

A Case Study on the Processes of
Academic Advising in a School-Centric Environment

by

Thomas Dickson

A Dissertation Presented in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Education

Approved April, 2014 by the
Graduate Supervisory Committee:

Christine Wilkinson, Chair
Linda Sullivan
Lowell Avants

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

May 2014

ABSTRACT

This study examined the processes of academic advisement in a school-centric university environment utilizing the O'Banion Model of Academic Advising (1972) as a baseline for theoretical comparison. The primary research question sought to explore if the O'Banion Model of Academic Advising, a dominant theory of advisement processes, was still representative of and present in contemporary advisement. A qualitative case study methodology was utilized to explore the lived experiences of professional staff academic advisors in the academic advisement process. Eleven professional staff advisors were interviewed for up to 90 minutes each about their lived experience in providing academic advisement services. A structured series of questions were asked about the academic advisors' experiences with the process and their daily advisement activities. The participants were asked how the vision, mission, philosophies, and structures of the institution impacted their role and responsibilities in the advisement process. Mixed results were found over the presence of the O'Banion Model in contemporary advisement. The results revealed significant additional workloads, unique structures, and complex roles as a result of the institution's school-centric philosophy. Role ambiguity and confusion over responsibility for the advisement process were also found.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First, I wish to thank my partner Rachel for all her understanding and patience through the process of completing the dissertation. Rachel served as a sounding board with whom I was able to refine ideas and whose support helped me maintain the needed confidence to finish. Rachel's love and support was critical to my success. Additional thanks are given to Dr. Alfredo de los Santos, who taught me the process of writing a dissertation and was a great mentor in formulating my original dissertation plan. It would not have made it off the ground without his efforts. Our working lunches became a favorite part of my experience and I will miss those discussions. Finally, I would like to thank Dr. Christine Wilkinson, Dr. Linda Sullivan, and Dr. Lowell 'Tom' Avants for their dedication and commitment to my success.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	vii
CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION	1
Background of the Problem	1
Statement of the Problem.....	3
Purpose of the Study	7
Overview of Methodology.....	10
Research Questions	10
Importance of the Study.....	11
Assumptions.....	12
Definition of Terms.....	14
Scope of the Study	16
Role of the Researcher	17
Organization of the Dissertation	17
2 LITERATURE REVIEW	19
History of Academic Advisement.....	19
First Era of Academic Advising	20
Second Era of Academic Advising	22
Third Era of Academic Advising.....	22
Definitions of Academic Advisement.....	24
O’Banion Model of Academic Advising.....	24

CHAPTER	Page
Critique of O’Banion’s Model	27
Organization and Delivery of Advisement Services.....	28
Impact of Institutional vision and Mission	30
School-Centric Mission	31
Behavior and Environment	33
3 METHODOLOGY	34
Introduction.....	34
Rationale of Approach.....	34
Research Setting.....	37
Participant Selection	38
Data Collection	38
Data Analysis.....	40
Coding Process.....	40
Coding of Mentions into Visual Matrix.....	43
Limitations	45
Theoretical Framework of the Researcher	46
4 FINDINGS.....	48
Introduction.....	48
Participants.....	48
Categorization	49
Initial Categories.....	51
Exploration of Life Goals	51

CHAPTER	Page
Exploration of Vocational Goals	53
Exploration of Program Choice	55
Exploration of Course Choice.....	56
Exploration of Scheduling Options.....	57
Unincorporated Themes and Sub-Categories	59
Data and Reporting	60
Customer Service and General Information	64
Student Engagement	67
Administrative Support and Policy Enforcement	67
Curriculum and Instruction	69
Counseling for Personal Issues	71
Student Transitions	73
Outliers.....	75
Responsibility for Advisement and Campus Partnerships.....	76
School-Centric Environment	77
5 CONCLUSION.....	83
Introduction.....	83
Interpretation of Data.....	84
Responsibility for the Advisement Process	89
The School-Centric Environment	97
Unanticipated Findings	99
Synthesis of Findings.....	100

CHAPTER	Page
Trustworthiness.....	104
Limitations.....	104
Generalizability.....	106
Conclusion.....	107
Implications of Policy and Practice.....	107
Recommendations for Future Research.....	108
Applicability of O’Banion Model in Modern Advisement.....	109
Distinctions between Professions.....	109
School-Centric Impact.....	111
Closing Statement.....	112
REFERENCES.....	114
APPENDIX	
A IRB APPROVAL LETTER.....	120
B RECRUITMENT LETTER.....	123
C INTERVIEW PROTOCOL.....	125
D INTERVIEW QUESTIONS.....	127
E PARTICIPANT EXPERIENCE.....	129
F MENTIONS CODED BY O’BANION MODEL BY DIMENSION.....	131
G UNINCORPORATED THEMES.....	137
H UNITS RECEIVING ADVISING REFERRALS.....	146
BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH.....	148

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Years of Experience of Academic Advising Participants.....	130
F1	O’Banion Model Mentions by Participant: Exploration of Life Goals.....	132
F2	O’Banion Model Mentions by Participant: Exploration of Career Goals.....	133
F3	O’Banion Model Mentions by Participant: Program Choice.....	134
F4	O’Banion Model Mentions by Participant: Course Options.....	135
F5	O’Banion Model Mentions by Participant: Scheduling of Courses.....	136
G1	Unicorporated Mentions by Participant: Data and Reporting	138
G2	Unicorporated Mentions by Participant: Customer Service	139
G3	Unicorporated Mentions by Participant: Student Engagement.....	140
G4	Unicorporated Mentions by Participant: Administrative	141
G5	Unicorporated Mentions by Participant: Curriculum and Instruction	142
G6	Unicorporated Mentions by Participant: Counseling.....	143
G7	Unicorporated Mentions by Participant: Transitions	144
G8	Unicorporated Mentions by Participant: Outliers	145
2	Referral Destination for Assistance with Advisement Goals	147

CHAPTER 1:

Introduction

Background of the Problem

Individuals well-versed in the history of higher education in The United States of America are familiar with the immense change experienced since its initial inception. The industry has grown from small, elite, instruction-focused, and limited access colleges into the contemporary diversity which includes a plethora of models ranging from those initial colleges to massive, metropolitan, diverse, accessible, and research-focused universities (Grites, 1979; Kramer, 2003). As the missions of institutions have evolved, the change in curriculum has also mirrored this growth. Curriculum has evolved from the singularly-purposed, prescribed curriculum of 17th-19th centuries into the dynamic models of tiered degrees, hundreds of specialized degrees, and robust elective course options first seen in the late 19th century and which continues to the present (Frost, 1991; Grites, 1979; Thelin, 2004; Hagen & Jordan, 2008). As electives evolved into majors and student populations both increased and diversified, the need to provide structured guidance and support services in the navigation of curriculum became imperative (Grites, 1979).

The evolution of public institutions shifted toward more diverse and specialized curricular offerings, larger and more diverse student populations, and in some cases an increased focus on research which required the creation of higher education function of academic advising (Smith & Allen, 2006; Thelin, 2004). These advisement services now span institutions of all types and sizes, and exist in a variety of delivery models based upon central philosophical and operational models (Habley, 2004).

As institutions of higher education diversified and specialized throughout their history, the profession of academic advising also evolved. The earliest institutions in American higher

education did not have formal academic advising structures (Grites, 1979). Academic advising for curricular purposes was unnecessary and the larger concern was upon character building of students by deans of students or faculty (Grites, 1979). Over time these models expanded with the curricular changes to a predominantly faculty only model (Kramer, 2003). Eventually, increased diversity, accountability, budget cuts, and specialization found the practice had evolved into a professional role with staff-based academic advisors, peer advisors, and other support personnel connected to the advising processes who were not faculty (Smith & Allen, 2006). Throughout the evolution of higher education, academic advising has grown from its roots in character-building and disciplinary actions, evolving into a simple process of choosing classes. This process evolved further into a complex, multi-model service designed to provide guidance in the successful completion of a wide range of curricular, career, and personal objectives.

As a relatively young profession, academic advising has only become a pervasive and fundamental student service in American higher education in the 1970s (Habley, 2004). As a result of declining enrollment and low retention rates in the 1960s and 1970s, institutions were forced to focus more time, money, and energy into the improvement of student support services; which included an expansion and professionalization of the academic advising function (Frost, 1991; Grites, 1979; Habley, 2004). In the monograph *The Status of Academic Advising: Findings from the ACT Sixth National Survey*, editor and author Wesley Habley (2004) identified two primary trends in academic advising: 1) that academic advising has become more visible in higher education and 2) the profession of academic advising has continually diversified in proportion to the change occurring at institutions in which they serve. It is a combination of both of these elements which frame the rationale for this study. The diversification and continual

change in the higher education landscape necessitates increased research into the fundamentals of this very visible and essential profession in order to account for and conceptualize how student needs are hopefully being served.

Statement of the Problem

Academic advising has existed as a formal function of the American higher education environment since the earliest elective systems were adopted at Harvard University and John Hopkins University in the 1870s and 1880s (Grites, 1979; Kramer, 2003). Yet as a well-established service, the knowledge of this profession is sparse and relatively new (Kuhn, 2008). In order to understand the profession of academic advising the fundamental roles and responsibilities that frame, categorize, and define the very processes through which academic advising is conducted must be explored.

First, it is important to note that academic advising, as a scholarly field of study, does not have a singular, all-inclusive theory through which to derive a consistent definition of the profession (Hagen & Jordan, 2008; Rankey, 1994). As a young profession, academic advising has not been a defined area of higher education since the 1870s and has not been an examined area of scholarly inquiry since the 1970s (Kuhn, 2008). Professional academic advising, or academic advising conducted by staff members who serve in a non-faculty role, has only recently become a common model in the 1970s, and only in the 2000s has it become a dominant model for undergraduate advising services (Kuhn, 2008; Habley, 2004). As the first formal definitions of academic advising (O'Banion, 1972; Crookston, 1972) were presented, scholarly inquiry into the profession and a professional association soon followed. It is due to this fledgling scholastic nature, vast diversity within the field, limited scholarship on the specific

functions and processes, a multitude of unique philosophies on the style of advising, varied staff models and delivery systems, student population changes, and variations in the environments in which advisors conduct their work that have historically prevented the creation of single unifying theory to define the nature of the work for academic advisors (King, 1993; Rooney, 1994; Rankey, 1994).

As evidence of advising research divergence, The National Academic Advising Association offers thirteen different definitions for academic advising that are split between two primary perspectives: 1) the processes of academic advising and 2) the functions of academic advising from individual philosophical bases (NACADA, 2003). As a primary point of distinction, this study is focused on the processes, in order to define the functions and elements that comprise the processes of academic advisement. As debates around the merits of developmental and prescriptive advising are meritorious, they are surrounded by a wealth of research (Crookston, 1972; Winston, Miller, Ender, Grites, & Assoc., 1984). The individual functions, duties, and roles of academic advising that define the process are the key interest area of this study. This study avoided any focus on the advising preferences, styles, or philosophies employed as any of these distinctions would not be indicative of the whole of advisors in any given environment.

While the field of academic advising does not possess a singular definition, it does possess a dominant set of theories which are utilized to define the field. The majority of modern definitions of the process of academic advising are derived from the originators of academic advising theory, namely B. B. Crookston and Terry O'Banion (Hagen & Jordan, 2008). Terry O'Banion's Model of Academic Advising (1972) and B. B. Crookston's theory of developmental advising (1972) laid the foundations upon which many future theories of advising have been crafted (Schein, 1994; Rooney, 1994). These foundational theories help frame the understanding

of the dimensions of the roles and responsibilities which are employed to distinguish the processes utilized in academic advising (Schein, 1994). Nearly forty years after these foundational articles, the National Academic Advising Association relies on both B. B. Crookston's developmental advising and T. O'Banion's Model of Academic Advising as the fundamental definitions for outlining the roles and responsibilities of the profession of an academic advisor as well as the primary philosophy of advising (NACADA, 2003; Smith & Allen, 2006; Rooney, 1994). Despite wide acceptance over these theories, this study utilized O'Banion's Model of Academic Advising (1972) as a dominant definition of the process and profession in order to frame this inquiry.

The first scholarly research on the dimensions of academic advising appeared in the 1970s with a pair of articles (Crookston, 1972; O'Banion, 1972) focused on the dimensions of work of academic advisors as well as the fundamental constructs for both prescriptive and development theories of academic advising. Terry O'Banion's (1972) work focused on the skills, knowledge, responsibilities, and ultimately the linear process of academic advising while Crookston's (1972) work defined the academic advising function as both peripheral to teaching or integrated with teaching, identifying and defining the distinct differences between prescriptive and developmental styles of academic advising. Crookston's work focused primarily on the developmental and prescriptive models of academic advising and the benefits to integrating student development into the academic advising process through developmental advising. As Crookston's definition of academic advising is centered on a specific philosophical approach to advising practice and not upon the fundamental functions, this definition did not serve as a base for this study.

The other dominant foundational article, the O'Banion's Model of Academic Advising (1972) is formally accepted by the National Academic Advising Association as a primary model for defining academic advising. Despite wide acceptance, some who study the profession do not fully agree with this definition and argue for further expansion of the knowledge of the profession of academic advising. In the Handbook of Academic Advising (Gordon; Habley & Grites, 2008), a prominent text in the study and practice of academic advising, a strong directive is outlined to continue research into the nature of academic advising and to challenge the constructs outlined by the standards and traditions of popular academic advising (Kuhn, 2008). Subsequent scholarly inquiry into the study of academic advising has often relied on a series of analogic and normative theories to compare, contrast, and align philosophies in order to reflect more accurately the varying nature of work of academic advisors (Hagen & Jordan, 2008). Inquiry into the fundamental functions of the profession has not been a significant part of defining the academic advising process. This study seeks to address this problem through examination of academic advising in a specific context.

The problem this study seeks to address is the continued exploration into O'Banion's Model of Academic Advising (1972) to determine if the model is still applicable in the contemporary academic advising process, and specifically in the modern school-centric environment of a large, public, research-extensive university in the southwest.

Purpose of Study

The O'Banion Model of Academic Advising (1972), defined the practice and dimensions of academic advising in both macro and micro terms: 1) the macro is a compilation of linear steps, or categorically organized actions, through which the practice of academic advising is conducted,

and 2) the micro which is a series of sub-categories of individual roles, responsibilities, service functions, knowledge, and skills which comprise the macro categories in the academic advising process. Developed in the 1970s, these two layers need to be revisited to ensure all of their elements are still applicable to the profession in the modern era as well as to explore who is responsible for these elements.

J. Burton and K. Wellington (1998) explored the linear nature of the macro-dimensions of the O'Banion Model of Academic Advising (1972). In their study, Burton and Wellington (1998) found that adherence to the prescribed linear nature of O'Banion's macro-dimensions often led to unnatural flow in academic advising discussions as well as student anxiety based on the needs of the student and expressed purpose for the advising appointment. Their case study (Burton & Wellington, 1998) concluded that all dimensions of the O'Banion paradigm could be appropriately addressed without the need for the linear order. Furthermore, in 1997, Terry O'Banion (as cited in Burton & Wellington, 1998) also expressed a desire to conduct further exploration and research concerning the original model.

The micro-dimensions of the O'Banion Model of Academic Advising (1972), or the individual functions and areas of responsibility that comprise the academic advising process, have received relatively little scholarly inquiry. In 2006, Smith and Allen (2006) compiled a collection of research into academic advising satisfaction and the perceptions of those services by students. While extremely helpful in understanding the needs and perceived needs of students, their work was focused on existing definitions of the academic advising process as set forth by others (O'Banion, 1972; Crookston, 1972). Smith and Allen (2006) called for more qualitative research into the reasons behind why certain functions are valued, which this author

would argue should also include a more in-depth qualitative research into the fundamental functions of academic advisors.

The scholarship associated with the division of responsibility is extensive (Frost, 1991 & 1994; Gilroy, 2003; Grites, 1979; King, 1993; Kramer, 2003; Gordon, 1992 & 1994; Lowe & Toney, 2000). The O'Banion Model of Academic Advising (1972) advocates for a team approach to academic advisement. O'Banion assigns responsibility for exploring life and vocational goals to professionally trained counselors and "sensitive instructors," exploring programs and course choice to faculty advisors or instructors, and trained students to assist with scheduling courses. Arguments over the process of academic advisement have attributed sole and combined responsibility to professional academic advisors, faculty advisors, career counselors, peer advisors, and other student service professionals (Frost, 1991 & 1994; Grites, 1979; Kramer, 2003; Gordon, 1992 & 1994; Lowe & Toney, 2000). This debate seems to vary widely and the only consensus seems to be that academic advising is a direct product of the institutional environment and no one model fits every institution (Gilroy, 2003; King, 1993). This study only seeks to add contextual information to this debate and does not attempt to resolve this broad question.

