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>Academic Advisor II</td>
<td>1 year, 9 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster</td>
<td>CBA</td>
<td>Academic Advisor I</td>
<td>7 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riley</td>
<td>CBA</td>
<td>Academic Advisor II</td>
<td>2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>Academic Advisor I</td>
<td>8 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6. Data Collection Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>28 interviews</td>
<td>First-person development of the purpose of advising and how they came to this understanding. Allows access to multiple perspectives of individuals in the same group and begins to point to some patterns of thought for the group (Glesne, 2011). What is happening in their own words.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New academic advisors</td>
<td>CBA = 6, CAS = 4 (1), COE = 4 (1)</td>
<td>New academic advisor interviews focused on how the college has played a role in the development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasoned advisors</td>
<td>CBA = 4, CAS = 3 (2), COE = 2</td>
<td>Seasoned advisors reflected on their development, competencies necessary to be an academic advisor, what is necessary for a new advisor to know, and how the college and institution differ in understanding and development design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisor trainers</td>
<td>CBA = 1 (1), CAS = 1, COE = 1</td>
<td>Trainers focused on how they constructed the new advisor training; what choices were made and why? How were the college and university structures involved in this process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising center directors</td>
<td>CBA = 1, CAS = 0 (1), COE = 1</td>
<td>Directors focused on how they view advising, where this view came from, what they perceive is happening at the university level and how this may affect advisor development (both positive and negative).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Groups</td>
<td>New academic advisors</td>
<td>CBA = 2, CAS = 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Additionally, brings the conversation back to the larger case; the university, by bringing these different perspectives together

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secondary</th>
<th>Advisor trainers</th>
<th>Portray values and beliefs on college and institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training materials</td>
<td>Advising center assistant directors/directors</td>
<td>Inform practice and policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Center website</td>
<td>Expand, support, challenge understandings both internally and externally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institution website</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission, vision, and goals</td>
<td>Center website</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institution website</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advising center assistant directors/directors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising policies and practices</td>
<td>Center website</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institution website</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New academic advisors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advisor trainers, academic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advising center assistant directors/directors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising handbooks</td>
<td>Center website</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institution website</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New academic advisors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advisor trainers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic advising assistant directors/directors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus newspaper articles</td>
<td>Campus newspaper website</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising organization documents</td>
<td>Advising organization leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document</td>
<td>Content</td>
<td>Obtained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising Manual</td>
<td>Mission, Staff, Curriculum, Policies,</td>
<td>Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advising protocol</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample advising</td>
<td>Daily meetings</td>
<td>Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>training schedules</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Advisor Assessment</td>
<td>Questions related to resources, policies,</td>
<td>Online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and curriculum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Advising</td>
<td>Team, International student policies,</td>
<td>Online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td>Advising Syllabus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document</td>
<td>Content</td>
<td>Obtained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Advising website</td>
<td>General Information, Ask An Advisor, Scheduling Appointments, Staff, Advising Schedule</td>
<td>Online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Health website</td>
<td>About, Events, Applicant Process</td>
<td>Online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Law website</td>
<td>About, Events, FAQs</td>
<td>Online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document</td>
<td>Contents</td>
<td>Obtained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisor Handbook</td>
<td>Mission, Advising Process, Academic Programs, Systems</td>
<td>Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisor Training Schedule</td>
<td>4-week, daily, advising training plan</td>
<td>Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising Checklist</td>
<td>Various topics to be covered during advising appointment</td>
<td>In-person, Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising load Fall 2018</td>
<td>Accounting of September, October, and November advising appointments</td>
<td>In-person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising Website</td>
<td>Mission, Staff, Advising Process, E-Advising Worksheet, Flowcharts, BamaBound Guide</td>
<td>Online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising Guidebook</td>
<td>Advising policy, Academic Programs, Curriculum, Resources</td>
<td>In-person</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10. *Southeast Research University (SERU) Collected Documents*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Contents</th>
<th>Obtained</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Updated Academic Advising</td>
<td>Vision, Mission, Goals, Measuring Success, Role Definition</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Part of Project Success advising retention initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Success &amp; Engagement Organizational Chart</td>
<td>Restructured organizational chart</td>
<td>In-person</td>
<td>Restructuring after changes in Student Success Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Success Center Organization Chart</td>
<td>Updated organizational chart</td>
<td>In-person</td>
<td>Restructuring after changes in Student Success Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Force on Undergraduate Advising Findings and Recommendations</td>
<td>Various recommendations related to advising</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Recommendations based on NACADA consultant findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Advisors’ Perspective</td>
<td>Campus Advising organization’s recommendations</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Campus advising organizations response to NACADA consultant findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising website</td>
<td>Advising spotlight, Advisor resources, Student guide</td>
<td>Emailed link, online</td>
<td>As of 12/17/2018 was not linked to main university website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student newspaper articles (20+)</td>
<td>Student articles related to academic advising</td>
<td>Online</td>
<td>Opinion articles and SGA VPAA platform statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Definition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director Role</td>
<td>How the director (or assistant director) demonstrates support for advisors, guides the office, and day-to-day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center History</td>
<td>Any background provided on the founding of the center and how it has changed over time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisor Role</td>
<td>How an advisor defines what they do</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mentions favorite aspect of role</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Advisor</td>
<td>What an ideal advisor does</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May include what an advisor should not do</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathway (job)</td>
<td>When an advisor is no longer considered new</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Next steps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Culture</td>
<td>How the advisor views</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advisor-student interactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff interactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Definition of advising</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Understanding role</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Culture</td>
<td>How the advisor views</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advisor-student interactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff interactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Definition of advising</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Understanding role</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Goal</td>
<td>Expectations at the completion of training and/or development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role in Development</td>
<td>How others contribute to the development of a new advisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Process</td>
<td>Topics, activities, experiences, timeframe of training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising Process</td>
<td>How the office advises students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>Knowledge necessary to perform the role</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prior knowledge that contributes to role</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competencies</td>
<td>Mention of competencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ranking or importance placed on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>University and office support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What impedes development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contradict</td>
<td>Information or experiences that contradict training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12. *Organizational Socialization Code Guide*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Boundaries</th>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Functional</td>
<td>FD</td>
<td>Various tasks performed by members of an organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hierarchical</td>
<td>HD</td>
<td>Distribution of rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inclusion</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Social fabric or interpersonal domain of organizational life</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Custodial</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Newcomer accepts status quo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Content</td>
<td>CI</td>
<td>Newcomer uneasy with knowledge base of role and unwilling to limit self to that knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>RI</td>