The purpose of this study is to address the research gap into the fundamentals of the academic advising process. While the macro-dimensions have been addressed in prior research, the micro-dimensions have been given little study. This study seeks to address the gap of knowledge through structured inquiry into the fundamental roles, functions, and responsibilities of academic advisors in a specific higher education environment. As advising continues to change across time and among different institutional environments, the need for continued and sustained inquiry into academic advising will help researchers, administrators, and practitioners understand

the profession and its roles with more depth. Borgard (1981) summarized this need for constant and continuous process of knowledge revision through systematic inquiry as being vital to understanding academic advising. This process of inquiry and investigation is crucial to understanding the ever-changing organism that is contemporary American higher education and the American college student (Borgard, 1981). Inquiry is also important to determine how these changes in environment and population impact the fundamental roles and responsibilities of the academic advising process (Borgard, 1981). This study seeks to add to this baseline of advising knowledge in order to address what changes may have occurred in the profession of academic advising as a result of these shifts in higher education. A better understanding of this profession could lead to a restructuring of academic advising services to address the needs of students in a more efficient manner.

Overview of Methodology

The methodology utilized for this study is the case study method. This methodology allows for focused analysis of the bounded system of academic advisement and allows for richer depth into the factors that comprise the advisement process. The institution of study is clearly identified as Arizona State University as the mission and structures are unique to this institution. A case study methodology will allow for an in-depth analysis to explore the boundary limits of the academic advising roles in the advisement process (Yin, 2009). Interviews were conducted with eleven academic advisors for a time period of no more than ninety minutes in length. Interviews were conducted in the participant's personal workspace as to maximize memory recall and to develop rapport. Interviews were recorded (Merriam, 2009) transcribed and then analyzed utilizing three rounds of coding as recommended by Yin (1994) and Saldaña (2009).

Research Questions

This study is guided by one essential research question: Are the essential functions that comprise the processes of academic advising changed by existing within a school-centric university environment?

This central research question can be divided into four additional framing questions: 1) How is the academic advisement process conducted in a school-centric environment? 2) Does a school-centric model, and its associated environmental and organizational structures, present any visible impact to the process of advisement? 3) Who is responsible for the process of academic advising? 4) Does academic advising in a school-centric model present any conflicts with the original O'Banion Model of Academic Advising? These central questions were employed to frame participant interviews, in drafting interview questions, and guiding the interview process.

Importance of the Study

As Richard Light stated in his text *Making the Most of College: Students Speak Their Minds*, “it is hard to imagine any academic support function that is more important to student success and institutional productivity than advising” (Light, 2001, p. 81). Academic advising is a consistent service across all institutions of higher education and as a critical factor in ensuring student success. As such, it is logical to assume that a critical service would be a well-defined profession; however this is not the case with academic advising. Kramer (2003) indicates that academic advising is not well-defined as a profession and that it is necessary to clarify the roles and responsibilities of this profession in order to ensure the needs of students are properly addressed. It is with this importance, and lack of clarity in definition, that the researcher has chosen to explore the dynamic field of academic advising and the impact of a unique institutional

model of school-centrism upon the nature of the fundamental roles and responsibilities of academic advisors in such an environment.

As a former academic advisor and advising administrator, the researcher has witnessed and heard through repeated anecdotes of a significant shift in the functions, roles and responsibilities of academic advisors over the last decade. As McLaren described the current state of academic advising “It seems to me that academic advising was more straightforward a few years ago than it is today” (2004, para. 3). Most memorable among these shifts was a change in philosophy by Arizona State University in the adoption of the school-centric university model. President Michael Crow explains:

“each school in this school-centric model for the university becomes driven by its own intrinsic requirements, and each school is uniquely designed, with the caveat that it must cooperate and link with other elements within the university.” (Crow, M., 2004, p. 2)

It was this institution’s shift in mission to a school-centric model that sparked immense debate within the academic advising community; and as a result of those discussions has also inspired this study. This philosophy changed the environment and, as the researcher hopes to find, also changed the historic role of the academic advisor within this structure.

At present, there are limited studies on the impact of institutional missions and their corresponding structures on academic advising processes (Abelman, Atkin, Dalessandro, Snyder-Suhy, & Janstova, 2007; Abelman, Atkin, Dalessandro, Snyder-Suhy, & Pettey, 2007). There are also no studies at the present that analyze the impact of a school-centric university model on the roles and responsibilities of any university professionals, which includes academic advisors. This study seeks to increase that knowledge base and explore if a specific institutional vision or

mission has an impact on the roles and functions that comprise the processes of academic advising.

Assumptions

A central assumption in this study is that in order to make the implementation of a school-centric vision the most impactful to a student, academic advisors would likely be one of the first professions to employ the institutional vision into practice. As Margaret King (1993) indicated, the one profession in higher education institutions with which students are guaranteed and required to interact, is the profession of academic advising. It is an assumption that the nature of the institution and the needs associated with the mission will impact the evolution of advising services. In personal communication with Terry O'Banion on the topic of academic advisement and the vision of a school-centric institutional model, he indicated that:

“Research strongly supports the practice of enrolling students as early as possible in a coherent program of study to increase retention and completion rates. The opportunities for such practices to occur are greatly increased in institutions that champion school-centric models of academic advising for it is in the schools or colleges where programs of study are created, monitored, and supported”(O'Banion, personal communication, September 27, 2011).

As O'Banion (personal communication, September 27, 2011) indicated, the predominant personnel to support, implement, and track enrollment, programs of study, retention and degree completion in the various colleges and schools of a school-centric environment are academic advisors who are tasked with these roles, responsibilities, and service functions. This study accepts this assumption in the determination of how the professional roles and responsibilities of academic advisors in the school-centric model align with the original function outlined by the

O'Banion Model of Academic Advising (1972). It is of great importance that the knowledge about the divergent nature of academic advising across diverse settings is subjected to sustained inquiry and re-examination. This study seeks to examine the field of academic advising further in this context and explore new avenues of knowledge that may come from an analysis of how the traditional dimensions of academic advising duties are impacted.

Definition of Terms

In this study a variety of definitions are necessary to clarify and delineate the specific groups being studied. The following definitions around academic advising are utilized in this study:

- *Academic advisor*: The National Academic Advising Association, or NACADA, offers thirteen different possible definitions ranging in philosophy and structure (NACADA, 2003).

This study utilized a combination of these various definitions offered by NACADA focused on the process of advisement and did not utilize those dedicated to attitudes or approaches.

Academic advisors were defined as institutional staff or faculty members tasked with the duty of providing assistance, guidance, and communication with students in the planning of life and career goals and navigation of how those goals intersect with institutional course and program offerings. Academic advisors are typically responsible for: organization and education of programs of study, exploration of life and career goals as they associate with degree options, assistance with the arrangement of a schedule of classes and enrollment, guidance in the exploration of programs or degrees, and communication of policies and procedures as they relate to programs, progression, enrollment and curriculum.

- *Academic Success Specialist*, a unique name for an academic advisor in a school-centric university model. In 2008, Arizona State University renamed Academic Advisor and Academic

Advisor, Senior titles to Academic Success Specialist (Fowle, 2008). Administration officials indicated the change was to accommodate the expanded duties and responsibilities reflected in the new institutional philosophy (Fowle, 2008). The most significant differences between Academic Advisor and Academic Success Specialist were the inclusion of specific language regarding: both online and in-person advisement, monitoring of student progress, ensuring student satisfaction, coordinating with other campus units to ensure success, utilization of eAdvisor to track student progress, and creating programming to promote success (“OHR Department,” 2009). Minimum qualifications for the position were reduced to a bachelor’s degree and two years of experience, down from four, and removed the qualification of a master’s or higher degree in counseling or higher education (“OHR Department,” 2009).

- *Professional or Staff Advisor*, an academic advisor who is employed in a non-faculty role. Some professional advisors may also have instructional duties, but those duties are not considered their primary area of responsibility or employment. Professional advisors may work with both undergraduate and graduate student populations. This study is designed to identify the processes used by staff advisors responsible for advising undergraduate student populations.

- *Faculty Advisor*, a faculty member who additionally serves in an academic advising role. Faculty advisors serve in instructional and/or research roles as their primary focus with varying levels of advising responsibility. This study is not designed to examine the additional dynamics and models of faculty advising. Faculty advisors will not be included in this study.

- *School-Centric*: An environment where individual colleges or schools within a university provide certain specialized services to students as a primary service provider instead of the university as a whole. This system utilizes a psychological principle known as chunking, which takes a larger entity such as a large university and creates manageable smaller units, or chunks.

These chunks, or schools, then provide a community for the student that is easier to access and identify within the larger whole. As President Michael Crow indicated:

“I am using the term “schools” to designate academic units—there can be colleges with schools, schools with schools, schools on their own. A school is a unit of intellectual connectivity between faculty and students organized around a theme or objective. And I am proposing a school-centric model for the university”
(Crow, M., 2004, p. 2)

- *Academic Advising Process*: The process of academic advising is defined as the collective functions and areas of responsibility that comprise the holistic activity that is academic advising. This study relies heavily upon the five dimensions of the O’Banion Model of Academic Advising (1972) as a baseline framework for the process of advisement.

For the purposes of this study, staff academic advisors were utilized. The selection of staff academic advisors is based in accessibility and abundance in the study environment. As there are multiple populations that provide advisement services, it is necessary to delineate and filter participation into a single category.

Scope of the Study

The scope of the study has been narrowed to focus only on the specific processes of academic advisement in the school-centric environment. As some questions could be considered political in nature, additional measures were taken to reduce this risk. Any questions that may elicit personal philosophies or feelings about policies or procedures have been specifically tailored to prevent such disclosure. Questions were designed to elicit feedback and recall of the individual functions, roles, and responsibilities of the academic advisors being interviewed. This limited

scope helps to provide boundaries for the nature of the questions and focus the inquiry on the vital functions of the process of academic advisement.

Role of the Researcher

As a former academic advisor in a professional staff role and as an academic advising administrator, the researcher was present during the mission change at Arizona State University to a school-centric model. The author's prior experiences within the academic advising community and professional advisor dialogues on the impact of the school-centric vision were the primary motivators for initiating this study. The researcher's background as an academic advisor, prior research in the field, understanding of the specific institutional culture and structures, and understanding the professional jargon allows added depth in the interpretation of participant feedback. In order to contextualize the interviewees' responses properly, the study is greatly enhanced by someone with a rich academic advising background to understand and contextualize their responses fully. A qualitative study was chosen for the methodology as it would best allow the researcher to explore the depth and breadth underlying the reasons behind individual responses.

Organization of the Dissertation

This dissertation is organized in a five chapter model. The first chapter reviews the background and statement of the problem, the scope of the study, and the limitations. The second chapter is an exhaustive review of all relevant research regarding academic advisement, institutional missions, and the impact of environment on behaviors. The third chapter presents the methodology that was utilized for this study. The fourth chapter is a presentation of findings.

The fifth and final chapter is a summary of findings, a synthesis and analysis of the data, a review of the study limitations, recommendations for future research, and a conclusion.

Chapter 2:

Literature Review

The literature review chapter is organized into seven parts: 1) the history of academic advisement, 2) the definitions of academic advising, 3) roles and responsibilities of the profession, 4) organization and delivery models, 5) university vision and mission, 6) school-centrism, and 7) behavior and environments. These divisions are designed to grant the reader additional understanding into the history, evolution, and contexts contained within a study of academic advising processes.

History of Academic Advisement

The history of academic advisement directly mirrors the evolution of student services and the comprehensive history of higher education in the United States of America (Gordon, 2004). The history of academic advising can be broken into three functional eras. The first era of academic advising lasted from 1636 to 1870 (Gordon, Habley, & Grites, 2008) and is typified by a uniform curriculum and little thought into student services (Gordon, Habley, & Grites, 2008). The second era of academic advising spanned 1870 to 1970 and started with the creation of both electives and majors (Gordon, Habley, & Grites, 2008). As a result of elective courses and the evolution of specialization and academic majors, a need for student services personnel evolved (Smith & Allen, 2006). In the second era, academic advising was an undefined and unexamined activity. The third era of academic advising consists of the profession being both a defined and examined activity which started in 1970 and continues to the present day (Gordon, Habley, & Grites, 2008).

First Era of Academic Advising

The first era of higher education lasted from the foundation of the first institution of higher education in the United States of America in 1636 and onward through 1870 (Gordon, Habley, & Grites, 2008). When initially founded, institutions of higher education in the United States operated under a uniform curriculum; students received identical training in fixed courses (Frost, 1991; Thelin, 2004). Institutional student support services were limited and due to the absolute curriculum, academic advising was neither a necessary nor a formalized part of the institutional services (Gordon, Habley, & Grites, 2008). The first era of academic advising was defined by the institutional services staff and faculty members who acted ‘in loco parentis’, or ‘in place of the parents’ for the students they served (Thelin, 2004, p. 18-23). These personnel were responsible for all elements of the educational and moral development of the entire student (Gordon, Habley, & Grites, 2008). Despite the charge of acting in place of the parents, faculty members were required to keep their professional distance in order to guide the moral behavior of the student (Grites, 1979). Elements of modern academic advising services were likely included in these interactions, such as the exploration of life goals, however the restrictive nature of the uniform curriculum model functionally made a formalized academic advising process unnecessary (Reinarz & White, 1995). The second era of academic advisement ended with the creation of elective courses (Gordon, Habley, & Grites, 2008).

In the late 1800s, student demonstrations were recorded over the rigidity of curriculum, poor relationships with faculty, and a lack of engaging courses (Thelin, 2004). Disillusioned with the standard curricula and harboring feelings of the faculty as being cold and distant, administrators created the first elective courses and an academic advisement system as a method to encourage student engagement (Reinarz & White, 1995). These elective systems were first implemented at

Harvard in 1872 (Thelin, 2004) and at John Hopkins University in 1877 (Kramer, 2003). These elective courses of labs and seminars had become so popular that entire tracks, or what later became known as majors, eventually evolved (Kramer, 2003). The addition of majors and electives instilled positive feelings in students and they reveled in the freedom of choice in coursework and majors (Gordon, Habley, & Grites, 2008). Professors became known as experts in specialized areas, which allowed them to create new styles of lectures to cater to larger audiences, to create supplementary seminars for advanced discussion, and to hold informal discussions (Thelin, 2004). These expert faculty were soon viewed as being more accessible than their historic counterparts (Gordon, Habley, & Grites, 2008).

As with any system with increased specialization and complexity, new rules and standards were put into place to regulate the system as well as to preserve the integrity of the core curriculum (Gordon, Habley, & Grites, 2008). Out of this flexibility evolved issues. These issues then generated increased rules and guidance systems to help students navigate this new model (Gordon, Habley, & Grites, 2008). Out of this necessity for clarifying policies and procedures, the first formalized academic advisors were created from the faculty (Gordon, Habley, & Grites, 2008). The expert faculty, who were seen as being more accessible, were then placed into official roles as the first known formal faculty academic advisement system in 1877 at John Hopkins University (Gordon, Habley, & Grites, 2008; Kramer, 2003). The elective system and formal advisement system at John Hopkins University in 1877 marked the beginning of the second era of academic advising (Gordon, Habley, & Grites, 2008).

The Second Era of Academic Advising

The second era of advising continued forward from the 1870s as a defined, but unexamined activity. Starting in the 1920s and moving forward to the 1970s, advising first received its start

as a consistent and formalized aspect of the American higher education system (Kramer, 2003). Along with other major reforms of the 1920s, the first staff academic advisors or counselors were put into practice to supplement faculty advisors in helping students navigate the variety of choices in academic fields (Kramer, 2003). By the 1950s there was a dramatic influx of students into higher education; including large numbers of students from diverse backgrounds academically, ethnically, and socially (Kramer, 2003). This great influx of students, coupled with the growth of student affairs in the 1950s, shifted the focus toward providing additional or enhanced student services such as formalized academic advising models (Gordon, Habley, & Grites, 2008; Kramer, 2003). This second era of academic advisement, which concluded in 1970, was identified as ‘defined,’ (Gordon, Habley, & Grites, 2008; Kramer, 2003) however no formalized definition of what these services entailed had been established.

Third Era of Academic Advising

The third era of academic advising, the current era, is focused on advising as both a defined and an examined activity (Gordon, Habley, & Grites, 2008). In the 1970s, academic advising changed from being a reactionary and unexamined activity to one of focused research and divergent models and definitions all attempting to articulate the nature of academic advising (Gordon, Habley, & Grites, 2008). The 1970s established a series of firsts in the scholarly world of academic advising: the first research on academic advising was published with Crookston (1972) and O’Banion (1972), the first conference on academic advising was held in 1977, and in 1979 the National Academic Advising Association, or NACADA, was formed (Gordon, Habley, & Grites, 2008). At this time the prominent model of academic advisement was still the faculty advising model (Kramer, 2003; Reinartz & White, 1995). It was not until the 1970s that professional or staff advisors were heavily utilized to assist faculty in the administration of

academic advising services (Frost, 1991). Kramer (2003) as well as Smith and Allen (2006) posited that during this timeframe, the use of staff advisors to supplement faculty advisors became an increasingly necessary component as faculty responsibilities and roles changed, student attitudes changed, technology became more pervasive, and budget cuts forced increased accountability. Faculty, Kramer (2003) indicates, no longer possessed the adequate knowledge of counseling, student affairs theory, and computer skills which were needed to advise students in the new environments of these institutions. These changing trends forced institutions to become more accountable and as a result more professional advisors replaced faculty advisors at the undergraduate level. Despite the changing trends, even into the early 1990s researchers (Kramer, 2003; Reinartz & White, 1995) acknowledged that academic advising was still seen as primarily an academic function only to be conducted by faculty.