<td>Newcomer seeks to redefine role by attacking and attempting to change the mission associated with the role</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tactics</th>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Look For</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collective</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Group of newcomers going through same boundary passage together</td>
<td>Sharing perspectives that differ from standards shared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Similar experiences</td>
<td>Experiment and report back</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Group think of profession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shared problem solving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Learning more from group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Group expectations differ from organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>Boundary passage singly and in isolation</td>
<td>Agent as role model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unique set of experiences</td>
<td>Needs/problems not understood by agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lonely changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Training done by one person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>FO</td>
<td>Segregated from regular members&lt;br&gt;Set of experiences explicitly created for role of newcomer&lt;br&gt;May be first round of training</td>
<td>Not needed information was covered&lt;br&gt;Information covered was not needed&lt;br&gt;Internalizing standards for professions&lt;br&gt;Called out as “new”&lt;br&gt;Feelings of isolation&lt;br&gt;Focus on attitude&lt;br&gt;Learning “correct” information, attitudes, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>IF</td>
<td>No rigid differentiation from more experienced&lt;br&gt;Role not explicit, Trial and error&lt;br&gt;May be second round of training</td>
<td>Trail by error&lt;br&gt;Unsure of what information is needed&lt;br&gt;Select own socialization agent&lt;br&gt;Peers have more influence than standards of profession&lt;br&gt;Unlearning formal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequential</td>
<td>SQ</td>
<td>Sequence of identifiable steps&lt;br&gt;Stages may build or expand upon preceding</td>
<td>Logical sequence&lt;br&gt;Sequence chosen for advisor&lt;br&gt;Conflicts of perspective between sequence trainers&lt;br&gt;Contradictory demands&lt;br&gt;Message about ease of sequence from someone that has been through it&lt;br&gt;Discussion on what happens after training (next steps or next role)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Random</td>
<td>RA</td>
<td>Steps to target role are unknown, ambiguous, and continually changing</td>
<td>Prior experience&lt;br&gt;No logic to sequence&lt;br&gt;Advisor chooses sequence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>FI</td>
<td>May have steps or stages but no certain order</td>
<td>Making normal transition to role</td>
<td>Not making normal transition to role (delayed in some way)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Precise time known for boundary passage</td>
<td>Time of transition is standardized</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>Few clues as to when to expect boundary passage</td>
<td>Search for end date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>What may be true for one is not true for another</td>
<td>Talking with others to gauge timetable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comparing to others experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Anxiety over uncertainty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Administrator/trainer changing timeline regularly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serial</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Experienced members of organization groom newcomers how are assuming similar positions</td>
<td>Continuity and history</td>
<td>Stagnation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Continuity and sense of history</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trained by someone in area but at a higher level than newcomer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disjunctive</td>
<td>DJ</td>
<td>No immediate predecessors or role models</td>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complicated and confusing</td>
<td>Brand new position to organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Newcomer with no one similar to them</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prepared by someone not in area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investiture</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Organization sees viability and usefulness of personal characteristics</td>
<td>Characteristics valued</td>
<td>No need to change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Take advantage of and build on skills, values, and attitudes already had</td>
<td>Needs are met</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divestiture</td>
<td>DV</td>
<td>Strip away and deny certain personal characteristics</td>
<td>Forced to do ‘dirty work”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Produce similar results</td>
<td>Harassed by other members for certain characteristics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tournament</td>
<td>TO</td>
<td>Separating into different tracks based on presumed differences in ability, ambition, and background. Winning means you go on to the next round, lose and you are out forever.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contest</td>
<td>CN</td>
<td>Avoid sharp distinctions between superiors and inferiors of same rank. Each person starts out equal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Sense of solidarity with other members based on this**
- **Training based on abilities**
- **Abilities explained by what is needed in organization**
- **Failure to get to next step**
- **Animosity between those in track**
- **Ability to choose what interested in**
- **Equal start for all**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>What to look for</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual</td>
<td>Concepts academic advisors must understand</td>
<td>C0</td>
<td>Do not see value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Ideas and theories</td>
<td></td>
<td>No time to consider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Definition, rights, responsibilities</td>
<td>C?b</td>
<td>Mentioned outside of discussion on competencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C1</td>
<td></td>
<td>History and role of academic advising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Caring, commitment, empowerment, inclusivity, integrity, professionalism,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>respect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Theory relevant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Approaches and strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Expected outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Equitable and inclusive environments are created and maintained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informational</td>
<td>Knowledge academic advisors must master</td>
<td>I0</td>
<td>Do not see value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Process</td>
<td></td>
<td>No time to consider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Policies, programs, resources</td>
<td>I?b</td>
<td>Mentioned outside of discussion on competencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Institution specific history, mission, vision, values, and culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Curriculum, degree programs, other academic requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Institution specific policies, procedures, rules, and regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Legal guidelines (FERPA, Title IX, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Characteristics, needs, experiences of major and emerging student populations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I5</td>
<td>Campus and community resources that support student success</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I6</td>
<td>Information technology available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relational Skills academic advisors must demonstrate</th>
<th>R0</th>
<th>Do not see value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No time to consider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Communicative skills, interpersonal approaches</td>
<td>R?b</td>
<td>Mentioned outside of discussion on competencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Warmth, welcome, questioning</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>Articulate a personal philosophy of academic advising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>Create rapport and build academic advising relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R3</td>
<td>Communicate in an inclusive and respectful manner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R4</td>
<td>Plan and conduct successful advising interactions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R5</td>
<td>Promote student understanding of the logic and purpose of the curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R6</td>
<td>Facilitate problem solving, decision making, meaning making, planning, and goal setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R7</td>
<td>Engage in on-going assessment and development of self and the advising practice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Please use reproductions of the IRB approved stamped consent form to provide to your participants.