Definitions of Academic Advisement

The National Academic Advising Association, or NACADA, acknowledges no unified theory of academic advisement exists (NACADA, 2003). The NACADA website lists thirteen unique definitions which are diverse in both philosophy and structure (NACADA, 2003). The simplest and most elegant definition recognized by NACADA was drafted by Thomas J. Grites who defined academic advising as “decision making process during which students realize their maximum educational potential through communication and information exchange with an advisor” (1979, p. 1). Grites (1979) felt that academic advisors should be agents of referrals, coordinators of curricular and extra-curricular activities and a communicator of institutional policies, procedures, and requirements.

O'Banion Model of Academic Advising

The first definition of academic advising that articulated specific roles and responsibilities was by Terry O'Banion in what would later become the O'Banion Model of Academic Advising (1972). In 1972, Terry O'Banion created the O'Banion Model of Academic Advising which identified the significant themes surrounding the roles and responsibilities of the academic advisor and outlined five major dimensions of the profession. The O'Banion's Model of Academic Advising defined the profession as a process involving five sequential elements: (1) exploration of life goals, (2) exploration of vocational goals, (3) program choice, (4) course choice, and (5) scheduling courses (O'Banion, 1972).

The first step in advisement was seen by O'Banion (1972) as the exploration of life goals. The exploration of life goals stage had a foundational belief that all students deserved respect and dignity and an appreciation of their individual differences. It was the job of the advisor to facilitate discussion around the student's personal characteristics, an assessment of the student's level of development, and an analysis of the level of understanding the student employed in the decision making process. The advisor was recommended to have knowledge of psychology, sociology, counseling skills and techniques, and basic student development theory (O'Banion, 1972). O'Banion later clarified that a working knowledge of psychological and sociological principles would suffice (O'Banion, 1972). O'Banion also indicated career counselors may be employed to address career placement tests and inventories as well as the interpretation of these instruments.

The second stage in O'Banion's Model of Academic Advising (1972), was the exploration of vocational goals. O'Banion indicated that the advisor needed all the skills of the first stage with the additional knowledge of career options and changes in society around career fields, the

ability to administer and interpret career inventories, and to treat all fields of work as worthwhile.

The third stage in O'Banion's Model of Academic Advising (1972), was assistance in the selection of a program or major. According to O'Banion, the academic advisor was to facilitate discussion around knowledge of programs available at the institution, of individual program requirements, and of program options available at other institutions as well as the transfer process involved to pursue those tracks. The academic advisor was also recommended to have a working knowledge of how other students had performed in the program of choice as well as have knowledge of the outcomes and successes of those who have finished the program (O'Banion, 1972).

Course choice and selection is the fourth and most expansive stage of O'Banion's Model of Academic Advisement (1972). O'Banion recommended that advisors be knowledgeable about which courses are offered, which had restrictions or special requirements for enrollment, proper sequences of courses, the nature of individual instructors, which were appropriate for the student's ability level, which would count for requirements, and courses that could be taken as remedial or honors. The fourth stage also included knowledge about institutional restrictions on students for probation and suspension, including limitations on how many units in which a student could enroll (O'Banion, 1972).

The scheduling of courses is the fifth and final stage of O'Banion's Model of Academic Advisement (1972). Scheduling of classes entails knowledge of the schedule itself, of the registration systems, and obtaining knowledge of the personal commitments around which a student must register for courses (O'Banion, 1972). In the prior stages of the model, O'Banion did not attribute any individual tasks to specific personnel. While the assumption is that these

are all conducted by academic advisors, O'Banion also suggests that depending on institutional priorities and structures, additional personnel may be utilized for any individual stage of the model. For the fourth stage in particular, peer advising was identified as possible replacement to faculty or staff advisors for this stage (O'Banion, 1972). It was viewed that the actual process and procedures of utilizing the institutional systems to register could be handled by specially trained student peers who could instruct other students on how to complete this process (O'Banion, 1972).

The National Academic Advising Association, or NACADA, expanded the responsibilities section of O'Banion's (1972) definition of academic advisors and incorporated it as a fundamental part of their Core Values (NACADA, 2005). The NACADA Core Values outline that academic advisors are responsible: (1) to the individuals they advise, (2) for involving others, (3) to their institutions, (4) to higher education, (5) to their educational community, (6) and for themselves and their professional practices. The Core Values were established to demonstrate the dynamic nature of the profession and that the role has multiple dimensions that include professional development, supporting the institutional vision, collaboration with others, and support of their colleges (NACADA, 2005). The Core Values (NACADA, 2005) statement is clear that the dimensions of work for advisors are not meant to signify an equal balance between all dimensions, rather it is a statement on the complexity and multiple priorities tasked to the advising profession.

Critique of O'Banion's Model

While Terry O'Banion's Model of Academic Advising (1972) is the accepted standard definition of academic advising used in the field, many scholars feel that there is a need to

“revisit, revise, and perhaps, recast the paradigm” (Burton & Wellington, 1998). The dominant theories of academic advising are based on the works of Crookston (1972) and O’Banion (1972) which have acted as the framework for most of the current research into the field (Hagen & Jordan, 2008). Hagen and Jordan (2008) note there should not be a standard theory of academic advising as a framework for the discipline. Instead academic advising should explore different theories, examine their usefulness in different situations and settings, and continue to seek self-examination with which to define itself as a profession (Hagen and Jordan, 2008). In the practice of advising, researchers Burton and Wellington (1998) identified that many academic advisors find the original model put forth by O’Banion (1972) to be difficult to integrate into their daily work with students. Questions over the practicality of the standard dimensions of advising and further calls for research into the field are at the very foundation of this study. The author seeks to revisit the standard model framed by O’Banion in the hopes of increasing knowledge in the field as to the practical roles and responsibilities of academic advisors as well as investigating how a unique university vision might play a role in shaping the definition of practice of academic advisors.

Organization and Delivery of Advisement Services

In 1983, Habley outlined the administrative and organizational structures of academic advisement (as cited in Gordon, Habley, & Grites, 2008). Habley found seven models of advisement organization: faculty-only model, supplementary model, split model, dual model, total intake model, satellite model, and the self-contained model (as cited in Gordon, Habley, & Grites, 2008). In the faculty-only model, there is no central advisement office and all students are assigned to instructional faculty (King, 1993). The supplementary model assigns all students

to faculty for advising and approvals; however it also implements a centralized advisement office for general referrals (Gordon, Habley, & Grites, 2008). The split model assigns all students to academic units or faculty advisors and also provides specialized advisement services to select groups of students including honors, athletes, undecided, and others (Gordon, Habley, & Grites, 2008). The dual model of advisement assigns each student two advisors; one advisor for general requirements and information as well as one faculty advisor for matters relating the specific major of study (King, 1993). The total intake model utilizes a central advisement office for the intake of all new students until they meet a required threshold, typically units or declaration of a major, and then advisement services are conducted in the department or school of the selected major (Gordon, Habley, & Grites, 2008; King, 1993). The self-contained model conducts advisement in a single unit for the entirety of the student's academic career (Gordon, Habley, & Grites, 2008). The satellite model is established where each school, college, or division establishes a unique method for advisement services (Gordon, Habley, & Grites, 2008). While the satellite model sounds like an ideal fit for a school-centric institutional mission, Arizona State University has utilized a hybrid of the models that include the satellite, dual, and split models.

The individual choice in how to organize and deliver academic advising systems is one that evolves out a series of choices from institutional administrators (King, 1993). Margaret C. King (1993) described this process best:

“The way in which advising services are organized and delivered on any given campus is largely influenced by four key factors: the mission of the institution, the nature of the student population, the role of the faculty, and the programs, policies, and procedures of the institution. To have an effective system, each

factor must be considered as an institution develops or redesigns academic advising services” (King, 1993).

The roles of the faculty, programs, policies, procedures, and student populations at Arizona State University had evolved over time. The most significant factor, which also impacted these earlier factors, was a change in mission to a school-centric institutional model.

Impact of Institutional Vision and Mission

Institutional vision and mission statements are a reflection of the environmental factors at work and the aspirations of where the institution wants to take itself in a competitive marketplace (Abelman & Molina, 2004). Vision and mission statements are reflections of the purpose and priorities of an institution (Abelman & Molina, 2004). A vision or mission statement is clear, compelling, distinctive, and appealing to stakeholders and customers (Abelman & Molina, 2004). Vision and mission statements are also reflections of the context and culture of the institution and a philosophical template of the type of product the institution wants to produce (Abelman & Molina, 2004; Abelman, Dalessandro, Snyder-Suhy, Janstova, 2007a). Vision statements are intended to serve as a foundation for structuring the institution’s daily operations around a common set of goals (Abelman, et. al, 2007a). As one of the most fundamental student service roles in modern higher education, academic advisors and their workplace functions are considered core to the transformation of university vision statements into tangible actions (Abelman, Dalessandro, Snyder-Suhy, Janstova, Pettey, 2007b).

Abelman and Molina (2004) asserted that “as an institution evolves in its vision, so too should its advising operations.” According to researchers (Abelman, and Molina, 2006; Abelman, et. al., 2007a; Abelman, et. al., 2007b), academic advisors are uniquely situated to provide

implementation of institutional vision. Academic advisors are well placed to implement and articulate vision statements as they have extensive connections to faculty, staff, students, and community members (Abelman, and Molina, 2004). The translation of vision statements into policies, procedures, curricular check sheets or degree audit systems, and other institutional forms is uniquely centered around the daily operations of academic advisors more than any other faculty role or any other type of student service professional (Abelman, et. al., 2007a).

School-Centric Mission

In 2002, Michael Crow became the 16th President of Arizona State University ('About Michael Crow,' 2011) and upon the start of his tenure, he implemented a new vision and mission for the university. The new vision for the university was termed the 'New American University' model in which the institution would adapt to the changing environment and create innovative methods and structures for achieving its goals (One University in Many Places, 2004; University Design Process, 2011). One of the innovative methods evolving from this mission was the creation of the school-centric university model which focused on the creation of "strong entrepreneurial colleges and schools" (One University in Many Places, 2004, p. 11). This focus on schools made each unit responsible for its own entrepreneurial efforts, intellectual differentiation, and for its own models of community, faculty and student success – with academic advising an integral and critical component of student services.

The model and mission of school-centrism created an environment where each academic unit was redefined and restructured to be more agile in responding to the unique challenges of the sociological and environmental impact in Arizona and the Phoenix metropolitan area (One University in Many Places, 2004). The school-centric model called for individual academic

units, or 'schools,' to focus on their individual success and based the success of the university as a whole on the individual ability of "each college and school advancing on its own" (One University in Many Places, 2004, p. 12). The school-centric model was designed to supplement university-wide services and place significant "responsibility to the level of colleges and schools" (One University in Many Places, 2004, p. 12) for providing their own services and designing their own models for success within their own market of intellectual activity. School-centrism was designed to alter how faculty, staff and administrators were envisioned and defined their own schools. As a result, this new vision outlined a new role for academic advisors; a role as the individual school's universal specialist for all things related to academic success, student programming, promotion of school programs and events, and student services as defined by the individual school.

The model of school-centrism was designed to be a method of organization where the academic structure of the university would be broken into smaller, more marketable, more adaptable, more manageable, and more measurable schools (One University in Many Places, 2004). The result would be a division of intellectual units where "the empowerment of colleges and schools will be enhanced by the judicious relocation and clustering of existing colleges and schools" (One University in Many Places, 2004, p. 13) toward a goal of increased academic and student success. To the student, this chunking of the larger whole could be used to create closer bonds with a smaller entity than the larger institution as a whole. It would be within these smaller schools that one of the most common service staff, academic advisors, would be uniquely placed to implement many of these new structural changes for the schools and their students. Abelman and Molina (2006) stressed the point, emphasizing that academic advisors are better positioned throughout institutions to implement institutional visions and missions.

Behavior and Environment

In 1947, Kurt Lewin founded a school of thought in psychology known as Field Theory (Lewin, 1997). Lewin's Field Theory is the concept that behavior is a function of the person, or group of persons and the environment. This study seeks to adapt the fundamental structure of the Field Theory model and examine academic advising. Lewin's work outlined three primary factors; the behavior, the person(s), and the environment. The person interacted in the environment, which in turn produced a behavior. In the academic advising version of this theory, these three factors can be replaced by their advising equivalents; the advising processes or behavior, academic advisors or person(s), and a school-centric institution as the environment. The goal of this study is to determine if the environmental change, as one of many possible factors for change, has had an impact on the historical foundations of behavior originally outlined in the O'Banion Model of Academic Advising (1972).

CHAPTER 3:

Methodology

Introduction

The purpose of this study is to investigate the process of academic advisement by non-faculty academic advisors in a school-centric environment. The primary research question seeks to identify how advising is conducted in this unique bounded system and to explore the individual processes used in advisement. This chapter reviews the rationale for using qualitative research and a case study methodology, the research setting, the selection of participants, data collection and analysis, limitations, and the theoretical framework of the researcher.

Rationale for Approach

The selection of qualitative research for this study is based upon the flexibility to explore an innovative process with more depth than a quantitative process (Berg, 2007; Creswell, 1994; Denzin & Lincoln, 2005; Marshall & Rossman, 1989). According to Marshall and Rossman (1989), qualitative research is ideal for describing subcultures, investigating depth of complex processes, understanding organizations and their processes, and studying innovative or undefined systems. As academic advisement in a school-centric environment is complex, a function of a greater organization, and a relatively undefined process, this type of research is ideal of the study. Qualitative research was also chosen as it is structured in a fashion which allows the researcher flexibility in collection and interpretation of data (Creswell, 1994). This flexibility may be necessary when selecting participants, in crafting questions, and in exploring evidence as it becomes available.

The chosen methodology for this dissertation was the case study. Yin (2008) identifies two primary definitions that must be met in order to utilize a case study methodology. The first definition requires the subject be both an exploration of depth as well as to have properties that create unclear boundaries (Yin, 2008). This study meets the first component of the first definition as academic advisement is an extremely complex process involving a variety of variables in both the process and delivery of service. The second component deals with the exploration of unknown of innovative systems (Yin, 2008). As a new and unstudied environment, the boundaries of academic advisement within the school-centric system are unknown in academic research. The second definition requires the subject of study be comprised of multiple variables, be studied utilizing multiple sources of evidence, and to be based on prior theory to guide the study (Yin, 2008). The O'Banion Model of Academic Advising (1972) is comprised of 5 linear steps, containing a total of twenty-six elements. With twenty-six elements, the advisement process sufficiently meets the qualification of containing multiple variables. This study utilized existing research, new articles, university mission documents, and participant interviews in order to satisfy the requirement for multiple sources of evidence. Finally, the utilization of theory must act as a guide for the structure and conduct of the study (Yin, 2008). This study is structured upon the foundations of the academic advisement process as established by prior research, primarily based on O'Banion's Model of Academic Advising (1972), which was utilized in context of analyzing the potential differences in contemporary academic advising processes.

Yin (2008), outlined three primary questions in identifying the choice of research methodology: 1) is the question in the form of a research question? 2) does the research require control of behavioral events? and 3) does the research focus on contemporary events? As this

study's central research question is framed in terms of 'how' and 'why' the proper research methodology could range from experiment, survey, archival analysis, history, or case study (Yin, 2008). Second, as the research is not absolutely required to control behavioral events, an experiment method can be eliminated (Yin, 2008). Finally, as the study is focused on contemporary events, the options of archival analysis, survey, or case study methodology are appropriate (Yin, 2008).

A case study methodology is ideal for this study as it allows for focused analysis of the bounded system of advising and more specifically that of advisement within an innovative, school-centric university model. Yin views a case study as a method focusing on a "contemporary phenomenon within its real life context" (Yin, 2008, p. 9) where the bounded system's limits are not clearly defined. As academic advisement processes are nuanced, practical, patterned, and complex processes a case study methodology allows for the best examination of the phenomenon (Stake, 2005; Yin, 2008). As the research was conducted in a single institution, the bounded limits are defined, however the nature of the profession of academic advisement within this system are not. As a young profession, academic advisement and the newly established school-centric model are both relatively contemporary phenomena. This study utilized a case study methodology to help define the limits of where academic advisor roles and the context of a school-centric university model intersect, where the edges of their domains are, how they differ, and how they have evolved in relationship to each other.

Research Setting

The site of the experiment was a large, metropolitan, research university in the Southwestern United States of America specifically identified as Arizona State University. The institution is

clearly identified due to the use of material from the institutional president, Michael Crow, and the unique philosophical model, school-centrism, that clearly distinguishes the institution. The interviews were conducted via GoToMeeting, distance communication software utilized to record the interviews. The participants were present at the institution, in their respective academic advising offices. The offices of the academic advisors were beneficial in order to provide the most comfortable and familiar environment for the participants. A comfortable and familiar environment will allow for the information exchange to be a freer and richer experience (Merriam, 2009). The environment in which the system operates is the ideal location, as it provides an additional element of evidence that the transcripts alone cannot provide (Krueger & Casey, 2009). Visual cues from the environment allow for a richer memory recall, as the environment in which the advising work takes place is the best environment for reminders about those experiences (Krueger & Casey, 2009).

The site chosen for study was both accessible and useful toward eliciting information from the interviewees. As the institution was both the undergraduate institution attended as well as a former employer of the researcher, a unique level of knowledge of institutional structures and network of contacts was already present. By using this site the ease of access to the participants, and the experience of the researcher provides both an environmental and a historical knowledge base to contextualize the information given by the participants.

Participant Selection

Interviewees were selected through a convenient sample; through the researcher's previous employment with the university and connection to the academic advising community. An ASU academic advising association called the Council of Academic Advisors (CAA) agreed to

provide the researcher access to distribute a general solicitation to be sent out via email (Appendix B) to all members of the academic advising community at the institution through the CAA email distribution system. The first respondents who met the qualifications, no more than twelve, were selected for interviews. Interviewees were required to have the following criteria in order to participate: a current role as an academic advisor or academic success specialist, at least one year of advisement experience, a primary responsibility to advisement of undergraduate students, and someone who was not employed as a faculty member for their primary employment classification. The criteria were purposely left broad to aid in selection of participants.

Data Collection

The method of data collection for this study was through structured interviews. Interviews were chosen as the most efficient means of addressing the research questions. Limited archival evidence, no ethnographic field observations, and limited documentation are available concerning the topic of study. Due to additional concerns with privacy laws and a lack of historic documentation surrounding academic advisement in the school-centric environment, interviews were the most efficient method of data recording (Seidman, 2006). Since the actual behavior of the academic advisement process has passed, and all elements of the process are not directly observable, the most efficient model to view the problem was to interview those involved (Merriam, 2009). The interviews were highly structured (Appendix C); each participant was asked the same questions (Appendix D), worded in the same manner and asked in the same order (Merriam, 2009). Each interview was recorded using the digital audio

recording functions of GoToMeeting and memos were taken throughout the interviews (Merriam, 2009).

Each interview was conducted according to the interview recommendations outlined by Seidman (2006) including interview length, number of participants, and selection of participants. Seidman (2006) indicated a single hour interview often leads to participants watching the clock and is often too short for some participants. A two hour time limit can result in feelings of being too long or can discourage participation (Seidman, 2006). The middle ground of no more than 90 minutes is the ideal to provide adequate length to investigate the issue without requiring too much of the participant (Seidman, 2006). The researcher reserved the right to adjust the length of the interview to a shorter time span based on the participant responses.

Interviews were conducted in the setting most applicable to the exploration of the processes, the academic advisor's personal office. By conducting interviews in the academic advisor's offices, the natural setting for working with students, the information recall was likely to be the greatest (Seidman, 2006). The selection of academic advisor personal offices as the setting for interviews is an additional function of rapport. By utilizing the natural workspace of advisors, the researcher created an instant minimum level of rapport and created a comfortable environment with the participants (Seidman, 2006). As interviews could contain personal perspectives on an institutional mission, each interview will be conducted with the door closed to ensure privacy and to provide greater freedom in the disclosure of information (Merriam, 2009).

As the researcher is a former advisor from the institution of study, professional relationships may exist. These relationships may help to encourage the free flow of information and potentially could increase both the levels of comfort and rapport with participants. At a

minimum, this knowledge and experience lends the researcher an additional level of contextual understanding which aids in the interpretation of findings.

Data Analysis

After each interview was concluded, the researcher reviewed memos and coded interview notes into salient themes as well as recorded additional notes relevant to the process of analyzing memos during later review. The researcher transferred the digital audio files to a secure computer, upon which each recording was transcribed for additional analysis. Additional memos were created after the transcription process to identify additional themes that emerged. The themes that emerged were then coded and grouped into sub-categories, which were then grouped into larger categories.

Coding Process

In accordance to the methodologies outlined by Yin (1994) and Saldaña (2009) the researcher conducted three rounds of progressive coding; descriptive coding, pattern coding, and magnitude coding. The first round of coding was conducted to identify elements such as contexts, situations, observations, feelings, experiences, and other attributes connected to the processes of academic advisement. This was done by reviewing the transcripts, highlighting key passages, adding notes in the margins, and circling or underlining key words. As a framework for organizing responses, and in order to address the central question of the applicability of the O'Banion Model of Academic Advising (1972), the five macro-dimensions, or primary categories, of the O'Banion Model and the twenty-six micro-dimensions, or sub-categories, were utilized. A sixth macro-dimension, entitled 'unincorporated,' was established under which to code any micro-dimensions, or sub-categories, that could arise from emergent themes not

conforming to the O'Banion Model (1972). This round of coding followed the structure of descriptive coding as outlined by Saldaña (2009). The process of descriptive coding consisted of identifying central topics throughout the transcripts and manually highlighting, underlining or adding notations in the margins next to each passage containing the topic. Topics were seen as individual words, short phrases, or several sentences.

A second cycle of pattern coding was then conducted in order to group topics, codes and memos from the first cycle into various shared themes. These methods followed the methodologies for pattern coding as described by Saldaña (2009). A review of all emergent topics was conducted to identify if any topics initially categorized as 'unincorporated' were appropriately coded as well as to identify if any could be included within the existing five primary categories of the O'Banion Model of Academic Advising (1972). The second phase of this process involved conducting comparisons of each emergent topic and grouping like topics into a series of emergent themes. The third phase of this process involved grouping each theme into a series of sub-categories.

The third and final round of coding consisted of applying magnitude coding, recording the frequencies of each mention. Each mention was coded based on the basic topic of each passage. Mentions consisted of a single word, a series of words, a sentence, or a series of connected sentences focused on a primary topic. A new mention was not recorded for longer passages as long as the original topic remained unchanged. These mentions were then assembled into a visual matrix.

Following the suggested methods in Yin's (1994) work on case study evidence analysis, the second order themes and thematic categories were grouped into a visual matrix to show the frequency and average occurrence of each topic as mentioned by the participants. The first

column contained each of the twenty-six sub-categories from the O'Banion Model (1972) and the emergent themes and sub-categories as grouped under the 'unincorporated' category. One row per sub-category and theme identified was added to the visual matrix. The second through twelfth columns were created for each participant and the frequency of each occurrence, or mention, was counted under each participant from which the mention originated. The thirteenth column contained the total occurrences of each sub-category theme with the fourteenth column containing the average mentions across all the participants. Once the visual matrix was completed, the researcher then re-analyzed the frequency coding on the transcriptions recording each mention based on the five categories and twenty-six sub-categories as well as each of the 'unincorporated' sub-categories on the visual matrix.

After the third round of coding was completed, the average mentions were recorded for each sub-category in order to identify the strength of each sub-category theme. The sub-category themes under the 'unincorporated' category were then reordered to list the most frequently occurring sub-category themes first and the least frequently occurring themes last.

Coding of Mentions into Visual Matrix

The first category in the visual matrix was codified by recording mentions that fell within the framework of exploration of life goals (Table F1). This section recorded occurrences associated with personal needs, hopes, dreams, passions, personal backgrounds and educational paths, desired outcomes in obtaining a degree, purpose for attending college, as well as coaching, mentoring, and guidance. The counseling section provided the greatest difficulty in discrimination of mentions, as there seemed to be two primary types of counseling as articulated by the participants. The first type of counseling fell within the boundaries of exploring life goals as the topics centered on acts of guidance such as: mentoring, coaching, providing advice and in

maintaining professional relationships with faculty, staff, and fellow students. The second type of counseling fell outside the exploration of life goals; the focus was on the exploration of emotional barriers, grappling with personal events from their lives, having tough conversations about deaths and other times of distress, and ultimately the desire for a more personal relationship from the academic advisor as might be found in a professional therapist, a friend or a parental figure.

The second category in the visual matrix recorded mentions associated with the exploration of career or vocational goals (Table F2). This section recorded occurrences focused on the topics of careers, internships, salary, and degree to career pathways. Discussions of applicable degrees leading to particular careers or most employable degrees were recorded in this category rather than the category for program exploration. The most complex coding involved the discrimination of post-graduation certifications, licensures, examinations and internships which were not directly linked to degrees. The rationale for classifying post-graduation support was based on language used by O'Banion (1972) which described this category as the second step leading to a third consisting of choice of a program. As these elements are focused on the time frames after graduation, they were excluded from this category and classified under the sub-category of 'Post-Graduation Assistance' in the 'unincorporated' category. While O'Banion's (1972) category two, part A is focused on the broad topic of knowledge of vocational fields, and if O'Banion is accepted as a linear model as the author intended, the category is a precursor to choosing a degree. Since the second category of vocational exploration is described by the author (O'Banion, 1972) as the second step prior to choosing a degree, any elements after degree attainment should not be included as part of this process.

Mentions associated with the exploration of program choice, the third step (Table F3) in the O'Banion Model of Academic Advisement (1972), were recorded on the visual matrix as the third category. This category recorded mentions associated with the topics of degree offerings, program requirements, university transfer requirements, or the performance of prior students in the programs. While not explicitly discussed in the O'Banion Model (1972), any topics concerning minors, concentrations, emphasis areas, transferability of courses, and the nature of online programs were coded into this category on the visual matrix as they fall within the framework of exploring programs. Graduation requirements, university requirements, and college requirements associated with the sequencing of courses as well as the transferability of specific courses were coded in the fourth category.

The fourth category of exploration of course choice (Table F4) and the fifth category of exploration of scheduling options (Table F5) were added to the visual matrix as corresponding categories. The fourth category recorded topics on the visual matrix associated with the nature of courses, course sequences, college rules determining course access, faculty associated with courses, and the content of courses. The fifth category recorded topics associated with the act of scheduling, focusing on topics such as system issues, when courses are offered, how courses are scheduled, and manageable course loads.

A sixth category was added to the visual matrix that encompassed all topics outside the scope of the O'Banion Model of Academic Advising (1972). This category was entitled 'unincorporated' and each topic mentioned that was unable to be coded into the prior five categories were added to a new row on the visual matrix (Appendix G). Later rounds of coding reduced these initial topics into themes, and these themes were later grouped into a series of sub-categories.

Limitations

The scope of this study is likely limited to similar systems and institutions to those found in the bounded system of study. Specifically, the academic advising structures, institutional environment, and school-centric structures unique to Arizona State University may have commonalities that extend outside this model. As these characteristics are unique to this system and the personnel serving within it, the findings of this study might have a limited scope and may not be generalizable to the extent of the unique nature of the school-centric system. It is possible that common elements across other institutional models with different philosophies may increase the generalizability and applicability of the study's findings.

While there would be little generalizability to other institutions, and their academic advisors, there is still some applicability in understanding of roles and responsibilities that comprise the academic advisement processes. As the roles and responsibilities of academic advisors in various institutional models still remain largely undefined and unexamined, this study provides additional insight into the profession. A goal of this study is not to provide a universal understanding of academic advisement, but rather an examination of a specific environment to explore the boundaries of the profession.

Theoretical Framework of the Researcher

The theoretical framework of the research is created from a viewpoint of critical theory, advising theories, the study of higher education, the study of governance of higher education, pragmatic research and of use-inspired research. In the generation of a problem in which to study, the researcher focused on the academic disciplines of higher education, student development, and academic advising. This interest in higher education stems from an

intellectual interest in psychology, counseling and student affairs as well as the professional experiences as a staff counselor, academic advisor, and advising administrator. The way the researcher views the purpose of research is pragmatic and ultimately use-inspired. The focus is on ways to study student services and find pragmatic ways of improving those services. As a critical theorist, the researcher is concerned with the shape and contexts of the systems in use in higher education. This study is structured upon a pre-existing understanding the phenomenon of the roles and responsibilities that comprise the processes of academic advising in a school-centric environment.

CHAPTER 4:

Findings

Introduction

Throughout this study, the participants provided a glance at the daily processes and work-life responsibilities of academic advisors in a school-centric environment. This study examined the topic of academic advising processes utilizing eleven interview questions. Responses were not constrained and categorized according to individual questions. An aggregate of all responses given to all questions was used to code and categorize responses. Therefore, the findings chapter of this study is organized into five thematic areas to allow for content overlap and present an easier conceptual framework for the reader to follow. The primary elements of this chapter include: participants, O'Banion's dimensions, unincorporated dimensions, responsibility for advisement and campus partnerships, and the school-centric environment.

Participants

One-hundred and eighty three academic advisors were contacted via electronic mail about participation in the study. Thirteen academic advisors expressed interest in participating in the interviews. Eleven participants, or 6% of the total population, were eventually interviewed for this study. Two additional participants scheduled an interview time; however they were unable to be interviewed due to scheduling issues. The study yielded four academic advisors from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, three from the Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College, two from the W. P. Carey School of Business, one from the School of Letters and Sciences, and one from the College of Health Solutions. Participants were representative of five of the twelve undergraduate degree-granting colleges at the institution. Participants' names were coded with

pseudonyms in order to protect identities. An assignment of an alphabetically ordered, four to five letter pseudonym was assigned to each participant for reporting purposes including: Alice, Beth, Carol, Dan, Emma, Felix, Greg, Holly, Ivy, Joe and Kate.

On average, the participants held 8.91 years of overall academic advising experience, 7.95 years of experience at ASU, and 5.81 years of experience of academic advising in their current unit (Appendix E). The lowest years of overall academic advising experience was six and the highest being fifteen years (Appendix E). Academic advising experience at ASU ranged from 4.5 to sixteen years (Appendix E). Current unit experience in academic advisement ranged from one year to twelve (Appendix E). A study of advisor perceptions of the professions found the majority of academic advisors nationally had less than three years of advising experience (Adams, Larson, & Barkemeyer, 2013). As all the participants in this study had more than four years of academic advisement experience and averaged 7.95 years of advisement experience at the institution, there is a strong level of confidence the feedback provided was similar to the experiences of other advisors at this institution.

Categorization

The process of coding and recording mentions of individual topics and grouping the patterns into the existing structures of the O'Banion Model (Appendix F) and an unincorporated category (Appendix G) yielded unexpected findings regarding the frequencies of teach topic. The strongest category of total mentions was the unincorporated category with 460 mentions, followed by the following categories in decreasing order: exploration of course choice at 108 mentions, exploration of program choice at 79 mentions, exploration of life goals at 73 mentions,

exploration of vocational or career goals at 40 mentions, and exploration of scheduling options at 32 mentions (Appendix F).

The first phase of descriptive coding resulted in 41 initial topics mentioned in the ‘unincorporated’ category (Appendix G) which were not inclusive of the O’Banion Model (1972). These topics were then re-organized and a pattern coding methodology was applied. Pattern coding reduced the topics into a twenty-seven themes, arranged into eight sub-categories. The final round of coding reduced and refined these themes down to twenty-three and the resulting analysis allowed for reorganization and clarification of the sub-categories, which remained at eight.

The visual matrix processes yielded results allowing for the visualization of the consistent presence of some data elements and the absence of two themes. Nine of the eleven participants had mentions of topics contained within the themes and sub-categories all five dimensions of the O’Banion Model of Academic Advising (1972). Two advisors, Dan and Greg, were the only participants without a mention of a single topic or theme within one of the larger five categories. Greg discussed topics across the other four categories as well as the unincorporated themes; however Greg did not discuss any topics or themes associated with the scheduling of courses. In addition to Greg, Dan also had a category with zero mentions, as Greg did not have any mentions of topics associated with exploration of career or vocational goals. (Appendices F1 and F2)

Initial Categories

As previously discussed, the five primary dimensions of the O’Banion Model of Academic Advising (1972) were the initial categories by which topics, themes, and sub-categories were coded. The O’Banion Model contains twenty-six sub-categories and five primary categories; 1)

exploration of life goals, 2) exploration of vocational goals, 3) exploration of program choice, 4) course choice, and 5) course scheduling. A sixth category, entitled ‘unincorporated,’ was utilized to group the topics, themes, and sub-categories which were not inclusive of the O’Banion Model. The following elements were discovered primarily as a result of questions two through five of the interview protocol (Appendix C).