Should you need to submit any further correspondence regarding this proposal, please include the above application number.

Good luck with your research.

Sincerely,


358 Rose Administration Building | Box 870127 | Tuscaloosa, AL 35487-0127
205-348-8461 | Fax 205-348-7189 | Toll Free 1-877-820-3066
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Appendix C - Informed Consent

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA
HUMAN RESEARCH PROTECTION PROGRAM
UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD

Title of Research: Core competencies and organizational socialization: The development of new advisors

Investigator(s): Heather Ammons (PI) and Karri Holley, PhD

You are being asked to be in a research study.

This study is being conducted by Heather Ammons, a Ph.D. candidate in the College of Education at the University of Alabama.

What is the purpose of this study – what is it trying to learn?

This study seeks to understand how an institution supports and impedes the development of new professional academic advisors.

Why is this study important?

The results from this study will allow academic advisors and college administrators to better understand how new academic advisors develop in their role and the ways an institution supports or impedes this development. This information can serve to inform the establishment of advising protocol, as well as redefine the role of advising on college campuses.

Why have I been asked to be in this study?

You have been asked to be in this study because of your status as a new professional academic advisor (three years or less in role), seasoned advisor (more than three years in role), academic advisor trainer, or advising center administrator at the College of Arts and Sciences, College of Engineering, or College of Business.

How many people will be in this study?

About 40 individuals will be in this study.

What will I be asked to do in this study?

If you agree to join this study, you will be asked to participate in a one-on-one interview with the principal investigator and, for new professional academic advisors, a focus group. The interview will last approximately one hour and will be audiotaped with participant consent. The focus group will last approximately an hour and a half and will be audiotaped and videotaped with participant consent.
How much time will I spend in this study?

Participants will be involved in an interview that will last approximately one hour. New professional academic advisors will also be asked to participate in an hour and a half focus group (scheduled after all interviews completed).

Will being in this study cost me anything?

The only cost to you from this study is your time missed from work.

Will I be compensated for being in this study?

You will not be compensated for being in this study.

Can the investigator take me out of this study?

The investigator may take you out of this study if she feels that the study is upsetting you or if you no longer meet the study requirements (i.e. no longer an academic advisor).

What are the risks to me if I am in this study?

There is little or no risk foreseen by participating in this study. Your identity and institutional affiliation will remain confidential and you may decide to end your participation at any time. Participants may also elect to not answer any particular interview questions.

What are the benefits that may happen if I am in this study?

There are no direct benefits to be gained by participants in this study.

What are the benefits to science or society?

This study will offer insight into understanding the role of advising as a process of higher education, how new academic advisors develop, and how institutions of higher education support or impede the development of new academic advisors.

How will my privacy be protected?

Your privacy will be protected, during the course of the interview, by conducting interviews in your office to ensure that the interview is not overheard by others.

Please be advised that the researcher will take every precaution to maintain privacy but the nature of focus groups prevents the researcher from guaranteeing confidentiality. Please respect the privacy of fellow participants by not repeating what is said in the focus group to others.
How will my confidentiality be protected?

Names of participants will be known only to the investigators in this study. The names will not be used as identifiers and participants will have the option of adopting a pseudonym of their choice. Information from the consent form, interviews, and focus group will be kept in a locked filing cabinet, in separate areas and not identified as being part of the same study. Electronic data, including audio files (interviews and focus groups) and video files (focus group) will be maintained on the PIs password protected University of Alabama Box account. All data will be stored for six years after completion of the study. After six years the data will be deleted or destroyed.

Please be advised that the researcher will take every precaution to maintain the confidentiality of the data but the nature of focus groups prevents the researcher from guaranteeing confidentiality. Please respect the privacy of fellow participants by not repeating what is said in the focus group to others.

What are the alternatives to being in this study? Do I have other choices?

The alternative to being in this study is not to participate.

What are my rights as a participant in this study?

Taking part in this study is voluntary. It is your free choice. You can refuse to be in it at all. If you start the study, you can stop at any time. There will be no effect on your relations with the

The University of Alabama Institutional Review Board ("the IRB") is the committee that protects the rights of people in research studies. The IRB may review study records from time to time to be sure that people in research studies are being treated fairly and that the study is being carried out as planned.

Who do I call if I have questions or problems?

If you have questions, concerns, or complaints about the study right now, please ask them. If you have questions, concerns, or complaints about the study later on, please call the investigator, Heather Ammons, at 478-960-8927 or Dr. Karri Holley, 205-348-7825.

If you have questions about your rights as a person in a research study, call Ms. Tanta Myles, the Research Compliance Officer of the University, at 205-348-8461 or toll-free at 1-877-820-3069.

You may also ask questions, make suggestions, or file complaints and concerns through the IRB Outreach website at http://ovpred.ua.edu/research-compliance/prco/ or email the Research Compliance office at rcompliance@research.ua.edu.

After you participate, you are encouraged to complete the survey for research participants that is online at the outreach website or you may ask the investigator for a copy of it and mail it to the University Office for Research Compliance, Box 870127, 358 Rose Administration Building, Tuscaloosa, AL 35487-0127.
I have read this consent form. I have had a chance to ask questions. I agree to take part in it. I will receive a copy of this consent form to keep.

Signature of Research Participant

Date

Signature of Investigator

Date

I give consent for the interview / focus group to be audio recorded.

☐ Yes  ☐ No

I give consent for the focus group to be video recorded.

☐ Yes  ☐ No
Appendix D - Interview Protocols

New Academic Advisor

Thank you for talking with me today. I greatly appreciate that you took time out of your day to meet with me.