Exploration of Life Goals

The first category of the O’Banion Model of Academic Advising (1972) is focused on the exploration of life goals, which yielded 73 total categorical mentions in the study. The exploration of life goals category is comprised of seven sub-categories, however only four sub-categories yielded any mentions. Three sub-categories yielded between twenty and thirty sub-category mentions including; 1. A. the knowledge of student characteristics and development, 1. B. the understanding of the decision making process, and 1. D. skills in counseling techniques. Emma best described the relationship of exploring life goals in the context of understanding the student’s decision making process:

“...it’s really important to get students to tell you what they really want in their life, or what they’re thinking about. Their dreams; their hopes. I find that’s an important role that I believe as an advisor I’ve taken on, because we have so many confused people coming to see us” (Emma, personal communication, January 2014).

The importance of establishing a student’s career goals and personal background was explored by Carol (personal communication, January 2014) who describes the importance of establishing life goals in the process of advisement:

“It does help to kind of establish rapport that I know where they’re coming from, what their goals are. You can kind of put them more at ease. You know that and you’re taking that into consideration. Also it might be part of that they’re explaining why they chose to come online rather than in person. They might be telling me ‘I’m living here in Florida. This is my situation at the moment’” (Carol, personal communication, January 2014).

Alice (personal communication, January 2014) described why the exploration of life goals is important in guiding a student through the following steps of career exploration and program choice:

“I find the successful conversations regarding academic advising have to do with bigger picture, broader scope and various student-centric issues. So I will often have conversations with students where we talk about what their passions are, what their goals are – because I’m in (department/major) which is a very broad career and a very broad study” (Alice, personal communication, January 2014).

Finally, the experience of academic advisors in providing coaching, or counseling services to students came from Alice who described this relationship in advisement: “So this is sometimes in the form of coaching, sometimes in the form of human rolodex, sometimes in the form of parent, sometimes in the form of disciplinarian” (personal communication, January 2014).

It is important to mention that several micro-dimensions, grouped within ‘Exploration of Life Goals’, yielded one or zero mentions during the interview process (Table F1). The micro-dimension of 1. E ‘appreciation of individual differences’ only yielded a singular mention. The micro-dimensions that yielded zero mentions included: 1. C. ‘the knowledge of psychology and

sociology’, 1. F. ‘the belief in the worth and dignity of all’, and 1. G. ‘the belief that all have potential’.

Exploration of Vocational Goals

Mentioned by ten of the eleven participants, the process of exploring vocational goals yielded only forty mentions as a total category (Table F2). Within this category, two themes were not present in any of the participant interviews; 2. B. ‘skill in the interpretation of assessment and career tests’, and 2. D. ‘the acceptance of all fields of work being dignified and worthwhile.’ The dominant sub-category of this section was 2. A. ‘knowledge of vocational fields’ yielding 29 mentions. One of the participants, Joe, best described this element in the greater context of the advisement process, while in a direct conversation with a student:

"Another conversation I have a lot with my students is just how this degree - either whether they're in it or whether they're interested in it, how this degree is going help them get a job down the road or get them to where they want to be with whatever their goal might be down the road. That's, I think, a big conversation that I have pretty consistently as well. And that's something that we're not necessarily trained on per se" (Joe, personal communication, January 2014).

The remaining micro-dimension, 2. C. ‘understanding the changing nature of work in society,’ was particularly difficult to categorize, and thus generated 11 mentions. Three academic advisors articulated the need for more ‘career advising’ versus ‘career counseling’ in order to support students properly in career exploration. Ivy (personal communication, January 2014), who discusses career advising and holistic advising on several occasions, stated:

“My specific one for academic advising takes in what I call holistic advising, or a combination of advising with career advising. So advising would involve not only telling the student what they need to get into a program, what they need to do to get through the program, and what they need to do to graduate from the program, but also monitoring them, listening to them all along the way to find out if they're having any career issues, any job issues, any problems with the program they're in, and then trying to advise them accordingly" (Ivy, personal communication, January 2014).

While career or vocational exploration may have a dominant role in some advisors workload, Felix felt career exploration was an element that should be left primarily outside of his workload as a direct result of the resources present in the W. P. Carey School of Business and the university wide Career Services center. Felix did acknowledge career exploration was a component of his work; however most of the exploration his students conducted through the various career centers and not through his advisement. It was unclear by Felix's responses if career exploration was structured, a referral process, or an informal process in academic advisement operations.

“I think some other advisors may have to do a little bit more as far as in the career area. We have our own business career center here so we don't get into the career aspect so much. We have them sign up to meet their career coach and of course ASU has a career center also that is serving all the other students” (Felix, personal communication, January 2014).

Exploration of Program Choice

The process of exploring program choice was mentioned by advisors a total of 79 times, making it the third most frequently mentioned category (Table F3). The first four sub-categories, 3. A. through 3. D., were all mentioned by the academic advisors, however the final sub-category of 3. E. knowledge of success rates of program completers was entirely absent in the responses. The dominant sub-categories were 3. A. knowledge of programs available which had 34 mentions and 3. B. knowledge of program requirements which had 38 mentions.

Most references in this section consisted of partial sentences, or short sequences of words such as the following quotes by Felix and Joe. Felix indicated that academic advisement was responsible for helping students "... to find their way through their four years here" (Felix, personal communication, January 2014). Joe discussed the nature of the program in the context of how the degree was offered by helping students to "understand the challenges of online" (Joe, personal communication, January 2014). Carol (personal communication, January 2014) had the most significant quote, describing how she worked with older students who may be unaware of the successes of other students who are taking similar pathways to a degree.

"I think maybe – well part of it I would say because they tend to be older students and returning after a longer gap. A lot of them are transfer students who are coming back to school after a number of years. They may not realize how many other students in the program are in those same shoes, but sometimes they sometimes seem to be offering an explanation of 'well I'm 47-years-old and I own this business but I'd really like to finish this degree as a personal goal" (Carol, personal communication, January 2014).

Exploration of Course Choice

Exploration of course choice was the second most frequently mentioned category and the most frequently mentioned of the O'Banion categories with 108 total mentions (Table F4). The only theme not mentioned in this category was 4. D. knowledge of honors or developmental courses. The dominant themes within this category were 4. A. knowledge of courses available, with 53 mentions, and 4. B. knowledge of special information regarding courses at 37 mentions, which includes: graduation requirements, specific times, prerequisites, transferability, course sequences, and general education applicability. Greg describes the two dominant sub-categories by discussing courses available and the special information regarding those courses, "There's the basic stuff that is the foundation of advising. Navigating courses themselves....Explaining that basic information about scheduling and coursework and what does general studies mean" (Greg, personal communication, January 2014).

Felix and Holly both stated experiences of discussing the quality of *faculty instruction and their teaching styles*. Felix (personal communication, January 2014) stated "I haven't taken the course, but this is what I hear from students." Holly included "... students will confide in me and give me some information as far as who the good instructors are, or if someone is easy going, or if someone is really being difficult" (Holly, personal communication, January 2014).

The discrimination of mentions presented a difficult choice in deciding between the categorization of topics and themes associated with course sequences and those associated with critical tracking and progression tracking. The distinction was made to group instances where specific pairings of courses were discussed, such as when Felix's mention of "...just after English 101 take English 102" (Felix, personal communication, January 2014). Any instances where subsets of sequences contained within a report that were discussed with a student were

included in this section. Instances where courses were discussed in the context of creating or reviewing reports for the purposes of tracking the entirety of degree progression were moved to a sub-category of data and reporting in the unincorporated category.

Exploration of Scheduling Options

The exploration of scheduling options was the least mentioned category with only 32 total mentions (Table F5). All three themes were mentioned by the majority of the participants with roughly equal weight. Joe discussed the importance of scheduling: “So my part of academic advising is, I guess, from the academic side in regards to scheduling. I think that's a big component of the job obviously” (Joe, personal communication, January 2014). Alice was able to connect bigger picture elements to the act of scheduling and commented on how discussions of scheduling can turn into larger conversation very quickly:

"I have instances where a student will come in and say 'I just want to know if this class is going to be offered in spring'. Well, you could find that out online, what other reason are you here for? And then having more personable conversations it might come out you want to find out if the class is being offered in spring because you're enrolled in it now and you're planning on failing it because you have 3 jobs and no time for school. So really, we need to have a different conversation"

(Alice, personal communication, January 2014).

Carol (personal communication, January 2014) reviewed how scheduling is often discussed with a student and how exploring personal restrictions associated plays a significant role in the advisement process:

"Like if they have a disability or even things like their living maybe close to the West campus for one semester and they're needing to take courses there or

perhaps they'll talk about what their work schedule is and we want to look at how that will work with the number of credit hours they're taking to make sure that they're not overwhelmed. So that would be part of the discussion. Kind of what is their schedule like, what are their other priorities and obligations, what else is going on in their life? Are they a student who has a family and they're also working full-time" (Carol, personal communication, January 2014)?

Only one participant, Greg, neglected to mention any course scheduling responsibilities in his interview. None of the participants discussed the utilization of peers or technology to review the process of scheduling courses.

Unincorporated Themes and Sub-Categories

Eight sub-categories, containing twenty-three themes were identified (Appendix G) existing outside the framework of the O'Banion Model of Academic Advising (1972). The twenty-three themes were coded and grouped into eight sub-categories in order of total mentions: 1) data and reporting, 2) customer service and information disbursement, 3) student engagement, 4) administrative support and policy enforcement, 5) curriculum and instruction, 6) therapeutic counseling, 7) student transitions, and 8) outliers. All of these sub-categories were grouped into one larger micro-dimension entitled 'unincorporated.' The title of unincorporated was selected to reflect their status as outside the linear process framework of the O'Banion Model (1972), but directly connected to the processes. The unincorporated category was the largest micro-dimension mentioned by the academic advisors. A total of four hundred and sixty mentions were made of the forty-one different topics in this category that were not able to be coded into the O'Banion Model (1972). As with the other categories and themes within the O'Banion Model,

the themes and sub-categories within the unincorporated often can overlap in some ways, however the primary element would need to fall outside of the O'Banion Model in order to be recorded in the category.

Data and Reporting

The title of 'Reporting and Data Analysis' was selected to reflect the multitude of operations associated with the themes and topics in this sub-category (Table G1). Elements in this sub-category were required to fall within four themes: 1) report generation for proactive advisement 2) progression tracking and records maintenance, 3) retention tracking and reporting, and 4) teaching technology and systems.

The first theme in the data and reporting sub-category is 'Progression Tracking and Records Maintenance.' Progression tracking and records maintenance encompasses the collection of data, the generation of reports, and analyzing data in order to enact proactive advising outreach. This sub-category received over one-hundred and fifty nine mentions from the academic advisors and was more frequently mentioned than any of the entire categories within the O'Banion Model of Academic Advising (1972). Joe best describes the importance of these reports for his college and his own advisement style:

"I think it's keeping proactive with that as well, not waiting for students to come to me. Making sure I'm writing reports and checking reports that my management sends me to make sure that if there's an issue there that the student doesn't necessarily bring to me, but I see a problem, that I'm proactively reaching out to them" (Joe, personal communication, January 2014).

The other advisors frequently mentioned conducting surveys and the act of monitoring students through a series of reports which were used to develop proactive advisement plans.

The theme of progression tracking and records maintenance was the single most dominant theme found within the entire study. Seventy eight mentions, an average of 7.09 mentions per advisor, were found in the transcription analysis on this particular theme across all eleven participants. Progression tracking and records maintenance encompasses the addition and removal of advisement holds from student records, the process of reviewing coursework and approving courses for use in the student's degree audit report system, or DARS, providing on-track and off-track advisement to students based on a custom progression tracking system, and making edits or exceptions to student records in the progression tracking system. Felix (personal communication, January 2014) described his experiences working with students and explaining "...what will happen if you are off track a second time for a class and what will be your next steps." Alice (personal communication, January 2014) attributed an increased ability to have very difficult conversations with students to the critical tracking system. Alice indicated these discussions were facilitated by the pre-coded expectations the system has for student course sequences and semester-based milestones. Alice mentioned these expectations for student progress afforded an easy conversational bridge into these difficult conversations and opened up avenues for the proactive exploration of support services and advisement on planning for the worst case scenario. While Alice and other advisors described the usefulness of the progression tracking system, some advisors were not convinced of the merits of this institutional operation and advisement tool.

Two advisors in particular were vocal about their skepticism and concerns with the progression tracking system, critical tracking, and how it impacts the student experience. Felix questioned the impact of the tracking system with regard to the timing of courses by stating at the end of a student's degree "... whether or not the student took Math 211 their second or third

semester really has no impact, but by school-centric we must go ahead and conform to the critical tracking that has been assigned to us" (Felix, personal communication, January 2014).

While the system is used a guide for course sequences and progression, Emma (personal communication, January 2014) expressed concern that students were being taught to be dependent on the system and indicated students were both less self-sufficient and more reliant on a computer program for guidance than in thinking for themselves. Whether perceived as positive or negative, there is no doubt the critical tracking, or student progression tracking system, had a great impact on both the frequency of mentions in this study and in the workload of the academic advisors.

As a counter-point to student progression, which seems focused on creating avenues for moving forward in a degree, retention tracking is focused on preventing students from falling behind or from losing the student entirely. Ivy was the dominant source of mentions of retention in the student (Ivy, personal communication, January 2014). Ivy discussed how many different activities spanning residence halls, orientations, peer advising, first year success courses or seminar courses, and mandatory advisement holds could all be considered part of academic advising retention strategies. Felix was the most vocal about the negative impact of retention strategies at the institution, even going so far as to say the topic of retention is "beaten into our heads" (Felix, personal communication, January 2014). Felix later went on to discuss how certain retention efforts, such as a targeted freshman advisement campaign by his college, impacted other students:

"I think at times, at least here in W. P. Carey, we maybe focus more on freshmen than anyone else and it's all for retention purposes. And sometimes that was at the expense of our sophomore students; juniors and seniors could not get in to see us

because of the wanting to serve the new freshmen. The theory is that if they have a good first year, they're more likely to stay at ASU and graduate” (Felix, personal communication, January 2014).

While not all advisors agreed on the impact of retention activities, nine out of the eleven advisors discussed the topic in their interview.

Finally, the last element of data and reporting is the theme of teaching technology. This theme is comprised of the educational process involved to train students on how to use the degree audit reporting system - DARS, how to use their student portal called MyASU, how to navigate the university academic calendar for vital dates, and how to interpret and track their academic progress using major maps and critical tracking. Joe, Ivy, and Carol (personal communication, January 2014) all discussed the philosophy of academic advising as teaching and directly connected their education of these systems to the teaching philosophy. Greg best described how technology has impacted advisement stating “a lot of students aren't familiar with those tools, and so part of advising now has shifted from merely explaining what these guidelines are to teaching students how to use the tools for their degree” (Greg, personal communication, January 2014). Greg also went on to make a declaration about the future of technology under the current leadership, positing “That’s one thing I would expect at least under Crow’s leadership for ASU to continue to move forward and we’re ever going to be moving toward using technology to advance the cause of student services” (Greg, personal communication, January 2014). While teaching technology and advisement tools to students was part of the narrative for eight out of the eleven participants, those who did discuss the element averaged 4.5 mentions. Teaching technology is an important role in a modern system and is closely related to other sub-categories such as providing customer service and general information.

Customer Service and General Information

Customer service and general information was formed utilizing advisor feedback concerning the provision of general information, providing referrals to other campus resources, serving as a connection point for the student to the institution, and essentially providing basic customer service (Table G2). Joe (personal communication, January 2014) was able to summarize this sub-category in defining his role: "I was going to say I'm not a problem solver; I'm a solution provider." While the O'Banion Model (1972) discussed providing information to students in specific contexts, it failed to articulate the provision of general customer service and the process of connecting students to appropriate resources or information. The importance of this sub-category was demonstrated through mentions by each advisor, one-hundred and eleven total mentions, and an average 3.62 mentions per advisor.

The theme of resource referrals and general information is comprised of referrals to campus resources, providing contact information, and bridging resources to resolve student issues. According to the participants, these student issues may not always be directly considered academic advising in a traditional sense, however a lack of resolution may often impede the ability of a student to register for coursework and progress in their degree. Joe linked resource referrals to student success by stating: "... my job's to make sure that they're put in a position to be successful, making sure that they know what resources are available to them" (Joe, personal communication, January 2014). The advisors indicated the need to refer students to particular resources as the other campus service area was often better suited to resolve the issue, such as financial aid, registrar, career services, counseling, international student services, faculty and other academic advisors. Overall, this theme was rather strong in its generation of 53 total

mentions, by being discussed by 9 of 11 participants, and in being mentioned on average 4.82 times per advisor.

As with any student service, academic advising often can be viewed in terms of a general customer service orientation. The advising participants echoed this viewpoint through their discussion of ensuring students have whatever they need, have their problems solved, have easy access to appointments, and that advisors are able to provide a broad range of advisement services. Joe described how the term customer service is often viewed and linked the concept to both student time and tuition:

"I think that's (customer service) a dirty word when we are dealing with students because they don't want them to be considered customers. But I think when you're looking at someone as a customer, you're putting in the time because you understand that they're putting in their time and money and they want to make sure they're getting the best return on that" (Joe, personal communication, January 2014).

Overall, the theme of customer service was divided into two primary elements; general customer service as ensuring a collegiate experience and a non-descript concept of student success.

A significant part of general customer service was the notion that student success and ensuring a good college experience were a crucial component of the advisement process. The concept of a good college experience was not further defined by the participants, however the phrase did seem to encompass personal development, student organizations and involvement experiences, engagement through activities, and overall satisfaction with support services. These vague indications of a good experience or college experience comprised nearly a third of the

general customer service theme. Ivy indicated "Whether it's with us or another college, our goal is to make sure the student has a good experience" (Ivy, personal communication, January 2014). Other advisors described the process as ensuring positive experiences, preventing negative experiences, and enabling the student to have the best college experience possible. The next two-thirds of this theme was comprised of ill-defined descriptions of overall student success. A few mentions of student success were linked to degree completion, however the major of mentions were similar to the following quote from Greg who concluded his "job is to help them be successful with their goal of degree completion. So I am their partner to help them be successful" (Greg, personal communication, January 2014). Many of the advisors referenced new surveys and mission statements from the presidential and provost level concerning customer service and resource referrals. It seems during the last six to eight months these elements have held an increasing focus for the institution and this institutional vision is already having an impact on the mindsets of the academic advisors who mentioned it fifty times.

Student Engagement

The third most dominant sub-category mentioned by the advisors was the incorporation of advice concerning campus activities, student involvement, and school-centric programming (Table G3). In discussions of academic advisement processes, the advising participants often mentioned the need to connect students to different experiences. Some of these experiences were campus-based student organizations and other college or school-centric activities designed to build connections between the college and the student. Seven advisors mentioned student involvement experiences such as student organizations, research opportunities, service learning, and a student involvement week. A few advisors also mentioned part of their duties was to coordinate with student leaders of different campus organizations. In addition to clubs and

organizations, eight of the advisors mentioned a need to help students identify with the college and connect to peers within their college. As Holly (personal communication, January 2014), a business advisor, described this process as “introducing the students to the university and the WPC culture.” These activities included first year experience activities, dedicated residence halls, Camp Carey, the W. P. Carey Career Center, Carey Connection, college success coaches, and peer mentors.

Administrative Support and Policy Enforcement

Often in academic advising the process is not a comfortable or positive situation. As mentioned by the advising participants, administrative workloads and policy enforcement is one of their least favorite advisement functions (Table G4). As a sub-category, administrative support and policy enforcement was the fourth most mentioned unincorporated sub-category by the academic advising participants. This sub-category contains upholding policies and procedures, progression issues, and administrative withdrawals. In upholding policies and procedures, the advisors mentioned a wide range of administrative paperwork and consultation associated with appeals, petitions, advisement holds and disciplinary actions. Progression issues as a theme contains advisor discussions of student dismissals, disqualifications, probation, and probation contracts. Dan (personal communication, January 2014) describes below how different schools have varied approaches to probation and disqualifications:

"I think the way that advisors in the other schools, the policies of the schools in terms of probation and disqualification, may be a little bit different based on different GPA standards that exist today and the different schools that are here"
(Dan, personal communication, January 2014).

The topic of grade point averages was a common one with Dan (personal communication, January 2014), who also described his experience with college policies and student advisement on grade point averages:

"Certain schools have different GPA requirements, so there are schools at ASU that have a higher GPA requirement than other schools. Consequently, in some of those schools, students are more frequently encouraged or forced to change their major to other schools or other majors. And so this impacts the way that an advisor might advise a student, particularly students who are on probation or at least who are ineligible to maintain their standing within a school that has a higher GPA standard than a different school at ASU" (Dan, personal communication, January 2014).

During the process of advisement, advisors are expected to uphold policies and procedures of the institution, however not all advisors are pleased about these processes. One such effort is the processing medical and compassionate withdrawal requests, which was mentioned only by two advisors. Another such effort is the process of removing advisement holds from student records. Emma describes her feelings on advisement holds and critical tracking below:

"Trying to control all the students, with all these holds on their accounts, and forcing them to pick their major. Putting them on - they have to remain on track, and if you don't we're going to make you switch your major. It's managing and controlling" (Emma, personal communication, January 2014).

While not all the advisors expressed the same level of frustration with advisement holds, there was a negative consensus related to the process.

Curriculum and Instruction

One intriguing theme of responsibility for the participant advisors was the topic of curriculum and instruction (Table G5). Themes of curricular processes and instruction presented themselves in the advisor interviews. For curriculum processes, six of the academic advisors mentioned the management of curricular change processes for their college or school as well as the creation of course content for first year success courses and seminar courses. Carol mentioned her unit had specialists who worked on particular tasks, one of which was curriculum processes:

“Well I didn’t mention that we all kind of have some extra specialties too. Like one of the other advisors is our person of 1st year programs. So he’s the orientation representative and the liaison for the 1st year seminar classes and teaching and we have 1 person who works with curriculums so like with new course approval she processes all that and if there’s a new course, reviewing the syllabus, getting all that submitted through the college. I know not a whole lot of advisors do that. I’m sure there are probably at least some in other units” (Carol, personal communication, January 2014).

Kate also described how her college’s professional associations has an impact on her workload and has her involved with curriculum:

“Specifically, because this school has a very strong pre-health focus, there is an expectation that advisors in this school have a really strong understanding of what it takes to go to medical school or dental school or pharmacy school that I don't think is necessarily required of every academic advisor in every department. I know that I work a lot more with the curriculum committee in the nutrition department in particular because of the outside of ASU requirements that are set

by the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics” (Kate, personal communication, January 2014).

It should be noted while six advisors mentioned curriculum work, the majority of these responses indicated this workload was unique to their role and was unlikely to occur in other colleges or schools. While the participants in this study mentioned curricular work more than was perceived, there is not enough evidence to determine if this is a frequent occurrence or if there were simply sampling issues creating a greater correlation than naturally exists.

Nine of the eleven participant advisors mentioned teaching as the sole instructor, team teaching, or training peer advisors to teach courses. A few advisors also mentioned creating curriculum for these courses as well as training student peer advisors to teach these courses to first year students. Dan (personal communication, January 2014) mentions his workload associated with success courses:

“Developing programs for new students; teaching first year success course work.
Developing curriculums for team teaching, for advising, and career development.
Developing curriculum for peer advisors, and success coaching the peer advisors
do” (Dan, personal communication, January 2014).

First-year success courses, introductory level department courses, and seminar courses all were mentioned as part of the advisement duties by the participants. As a point of distinction, it should be noted only one advisor mentioned responsibilities teaching introductory level department courses due to her academic background in the subject area. This participant was also very clear the instruction duties were a special arrangement and her primary responsibilities were to the provision of academic advisement.

Counseling for Personal Issues

As part of the development of rapport and/or in providing good customer service, many advisors noted the necessity to provide personal counseling as part of the process of advisement (Table G6). It should again be mentioned, this section differs from the exploration of life goals and mentorship found in O'Banion's category one, sub-category D. This section related to the provision of counseling-like services to address personal or emotional barriers preventing student success. The advisor participants mentioned this often was found in the form of financial counseling, counseling for roommate issues, discussing parental issues, exploration of sexual orientation, and discussions of other relationships. Personal counseling was mentioned by the advisors 21 times and ranked sixth in the unincorporated category. The most common discussions are typified by Alice (personal communication, January 2014) who discussed how one advising discussion can lead into something more:

“I've sometimes had pseudo counseling conversations with students where they come in because perhaps they are on probation and that leads to a discussion about having to deal with a very serious issue. So you end up – I as an advisor end up having to sort of triage a situation and then refer them out to services such as counseling or just let them – or just sit and listen. Sometimes students need somebody to listen. Even though we're not theoretically talking about academics it's definitely an advising session” (Alice, personal communication, January 2014).

While Alice discussed the need to provide counseling services toward student progression and about probation, she also balances this need with a responsibility to triage the situation and make referrals to professional counseling services at the

institution. Not every advisor was able to make this distinction and establish professional boundaries. As one example, Joe's (personal communication, January 2014) experience is representative of many advisors who discussed the need to be something more than a professional, to be something more akin to a friend:

“To the flip side, where they want me to be their best friend, and we've had long conversations about their future and what they're doing now and their family and their friends and *Lost*, the television show, and then everything in between that. So I was a little bit of an academic advisor, little bit of an emotional counselor... I had to be a little bit more proficient at having those tougher conversations with students. It wasn't just academic in nature" (Joe, personal communication, January 2014).

While findings about emotional counseling were not unexpected, the extent of the service provided and topics covered certainly were unanticipated.

Student Transitions

According to the participants, student transitions are often one of the most difficult times for a student (Table G7). Learning a new climate, adapting to new policies and procedures, adjusting to new expectations, and building new support networks are often difficult tasks the advisors seemed happy to simplify. As part of student transitions, the participants mentioned three primary elements: recruitment activities, post-graduate assistance, and new student orientation programs.

The first programming associated with student transitions, new student orientations, often comes in the form of either transfer or freshman orientations. According to the participants, both orientation types are geared toward providing a foundation of knowledge and acclimation to

university systems in order to ensure student success. Greg's (personal communication, January 2014) comments below typified this assurance of success and further discussed an institutional focus to prepare first time students:

"I have noticed in the recent past few years I would say from 2010 maybe 2008 forward, it's really about advising has shifted to become more about the incoming students, really getting that incoming student off to a solid start instead of just having people filter into their classes and try to correct issues as they go along, there's more of an emphasis on the orientations that happen before students begin selecting their courses. So there's a lot more emphasis on transfer orientation. There's a lot more emphasis on new student orientation. Are these orientations covering the details that students need to be successful on their first day on campus in their coursework? So that seems to be a much larger emphasis than it ever was before" (Greg, personal communication, January 2014).

The second element of transitional advisement came in discussions of post-graduate assistance. Six different advisors mentioned duties requiring them to be proficient in the provision of information on professional certification exams, licensure requirements for the profession associated with the degree, post-graduate internship requirements, requirements of decorum and professionalism in the business world, and discussion of graduate school options outside the institution. Kate (personal communication, January 2014), along with some of the education advisors interviewed, discussed the need to review professional licensure and certification examination requirements with their students. Kate's (personal communication, January 2014) experience is outlined below:

"I work with a program that is highly prescriptive and has to meet the requirements of an outside organization, the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics. And so, I spend a lot of time talking to students about what that organization requires of them because a lot of them don't know, and the requirements are very extensive, very time consuming, and require a lot past just their bachelor's degree" (Kate, personal communication, January 2014)

Several of the advisors who discussed such requirements, also discussed how this element was unique to their role and college.

The final element of student transitions is the process of recruitment. Only six advisors mentioned the process of recruitment. Ivy describes how she incorporated recruitment into her advisement: "So in a sense we've also become mini-recruiters for a new program or a marketing expert in that area. We are knowledgeable enough to know how to market our programs to the students" (Ivy, personal communication, January 2014). The typical recruitment activities mentioned by the participants included community college visits, recruiting change of major students, and general recruitment events at unspecified locations.

Outliers

The final sub-category of the unincorporated topics were grouped as outliers (Table G8). While not significant in their own right to create new sub-categories, they were prominent in the unique nature of the associated duties. The outliers' sub-category is comprised of graduate student advisement, supervision of staff and student workers, management of social media, ensuring scholarship requirements are met, and ensuring international student requirements are met. Providing support to graduate students typically falls outside the range of traditional academic advisement. Only one advisor mentioned duties providing academic advisement and

student support services to graduate students. Two advisors mentioned the act of supervision in their interviews. This included the supervision of other advisors or staff, graduate students, and student workers. One advisor mentioned the need to maintain the college's social media accounts in order to update students on college events and activities. Finally, one advisor mentioned duties associated with the assurance of scholarship and international student requirement fulfillment. These outliers should not be considered commonplace due to their relatively low frequency of mentions, but may warrant further investigation.

Responsibility for Advisement and Campus Partnerships

One interesting topic of exploration was based on question six, which focused on the resources, offices, and personnel whom academic advisors rely upon to meet their advising goals with students. The dominant mentions were faculty related; with eighteen mentions across ten of the eleven advisors (Table 2). The faculty were identified as a resource for students in multiple capacities ranging from career, major and course exploration to fostering involvement opportunities and campus connections. Interestingly, Career Services was mentioned only eight times, by five different advisors. As a center so closely related to the exploration of career goals, it was surprising to find this resource so infrequently mentioned. Formal student support offices including financial aid, admissions, the registrar, and tutoring centers all received between five and eight mentions each. Less formal functions such as peer advisors, peer mentors, and student success coaches were all mentioned twice by the advisors. It was clear that the academic advisors felt positive referrals and established networks with student support centers were crucial to ensuring students met objectives and were successful in degree completion.

School Centric Environment

In questions seven through ten of the interview protocol the focus was shifted from direct questions about the workplace duties to those on the school-centric environment and its impact on advisement. In examination of the central research question through this lens, the academic advisor participants described the impact of critical tracking, standardization of institutional procedures and policies as well as the impact of policies on advisement workloads and appointment structures.

When asked about the impact of the institutional mission and vision, the most frequently mentioned element was the impact on how advisement is conducted. One consistent theme that emerged was discussion over individual school differences in how advising appointments were structured and how the appointments occur. The general attitude by advisors both from the W. P. Carey School of Business and those outside were that W. P. Carey was often overly restrictive in appointment length and in delineating which students could receive advisement services. Most of these discussions occurred over who could declare a W. P. Carey major, the grade point average requirements for entry to the school, and the requirements to meet critical tracking milestones as foundational criteria for meeting with an advisor. Meanwhile, academic advisors in the School of Letters and Sciences and the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences advising centers were more focused on issues of accessibility and openness of advising appointments. These advising units discussed college philosophies that impacted student advisement access by providing extensive walk-in appointments, advising hours outside the normal business hours, and an administrative mandate allowing meetings to last as long as the student needs to meet their goals. Dan's comments below were representative of the advisors' viewpoints of the origins of advising service philosophies:

“I think at ASU the academic advising is very much a top down affair. I think in some other colleges and universities, there may be more of a grass roots sort of advising; where advisors develop a process of academic advising that might be a little bit more individualized or separate than maybe other advisors within their college, but at ASU, because of the nature of the way the curriculums are curricula is created, the nature of the rules on how students change majors, it very much is set at the provost level and so advising techniques are very standardized” (Dan, personal communication, January 2014).

Most of the advisors mentioned these philosophies came from their school’s administration and ultimately from the Provost.

The common feedback from the participants indicated that institutional, or administrative level, mandates were strongly focused on standardization. Seven of the advisors interviewed mentioned a large shift with the implementation of critical tracking, also known as eAdvisor or Major Maps, which were a significant element toward standardization through tracking student progression. Eight of the eleven participants mentioned a second phase of standardization that occurred in the last year. This philosophical shift moved the institution toward greater standardization policies and procedures among the colleges in order to ensure smoother experiences for students. Joe (personal communication, January 2014) describes how he perceives this change:

“I mean, I think that – actually, as I kind of just alluded to, I mean, I think that's being recognized by the school, that each school is its own world. So each of them have different managers that run that department the way they best see fit, and then there's not a great amount of consistency across the board. I mean, I

think it has a huge impact in how we advise. They're working to get a little bit more condensed and consistent training across the campuses and schools here at ASU. They're also developing blackboard classes for those trainings, but also for ongoing updates and advising information, etc. So I think, yes, that certainly does have a big impact in how we advise here and I think that's something that ASU, for better or worse, is trying to fix" (Joe, personal communication, January 2014).

Greg (personal communication, January 2014) provided his viewpoint on how institutional policy has shifted over the last ten years:

"I guess that's a nice thing of having the years of experience that I've had at the same institution so I can see how things have evolved. And I would say prior to Crow, ASU was a bunch of separate different entities within the university umbrella that could have a wide variety of different policies. So you could be advising in one college and they would have a separate policy for XY and Z than another college just across the sidewalk. Since Crow there seems to be a lot more unification in university policy. So college policies are being more integrated with university policy" (Greg, personal communication, January 2014).

These new missions, both critical tracking and the focus on standardization, have come with increased workload for the advisors and with them, different opinions were expressed. While standardization has been perceived as good for establishing a baseline of service, a minority of advisors felt any failure to embrace these standards classified you as "not being progressive" (Emma, personal communication, January 2014). Emma typified this dissent when she described the situation as establishing an environment of student management and control which was negative for student development. Emma was highly negative about critical tracking,

perceiving the system as creating artificial innovation. Emma went even further with her dissent describing a push of responsibility away from faculty and an overall environment that is not conducive to fostering true innovation and discovery. Overall, the negative viewpoints of standardization were overshadowed by positive critiques which reflected Alice's viewpoint that standardization is better for students: "So because they (policies of standardization) have sort of a mission and a purpose and connect back to that bigger vision, I think myself and my advising staff can get on board with it" (Alice, personal communication, January 2014).