Today will consist of an hour-long conversation that focuses on the development of new academic advisors. We will begin by exploring your background in advising and then move into your understanding of advising and how the institution supports or impedes new academic advisor development. Is that clear?

For the purpose of this study a new academic advisor is someone who has served in that role for three years or less at SERU or another institution.

Before we delve into your perspective on academic advising I would like to ask you a few introductory questions.

1. Name
2. Current position/Title
3. Years in position
4. Previous advising experience
5. Degrees obtained/in-progress

In my research analysis each participant will have a pseudonym. Do you have a preference as to what pseudonym used?

1. What is the role of an academic advisor?
2. What would you say is the office’s advising culture?
3. What would you say is the university’s advising culture?
4. Could you please detail how you were trained as an academic advisor?
5. What has been the most important topic covered in your training? Why?
6. What has been your office’s involvement in your development as an academic advisor?
7. What has been the university’s involvement in your development as an academic advisor?
8. What would you say is the goal of all the training and development you go through as a new academic advisor?
9. How will you know when you are no longer “new”?
10. What can you tell me about NACADA’s pillars of academic advising?
11. What stands out to you about the core competencies?
12. How do you use the core competencies in your practice?
13. How does your office and university employ the NACADA core competencies and other academic advising standards?
14. What, if any, differences do you see between the university’s perspective of academic advising and that of the NACADA competencies? Where is this most obvious?
15. What contradictory perspectives and information have you received about academic advising? What parties shared the contradictory information?
16. What, if anything, has had a negative effect on your development as an academic advisor?
17. What resources do you recommend I take a look at?
18. Is there any additional information you would like to provide or questions you would like to expand upon?

Again, thank you for taking the time to meet with me today. If I have questions about our conversation as I begin transcribing it would you mind if I contacted you again? I will be in contact with you at a later time about an optional focus group amongst the new academic advisors that participate in this study.

Seasoned Academic Advisor

Thank you for talking with me today. I greatly appreciate that you took time out of your day to meet with me.

Today will consist of an hour-long conversation that focuses on the development of new academic advisors. We will begin by exploring your background in advising and then move into your understanding of advising and how the institution supports or impedes new academic advisor development. Is that clear?

For the purpose of this study a new academic advisor is someone who has served in that role for three years or less at SERU or another institution.

Before we delve into your perspective on academic advising I would like to ask you a few introductory questions.

1. Name
2. Current position/Title
3. Years in position
4. Previous advising experience
5. Degrees obtained/in-progress

In my research analysis each participant will have a pseudonym. Do you have a preference as to what pseudonym used?

1. What is the role of an academic advisor?
2. What would you say is the office’s advising culture?
3. What would you say is the university’s advising culture?
4. Could you please detail how you were trained as an academic advisor?
5. What was the most important topic covered in your training? Why? How was it covered?
6. How are new advisors trained in your office?
7. What would you say is the goal of all the training and development a new academic advisor goes through?
8. What is the most important information a new advisor can learn? How do they learn this?
9. What is your role in the development of a new academic advisor?
10. How about the office? University?
11. When as new advisor no longer “new”?
12. What can you tell me about NACADA’s pillars of academic advising?
13. What stands out to you about the core competencies?
14. How do you use the core competencies in your practice?
15. How does your office and university employ the NACADA core competencies and other academic advising standards?
16. What, if any, differences do you see between the university’s perspective of academic advising and that of the NACADA competencies? Where is this most obvious?
17. What contradictory perspectives and information do new advisors receive about academic advising? What parties shared the contradictory information? How is it shared?
18. What resources do you recommend I take a look at?
19. Is there any additional information you would like to provide or questions you would like to expand upon?

Again, thank you for taking the time to meet with me today. If I have questions about our conversation as I begin transcribing it would you mind if I contacted you again? I will be in contact with you at a later time about an optional focus group amongst the new academic advisors that participate in this study.

Academic Advisor Trainer

Thank you for talking with me today. I greatly appreciate that you took time out of your day to meet with me.

Today will consist of an hour-long conversation that focuses on the development of new academic advisors. We will begin by exploring your background in advising and then move into your understanding of advising and how the institution supports or impedes new academic advisor development. Is that clear?

For the purpose of this study a new academic advisor is someone who has served in that role for three years or less at SERU or another institution.

Before we delve into your perspective on academic advising I would like to ask you a few introductory questions.