In the end, it seems most advisors agree that streamlining student services for success only leads to a more holistic environment of good customer service. Alice (personal communication, January 2014) explains how advising at the institution is focused on opportunity and student success:

"I think in many ways advising at ASU for me feels very different than advising at the other 2 universities. It is very school-centric and very university-centric and I think because ASU is so huge and has so many opportunities and I've said to this to my students. I'm like "this is a great place to go to school because if you can think it you can probably do it here." With the number of colleges we have, the number of degree programs we have there's so much more opportunity here than I ever experienced at the other 2 institutions. So again it even more reiterates that. You have chosen the right brand; Coke over Pepsi every day, good job" (Alice, personal communication, January 2014).

Ivy depicts this customer service centered environment in the context of one of her favorite films:

“I mean, it's kind of like the old – if you ever saw the movie *Miracle on 34th Street*, there was a whole segment in there about the parent and child coming in, meeting with Santa who said, "I really want to get a pair of roller skates for Christmas. Okay?" And then Santa says, "Oh, sure, we can get you that." And the parent's like, "Wait a minute. Are you nuts? I've been all over town, I can't find anything." And he said, "Oh, wait a minute. I know exactly where you need to go. You go here, you're going to get the best fit, the best" – and now you have this one element of holistic selling, holistic advising, same kind of comparison. Now the parent leaves feeling, "Hey, this store really helped me get the best choice," and wouldn't that be nice if ASU could be left with that kind of image. You come here and we're going to try and make sure you're in the right fit, the right field, the right career, and the right courses, so that you can graduate and go out there and be comfortable in your choice of careers” (Ivy, personal communication, January 2014).

In the end, the majority of the advisors agreed the focus for standardization, regardless of the impact to their workload and despite philosophical differences, creates environments for greater levels of student service, more accurate tracking of student progress, and results in higher rates of success.

The findings in this study revealed ample evidence of expanded work duties and responsibilities of advisors to support the process of advisement. The findings did not establish sufficient evidence with which a new theory of advisement would be proposed, nor evidence necessary to alter radically or eliminate any of the five existing categories of the O’Banion Model of Academic Advisement (1972). There is evidence to support edits to the O’Banion Model of Academic Advisement and modernize the content. The study did find significant

findings associated with the unique roles of academic advisors in a school-centric model as well as significant unincorporated themes. The following chapter is focused on a thorough discussion and analysis of these findings as well as recommendations for future research.

CHAPTER 5:

CONCLUSION

Introduction

Throughout the course of this study, the central research questions have sought to explore academic advising in a school-centric environment to determine how the essential functions might be changed by the unique vision and mission of the institution. The primary finding of this research study has concluded there are indeed impacts to academic advising work roles and responsibilities based on the environment. Also, the primary theoretical process (O'Banion, 1972) of academic advisement has a mixed presence. The dimensions that have changed are reflections of the lack of a formal definition, ambiguity over responsibility for the process, and an extensive workload required to conduct the process of advisement. In analyzing the O'Banion Model of Academic Advising theoretical framework, no clear dimensions emerged, nor are any new congruent categories to the framework proposed. The dimensions that have emerged yielded a rich set of topics and sub-categories crucial to the overall effort of academic advisement and student success, but not directly to the process of advisement itself. The sub-categories comprising the unincorporated category identified crucial elements of advisement practice and necessary support structures. These support structures are necessary to ensure overall student success and ensure elements of advisement functions including: the development and dissemination of knowledge, enhancement of advisement efficiency, to conduct proactive or intrusive advising, to develop rapport, to ensure successful transitions, to facilitate referrals, and to maintain records and tracking systems.

Interpretation of Data

In the interpretations of the data it is conclusive the five categories of the O'Banion Model of Academic Advisement (1972) are still all operational in present day advisement processes; however the smaller elements that comprise each dimension of the process provide some exceptions to this finding. The study found the presence of the nineteen of the twenty-six micro-dimensions and all five macro-dimensions present. A total of three-hundred and thirty two mentions from the academic advisor participants reflect the presence of these dimensions (Appendix F). Each of the main categories, or macro-dimensions, of the theory were present in the school-centric advising environment, thus allowing for a confirmation of the overall process. Data found to be incongruent with the finer elements of the theory were discovered in the absence of several micro-dimensions of the theoretical model and in the extensive unincorporated topics.

A significant finding concerning the process of advisement was the absence of eight micro-dimensions, or sub-categories from the O'Banion Model of Academic Advisement (1972). Three of these elements were beliefs, two were knowledge based, and one was a particular skill. The missing skill was the assessment and interpretation of psychological examinations to determine career placement. The absence of this area may be a reflection of a skill set no longer in use by today's advisors or it may just be something the advising participants did not discuss. The missing eight micro-dimensions which were based on a particular set of knowledge or a belief may have been difficult to ascertain without direct interview questions about the topic. The findings of this study are not conclusive whether these missing dimensions did not exist in present day advisement or if they simply were not addressed properly in the question set. The

findings do allude to a greater discussion concerning the applicability of the O'Banion Model of Academic Advisement in a contemporary higher education environment.

In answering the research question if the O'Banion Model of Academic Advising (1972) was still present, there is certainly ample evidence the theory and advisement process model is still present and applicable. In addressing if there are any conflicts with the theory the dominance of unincorporated dimensions, the absence of eight dimensions, and the emergent issues with responsibility for the process all present clear conflicts with the existing theory. Overall, the theory and the primary steps in the process of advisement are still fundamentally sound, however the sub-categories within these primary dimensions need adjustment for a modern age and unique institutional environments.

In the author's own experience as an academic advisor and advising administrator, the most frequently cited job responsibility of an academic advisor is to help students find classes. This perception seems to be the fundamental descriptor for the primary role of an academic advisor by the general public. Interestingly, the findings of this study revealed the most dominant category in the O'Banion Model (1972) was the exploration of course choice; congruent with public expectations of the role. Exploration of course choice was mentioned by all eleven advisors and the majority of the sub-categories were mentioned. In the analysis of the transcripts, it was interesting to note that even the advisors mentioned course choice or the selection of courses as one of the first elements of their responsibilities. When asked to describe her work with students, Alice (personal communication, January 2014) mentions courses within the first two sentences of her statement "Okay, so certainly assistance with understanding degree requirement or requirements for minors or certificates or whatever the program may be. Certainly there's a lot of assistance with course scheduling." While this is a relatively common responsibility, there

does not seem to be any research associated with this element of advisement. A few theories, include the O'Banion Model, reference this responsibility, however the details of how this is conducted, what knowledge is required, what skills are needed, and other elements of this process are not explored in sufficient detail to understand the process fully. The prevalence of course selection and course scheduling is certainly a topic that could be explored in more detail by future research.

The primary elements in need of adjustment from the original O'Banion Model of Academic Advising (1972) are the differentiation of dimensions four and five of the O'Banion Model which separate course choice from course scheduling as well as recognition of informational support in the advisement process. The first three dimensions are distinct and self-encompassing; however course choice and course scheduling are both course based elements. Perhaps there is room to consolidate and condense these two dimensions into a singular fourth dimension inclusive of both dimensions and associated micro-dimensions. Given the change in higher education associated with technology, less of an emphasis may be placed on the actual action of scheduling courses. Additionally, the O'Banion Model could be updated to recognize the importance of providing general information (Table G2). Many advisors cited the need to provide basic institutional information in order to allow the process of advisement to begin. This institutional information included financial aid, campus housing, childcare, campus connections and community building, institutional expectations, campus infrastructure, and both academic and student codes of conduct. Without a base knowledge of these expectations, students may be both unwilling and unable to begin the advisement process.

In addressing the research question of how advisement is conducted in a school-centric environment, it seems the process of advisement is conducted primarily in line with the

O'Banion Model (1972). It should be noted that while the O'Banion Model was clearly present, a greater presence was found in the unincorporated elements outside this framework and some dimensions were absent altogether. These unincorporated dimensions may or may not be part of a future theory concerning the processes of advisement, but at this time they seem to be more closely associated with advisement support activities rather than an element of the academic advisement process itself.

While the O'Banion Model of Academic Advisement (1972) was present in the findings, a greater presence was found in the four-hundred and thirty mentions of advisement topics falling outside this framework. With approximately one-third more mentions than the O'Banion Model, the unincorporated themes were more dominant in the interviews and seemed to take up a greater portion of the daily workload of the academic advisors. It is not this author's opinion that the presence of these themes makes the O'Banion Model dimensions any less important or applicable; however it does lend significant credence to the concept of a school-centric impact on the academic advisement process and its supporting workloads. Additional studies would need to be conducted to determine if these found dimensions are present in other institutional environments in order for a proper comparative analysis to show a clear impact of the school-centric model. At this time, it seems the research question which asks if the environment has an impact to the process of advisement could be answered affirmatively due to the four-hundred and thirty dimensions found outside the O'Banion Model framework.

The most dominant of the unincorporated sub-categories, data and reporting as well as customer service and general information, also lend themselves to interpretation of a school-centric environmental impact. Given the institutional vision and mission which implemented a critical tracking system and a focus on the persistent theme of general student success, there

seems to be an impact of this philosophy which is found in the volume of mentions. These top two sub-categories yielded two-hundred and seventy mentions alone, making them equivalent to 81% of the total mentions of all five combined categories of the O'Banion Model (1972). These elements were the most dominant in the discussions with the participants, elicited the most engaged responses, and seemed to reflect the greatest workload to support the advisement process.

The most direct topic showing an impact of a school-centric environment, outside of critical tracking, was found in the student engagement sub-category. The advising participants mentioned this responsibility thirty-two times during the interviews. These activities included a variety of school-based services that included specialized student organizations, school-based residential communities, specialized events, and specific centers for student support services customized to the college. As Holly (personal communication, January 2014) described these activities as: "introducing the students to the university and the WPC culture." Several advisors described these activities both as being in support of students and as an element in creating a student identity or connection with their college or school. The individual missions and disciplines guide these unique programs and dictate which types of services may be necessary. Joe (personal communication, January 2014), an advisor from the School of Letters and Sciences, described how he needed to do more proactive outreach and create social media based connection points for his population of degree completion and liberal arts students. Kate (personal communication, January 2014), an advisor from the College of Health Solutions, described how her college needed to conduct specialized programming in order to connect students with the certification requirements and internships needed for the profession most associated with the college's degree offerings. Dan and Emma (personal communication,

January 2014) both described their college's, the Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College, engagement activities associated with service learning and educational programming designed to connect students with educational environments at an earlier point in their degree. Finally, both advisors (Felix and Holly, personal communication, January 2014) from the W. P. Carey School of Business described the multitude of specialized centers, career preparation events, camps, courses, residence halls, and engagement personnel dedicated to immersing their students in a business culture focused on professionalism. All of these elements involve the advisors and are designed to build connections with the college as well as provide customized support services to ensure student success within a school-centric environment.

Responsibility for the Advisement Process

The original article by O'Banion (1972) reflected a variety of campus partners who would share in the responsibility for academic advisement: counselors, trained students, and faculty. O'Banion assigned responsibility for the first two dimensions of the process of advisement to counselors, the third and fourth dimensions to faculty advisors, and the final step to well-trained staff or student workers. Further, O'Banion ascribed a series of problems with allowing counselors alone to conduct advisement processes. These risks included counselors spending too much time with the "nitty-gritty details," becoming bogged down with a "flurry of forms and figures," and creating a student perception that counselors were clerical staff. O'Banion indicates that instructors know students better, are experts in curriculum, and know the college better than counselors. He tempers these statements by stating instructors are not experts in exploring life or career goals. Finally, O'Banion assigns the fifth dimension of scheduling to specialty trained student workers or professional staff who could serve as counselor aides.

In 2012, O'Banion issued an update to his 1972 article with the intent of updating the academic advising model for the modern era (O'Banion, 2012). O'Banion's updated work (O'Banion, 2012) cited the need for an increased sharing of responsibility for the process of academic advisement; however he did not update the assignment of responsibilities from the original model of academic advisement (O'Banion, 1972). O'Banion stated:

“Academic advising is too important to assign it to one group. Personnel should be assigned based on the skills, knowledge, and attitudes required for each of the five steps. Students counselors, instructors, and special personnel, including student assistants, community volunteers, and advising specialists, contribute to the process” (O'Banion, 2012, p. 47).

While O'Banion does now recognize the contributions of staff advisors and community volunteers in the revised model (2012), he does not recognize models where professional advisors would conduct all of the five steps. The school-centric and professional advisor dominant model of Arizona State University certainly contradicts the assignment of responsibility. Emma (personal communication, January 2014) summarized the interplay of roles and responsibilities, as well as her beliefs of these roles, by stating:

“what ASU has tried to do is they have tried to use the advisor as the end all for their students obtaining their degree within four years. And it's been put to the advisor to ensure that happens. And I do believe an advisor can help manage that, can absolutely assist with that. However, I also feel it is the responsibility of the instructor/professors, or the people teaching at the university, to also assist in that. And all I see that is going on at ASU, and I'm all for tutoring centers and extra help; I used it myself when I was in school. But, what I see happening is, less and

less it's being put onto the teachers, so they have all these tutoring centers now, so students don't even go in and see their teachers for assistance anymore. So, they don't even get to know who their teachers are. And studies have shown, one of the best forms of student achievement and finishing school, is the relationships they're going to have with their teachers. Not the advisors; the teachers" (Emma, personal communication, January 2014).

It was one of the primary research questions of this study to determine who was responsible for the roles of advisement and to explore further how the model of advisement at the institution differs from the proposed advisement process by O'Banion (1972).

A primary sub-question generated from the original research question inquired about whom was responsible for the process of academic advising in a school-centric environment. The findings of this study are rather mixed on this matter and eluded to a variety of elements of role ambiguity at the institution. Sixty-one mentions were made concerning referrals needed to help achieve the goals of academic advisement (Appendix H). Eleven campus partners were identified in these findings (Appendix H). Despite these referrals, all five of the dimensions of the O'Banion Model (1972) were mentioned by the academic advisors as part of their role (Appendix F). The three primary areas of role ambiguity were focused on counseling, career counseling or career advisement, and curriculum and instruction. This ambiguity correlates to themes found in the research (Frost, 1991; Gordon, 1992; Lowe & Toney, 2000) which attributes the lack of consensus over these functions to a lack of research on advisement and low quality training of advisement personnel. It is clear there are various services that could potentially find inclusion within the process of academic advisement. It is unclear if there is a professional standard, an unwritten policy, a threshold of depth, or a level of difficulty used by the advisors to

determine when such referrals are needed. Another concern may be an element of role confusion or lack of clarity about the functions of an academic advisor in the school centric model.

One example of role ambiguity came in the form of counseling in two different themes. The topic of counseling presented itself both in the exploration of life goals within the O'Banion Model of Academic Advising (1972) as well as in the unincorporated themes in the form of emotional or personal counseling. Many advisors mentioned that both forms of counseling were components of rapport, part of removing barriers to success, attempts to help, attempts at providing guidance, or as part of good customer service. Ten of the eleven advisors mentioned counseling in the context of exploring life goals; eight advisors mentioned responsibilities of conducting personal counseling as an unincorporated dimension, yet only two advisors mentioned referrals to the institutional Counseling and Consultation offices. Greg (personal communication, January 2014) mentioned his role as a counselor by stating: "I guess it leans a little more toward counseling than it ever did before. I don't think you necessarily have to be a counselor to do this job." Greg felt the job is leaning into the realm of professional counseling and that he does not need to have counseling as a background in order to conduct this service. Greg was correct in his statement that he does not need a counseling background, and the institutional job description for an Academic Success Specialist also confirms there is no required qualification for counseling experience (OHR Department Job Title Description, 2009). The official job description lists the qualifications as needing a bachelor's degree in counseling or equivalent in order to meet the minimum requirements for the position. The institutional policy manual of academic affairs for academic advisement specifically stipulates that academic advisors should refer students with personal problems to specialized services at the institution for assistance (Academic Affairs Manual, 2013). As the institution does not offer a bachelor's

degree in counseling, the only degrees are at the master's or doctoral level. It remains unclear exactly how counseling skills should be acquired to meet qualifications or for integration into the role.

The differentiation utilized in this study categorized counseling as either for guidance or as a therapeutic purpose this was generated from the definitions provided by Wilson (2010). Wilson outlines how present day counseling as guidance has evolved from the original definition of counseling that describes the act as a process of helping or guiding. He argued that while it may be intuitive for student affairs professionals, including academic advisors, to desire to provide help or guidance, there should be strict limitations and differentiations between guidance and therapy. Therapeutic counselors are extensively trained, credentialed, insured, regulated, and licensed and can provide a wide range of services, while student affairs professional may have little to no training and limited legal protections. There is also concern that by attempting to counsel a student without proper education, credentialing, or insurance may lead to additional student harm or potential institutional legal liability. Wilson encourages student affairs professionals and academic advisors to acquire additional counseling skill to aid in the advisement process; however Wilson warns that they must be extremely aware of their limitations.