1. Name
2. Current position/Title
3. Years in position
4. Previous advising experience
5. Degrees obtained/in-progress
In my research analysis each participant will have a pseudonym. Do you have a preference as to what pseudonym used?

1. What is the role of an academic advisor?
2. What would you say is the office’s advising culture?
3. What would you say is the university’s advising culture?
4. Could you please detail the advisor training process in your office?
5. Why is it set up this way?
6. What is the goal of new academic advisor development?
7. When training a new academic advisor what would you say is the most important topic to cover? Why?
8. How do you incorporate this topic into training?
9. At what point is a new academic advisor no longer considered “new”? How do they reach that point?
10. How are the NACADA pillars of academic advising, in particular the core competencies, incorporated into advisor training?
11. How does the office’s training protocol encourage new academic advisors to use these in their practice?
12. How do you encourage your advisors to expand their knowledge in the field?
13. How is information shared with a new academic advisor? Who holds this responsibility?
14. How does your office and university employ the NACADA core competencies?
15. What, if any, differences do you see between the university’s perspective of academic advising and that of the NACADA core competencies? Where is this most obvious?
16. What contradictory perspectives and information do new advisors receive about academic advising? What parties shared the contradictory information?
17. How does this effect the development of an academic advisor?
18. What resources do you recommend I take a look at?
19. Is there any additional information you would like to provide or questions you would like to expand upon?

Again, thank you for taking the time to meet with me today. If I have questions about our conversation as I begin transcribing it would you mind if I contacted you again?

Director of Academic Advising/Student Services Center

Thank you for talking with me today. I greatly appreciate that you took time out of your day to meet with me.

Today will consist of an hour-long conversation that focuses on the development of new academic advisors. We will begin by exploring your background in advising and then move into your understanding of advising and how the institution supports or impedes new academic advisor development. Is that clear?

For the purpose of this study a new academic advisor is someone who has served in that role for three years or less at SERU or another institution.
Before we delve into your perspective on academic advising I would like to ask you a few introductory questions.

1. Name
2. Current position/Title
3. Years in position
4. Previous advising experience
5. Degrees obtained/in-progress

In my research analysis each participant will have a pseudonym. Do you have a preference as to what pseudonym used?

1. What is the role of an academic advisor?
2. What would you say is the office’s advising culture?
3. Does this differ from the university’s advising culture?
4. What is the goal of new academic advisor development?
5. What is your role in the development of new academic advisors?
6. What do you view as the most important topic for new academic advisors to understand?
7. How is this communicated to them?
8. At what point is a new academic advisor no longer considered “new”? How do they reach that point?
9. What can you tell me about NACADA’s pillars of academic advising?
10. How does the office use these to support its mission, vision, and goals?
11. What, if any, value do you place on the NACADA core competencies?
12. What, if any, differences do you see between the university’s perspective of academic advising and that of the NACADA competencies? Where is this most obvious? What about the office?
13. What contradictory perspectives and information do new advisors receive about academic advising? What parties share the contradictory information?
14. How does this effect the development of an academic advisor?
15. What resources do you recommend I take a look at?
16. Is there any additional information you would like to provide or questions you would like to expand upon?

Again, thank you for taking the time to meet with me today. If I have questions about our conversation as I begin transcribing it would you mind if I contacted you again?

**Focus Group**

Thank you all for talking with me today. I greatly appreciate that you took time out of your day to meet with me.

Today will consist of an hour and half-long conversation that focuses on the development of new academic advisors. The questions are based on topics mentioned during the one-on-one interviews and the various advising documents that have been shared with me. This focus group
is meant to be a conversation amongst the group. Please feel free to respond to each other, ask questions of each other, and seek clarification. Is that clear?

For the purpose of this study a new academic advisor is someone who has served in that role for three years or less at SERU or another institution.

In my research analysis each participant will have a pseudonym. If you mentioned a preference during our one-on-one interview that pseudonym will be used otherwise one will be selected for you. Please respect the privacy of fellow participants by not repeating what is said in the focus group to others.

1. What is the advising culture at SERU?
2. Some of your colleagues described it as “a”, “b”, and “c.” What do you have to say to that?
3. In what ways does this differ from NACADA standards? Honestly, do those matter to your practice?
4. What is the current culture of advising at SERU?
5. What would you like it to be? Some of you mentioned “a”, “b”, and “c.”
6. How do you support each other as new advisors?
7. How does the University support you as a new advisor?

Again, thank you for taking the time to meet with me today. If I have questions about our conversation as I begin transcribing it would you mind if I contacted you again?