The second area of role ambiguity lies in differentiating between career counseling and the related area of career advising. Career counseling is defined as the breadth of activities associated with career exploration including the span of work, family, and leisure (Gore & Metz, 2008). Career counseling includes psychological and vocational assessments, job search, job placement, and career preparation activities (Gore & Metz, 2008; Zunker, 2002). Career advising is the process of connecting academic programs to career paths, without the use of

assessments (Gordon, 2006; Gore & Metz, 2008). The element of ambiguity was summarized succinctly by Emma (personal communication, January 2014) who indicated "I find myself being more of a counselor; career advisor, and I'm sure other advisors do this as well." In addition to Emma, nine additional advisors discussed career exploration duties with either career advising or career counseling as a descriptor, while only five advisors mentioned making referrals to career services for career counseling services (Table G6). Interestingly, the use of career tests or psychological assessments for career exploration in the O'Banion Model (1972) was completely unmentioned by the advising participants. It was a highly unexpected finding to have a low number of referrals to career counseling and to have the category mentioned second to last by the advisors. The prominence of career exploration in O'Banion's Model and the author's own experiences generated an expectation that this dimension would have been more prominent. These findings confirm an element of role ambiguity in career counseling and career advising. Professional guidelines for the delineation of services among the academic advising community at the institution and potentially across the profession at other institutions are needed. In addition, more research is needed into these roles and the prevalence of these dimensions in other institutional environments.

The third and final area of role ambiguity lies in the extent of mentions associated with curriculum and instruction. Six advisors mentioned involvement in the curriculum process and nine mentioned duties in instruction (Table G5). The nine advisors who mentioned instruction duties described coursework as first year success courses, seminar courses, and departmental introductory coursework. The advisors who mentioned the curriculum process described involvement with curriculum committees, faculty collaborations, documentation drafting and processing, and implementation of curricular change. Extensive research has been conducted

over the use of both professional and faculty academic advisors (Frost, 1991 & 1994; Gilroy, 2003; Grites, 1979; King, 1993; Kramer, 2003; Gordon, 1992 & 1994; Lowe & Toney, 2000). As this is a widely debated topic in the study of academic advisement, it seems unusual there would be overlap with the academic advisors interviewed and traditional faculty roles of curriculum development and instruction. While it seems applicable for an academic advisor to teach a first year success course, the instruction responsibilities were not limited to these courses. Additional courses were taught by participants including seminars and departmental introductory coursework as part of academic advisement responsibilities. Furthermore, the process of curricular development was completely unexpected as it does not relate back to the process of academic advisement. There is not a clear purpose why an advisor would be involved in any dimensions of curricular development, as this has historically been a faculty role. As these elements were not mentioned in greater detail, and without additional evidence, it is uncertain if these processes are unique to a school-centric environment or if a new component of the profession has emerged.

As the role of faculty is well-defined and long-standing, engagement with this role by academic advisors could produce unintended consequences. Faculty are accustomed to being the sole provider of both instruction and research, as well as being a dominant part of institutional governance (Tierney, 2008). Some elements of institutional governance have started to shift (Tierney, 2008) toward more shared institutional governance provided by a combination of constituents including boards of trustees, non-faculty administrators, student governance, and faculty. This area presents an additional element for future discussion and an opportunity for research.

Associated with curriculum and instruction is the philosophical concept of academic advising as teaching. Prior research (Appleby, 2001a; Appleby, 2001b; Crookston, 1972; Lowenstein, 2005) has made links from developmental advising to the concept of academic advising as teaching. As with other forms of teaching, the academic advising as teaching concept utilizes teaching curriculum, interpretation and making meaning of the curriculum, listening, challenging, and reflecting back to the student in order to help them develop (Lowenstein, 2005). Appleby (2001b) wrote that academic advising can be considered the same as teaching, with navigation of undergraduate programs and environments as the topic of study. Appleby (2001b) indicates that advising can qualify as a scholarly activity as it requires discipline-specific knowledge, can be replicated, can be documented, is subject to peer-review, and has an impact. Appleby (2001b) even suggests that advisors think of themselves as teachers, advisees as students, offices as classrooms, and student development as learning outcomes. Appleby (2001b) is also clear to point out that not all advisors are scholars and not all advising is considered a scholarly activity. Overall, the topic of advising as teaching is a popular one among the advising community; the philosophy has even spawned the concept of the academic advising syllabus which outlines student and advisor responsibilities, learning objectives and outcomes, and a timeline of goals (Lowenstein, 2005). Given faculty culture and the rigors to obtain faculty positions, the author would strongly suggest any additional research in this area have a high level of sensitivity to avoid language which could be perceived as a softening of the boundaries between professional advising and faculty roles.

The School Centric Environment

Kurt Lewin (1947) indicated behavior is a function of a group of persons and the environment. Given the particular vision and mission of the Arizona State University

environment, it is clear these elements had a significant impact on the workloads and processes of advisement. The change in environment brought a visible impact to the nature of college programming through which to encourage more school-centered events and activities. There was also a noticeable trend toward standardization of policies, procedures, and appointment structures across the institution to create a consistent level of service for students.

In changing the mission of advisement and the names of advisors to Academic Success Specialists, a greater attention to success tracking and customer service has been created. As confirmation of these changes, job descriptions for academic advisors now focus on general student success, high levels of customer service, and mandatory tracking of student progress (Fowle, 2008). These changes have resulted in an intense focus on customer service and student success – terms that often are vague and ill-defined. This change has also brought with it the most discussed elements of advisement and the heaviest perceived workloads which were associated with critical tracking, student success, and customer service.

Technology yielded the most significant impact and has contradictory implications for advisement processes. Technology has changed the nature of advising by simplifying the course search and registration process, providing self-tracking tools, and ensuring rapid communication. This simplification of systems allows the advisors more time to discuss life, career, and program goals. From the alternative perspective, technology requirements have constrained student course choice by requiring specific course sequences, pre-coded into the tracking system, and by mandating specific milestones be achieved to determine student progression. Technology has added supplementary records to maintain, burdened advisors with extensive system-based workloads, and has created a perceived dependence on quick answers instead of in-depth goal exploration.

Finally, a focus on school-centered offices, resources, and programming is present throughout the environment. Colleges and schools have created custom support services, specialized events for the specific population, changes to curriculum, and an increased use of first year success courses for specific colleges. All of these activities are geared toward building rapport with students, creating a sense of a smaller community, and developing a unique experience within the college or school.

Unanticipated Findings

A series of unanticipated findings occurred which contrasted with the expectations of the author. The author expected to find all of the O'Banion Model's (1972) dimensions, a large number of mentions of critical tracking, and a significant number of responses concerning retention, new student orientations, and recruitment activities.

An unexpected finding of this study was the absence of eight sub-categories from the O'Banion Model of Academic Advising (1972) and seven sub-categories that yielded less than ten mentions. In the resulting transcription analysis, coding, and theme generation, zero mentions were made by any of the participants of the following sub-categories: 1. B. Knowledge of psychology and sociology, 1. F. Belief in the worth and dignity of all, 1. G. Belief that all have potential, 2. B. Skill in interpretation of assessment tests, 2. D. Acceptance of all fields of work as worthwhile and dignified, 3. E. Knowledge of success rate of those who have completed the program, and 4. D. Knowledge of honors or developmental courses. An additional seven sub-categories were mentioned less than ten times. These less frequently mentioned dimensions also contained a significant number of knowledge and beliefs that may have been difficult to capture. It is not clear if the question set utilized did not properly elicit responses to these

dimensions, if they did not exist in the environment, or if they are simply difficult to elicit as knowledge and belief systems can be difficult to capture in interviews.

The creation of eAdvisor, or critical tracking, generated a great deal of workload for advisors. As a result, the author expected a high number of mentions about tracking and reporting associated with these systems. The unexpected element was the overwhelming significance of this dimension in the overall mentions of advisors. With one-hundred and fifty-nine mentions, this sub-category was higher than any other dimension by forty-eight mentions. Critical tracking was mentioned by every advisor interviewed an average of 7.09 times each. As a unique system with an immense workload, more research into how this system impacts the process of advisement and the workload of advisors is strongly recommended.

Based on the author's experience as an advisor, two elements that received less attention than expected were recruitment activities and new student orientations. New student orientations, both freshman and transfer, comprise a significant workload for the advising community, often comprising a significant part of spring terms and nearly dominating the entirety of summer terms. Due to the length of time needed to participate in both orientations and recruitment, often requiring a commitment of the entire day, it was surprising these elements were not mentioned more frequently.

Synthesis of Findings

The most important findings in this study were the dual realities confirming most of the O'Banion (1972) dimensions, and the absence of eight dimensions from contemporary advisement. Additionally, the impact of the school-centric environment upon advisement and

advising processes as well as the dominance of advisement roles and processes unincorporated with the existing theoretical framework.

The theoretical framework of the O'Banion Model of Academic Advising (1972) was confirmed on the macro scale and partially confirmed on the micro scale. All five macro-dimensions in the steps of the advisement process were confirmed by the study, adding validity to the O'Banion Model. Reducing validity was the presence of only eighteen of the twenty-six micro-dimensions, or only 69% of the total theory dimensions were found to be present in this study.

There is a need to recognize the twenty-three themes within the unincorporated category as they present a significant workload to support, sustain, guide, and deliver academic advising services. It was expected to find a prevalence of the O'Banion Model (1972) in present day academic advisement due to the dominance of the theory and the frequency of its use in advisor training and development. It was not unexpected to find these work elements as the nature of the environment has shifted dramatically since 1972 when the O'Banion Model was written. The advent of computer tracking systems, the creation of customizable reports and analytic systems, and the growth of professional academic advisors all have an impact on the environment. The O'Banion Model makes assumptions that support staff or student workers would conduct many clerical elements, counselors or instructors would share some of the workload, and student peer advisors would be used for additional elements of the process. As the O'Banion Model does not explicitly discuss any additional work duties associated with the advisement process, it is important to explore these roles and responsibilities further in future research.

A finding which was not coded or categorized in this study, yet has had a significant impact on the field of academic advising, is the prevalence of technology in the process of academic

advisement. Today's modern technology allows students to take and receive interpretation of career tests that take into account life goals, provides tools for comparing and contrasting degree options, allows the exploration of online catalogs which contain detail course information about class offerings, demonstrates the proper sequencing of courses for degree programs, provides comparisons of similar courses for recommendation, allows an exploration of prior student experiences including ratings of professors and their teaching styles, provides directory information, connects students to involvement activities, and allows for demonstrations of how to utilize online scheduling systems. While not directly addressed in this study, the change in advisement and the associated processes has been impacted by technology. In his updated article, O'Banion (2012) fails to address this change and the importance technology will play on the future of the academic advisement process.

The impact of the school-centric environment, including the vision and mission of the institution, was felt by all participants. An increased workload associated with maintaining student records, articulating policies of tracking systems and their impact on declaring or changing majors, navigating critical tracking systems and policies, and in the generation of reports was found. Significant focus was placed on recent policy shifts which placed increased focus on the standardization on policies and procedures across campus. An impact on the nature and structure of appointments was articulated. An increased workload and expectations was observed in the assurance of a good experience, in general success, and in providing a high level of customer service. A positive note concerning the standardization of policies and procedures was also present. Additional workloads to provide school-centric events, activities, services, and coursework were observed. Neutral impacts of the school-centric model have been observed through adding significant workloads to academic advisors in monitoring and maintaining the

system and workloads were conversely reduced through the simplification and standardization of procedures, policies, and appointments structures. Additionally, a contradictory element is the creation of standardized elements to ensure a common experience while encouraging individual colleges to create their own unique school identity.

Academic advising has grown from a long history of faculty advisement, out of the need for introspective and sensitive counselors, and out of necessity or strategic structure for professional advisors. Boundaries between these similar professions, with similar goals, and alterations to individual roles could easily lead to blurred boundaries between professions. This reality should not however detract from the need to provide the highest quality of assistance and to ensure the most skilled personnel are providing that service. According to Self (2008; p. 270) “Professional advisors should use their referral skills in getting students to appropriate resources when the need is beyond the scope of the academic advising role or beyond the skills of the specific academic advisor.” The findings of this study only further build on this knowledge base and reaffirm the need for proper training and definitions of responsibility. King (1993), Kramer (2003), and O’Banion (2012) all recommend the process of academic advisement be a shared model of responsibility utilizing the best trained combination of advisors regardless whether they are staff, counselors, or faculty. The author also recommends a campus-wide effort to define roles and responsibilities, establish clear protocols, and conduct adequate training to ensure the proper services are being provided by the most appropriate personnel to promote student success.

Trustworthiness

As a standard analysis of the trustworthiness of the data, four tests were administered to determine: construct validity, internal validity, external validity, and reliability (Yin, 2009).

Construct validity was addressed through only one of three potential methods, resulting in a low construct validity. Construct validity was only addressed by establishing a clear chain of evidence. A review by key informants and the use of multiple sources of evidence were not used. For internal validity, all four tactics were employed in order to establish a high internal validity: pattern matching, explanation building, analysis and address of rival explanations, and the use of logic models. External validity was established by utilizing theory in the research design. It is strongly recommended that additional cases be studied in order to increase the potential generalizability. Finally, reliability was addressed by utilizing both a case study protocol and a case study database. These elements were utilized in order to assist future researchers in the replication of the study.

Limitations

The most significant limitations of this study are found directly in the research methodology utilized. The choice of a case study automatically limits the findings to the singular bound system in which the research was conducted, and some analysis to the broad theory on which the study was based (Yin, 2009). Yin indicates, as the study cannot be duplicated in its entirety, there is a lack of ability to see similarities between cases in which to support the theories generated. While the case may not be replicated exactly and generalizability is limited, the set of results found through analytic generalization allows the research conclusions to be generalized to broader theories. The single case design utilized for this study has a significantly weaker effect than if a multi-case design was utilized (Yin, 2009). The selection of the case itself may be open to selection bias as the researcher possessed a working knowledge of the case and could have collected evidence to support pre-existing beliefs or agendas (Yin,

2009). Additionally, the choice of an interview brings additional weakness to the design which includes the potential bias for question structures and wording, response bias, participant selection, incomplete or inaccurate recall from participants, and issues of reflexivity.

The selection of participants has the potential for additional bias. Bias could occur in the selection of participants by choosing only the best candidates or only those whose responses matched the desired outcomes of the researcher (Yin, 2009). As the researcher has a prior professional history at the institution, the potential for a volunteer bias on the basis of past relationships may have occurred. As representatives of the various schools at the institution, only five of the twelve undergraduate degree granting colleges were represented in the study. Through a lack of representation, bias may exist based on the specific schools represented or absent from the study.

In order to address participant bias, efforts were taken to utilize all volunteer participants, and to interview the participants in the order they volunteered. Two participants who volunteered were unable to be interviewed for the study due to scheduling issues. As the requisite ten participants had been met, the researcher stayed with the initial eleven individuals. As each participant was interviewed and a balanced representation was found, the proposed specialized selection process to balance the number of participants from particular units was not utilized.

Additional bias may exist in how the questions were structured. A focus on the processes in advisement may have led toward more responses concerning the functions and duties of advisement and could have shifted the focus away from other elements. One such example was the concern that many of the missing dimensions O'Banion Model (1972) which were focused on knowledge, beliefs, or specific skills may have been absent from the interviews based on the nature and structure of the questions.

Generalizability

As previously discussed, the generalization of single case study through the use of interviews is extremely limited. As Yin (2009) indicates, the process of analytic generalization still allows applicability to broader theories, such as the O'Banion Model of Academic Advisement (1972). In order for the conclusions of this study to have increased validity and generalizability, additional studies in other environments would need to be conducted to validate or refute the findings. As the profession of academic advising varies widely in model, structure, institutional type, and in personnel responsible, the immediate generalizability is limited. Despite its limitations, the study may inform others and encourage additional research through which to add greater reliability and generalizability of the findings.

Conclusions

Implications of Policy and Practice

The implications for the policy and practice of advisement involves the existing models of advising processes, the missing elements of those processes, role ambiguity of advisors, and the impact of institutional vision and mission on the operations and processes of advisement.

The O'Banion Model of Academic Advisement (1972) remains a strong theory for which advisement processes may be based. Eighteen of the twenty-six micro-dimensions and all five macro-dimensions for the process of advisement were confirmed through this study. While most were confirmed, the O'Banion model also requires significant updating to address missing elements from the theoretical framework. The O'Banion model also needs revisions in order to address a lack of recognition for the unincorporated dimensions that create dramatic workloads for the support and enhancement of advisement processes. Finally, both editions of the model

(O'Banion, 1972 and 2012) need updates to address the continuing impact of technology upon the process of academic advisement, which were entirely absent from the original and updated works.

The impact of role ambiguity can have a detrimental impact to the profession of advisement and to the students receiving advisement. Conflicts with career counselors, faculty, and therapeutic counselors may weaken the positive impact professional advisors have made upon the profession. Confusion over roles may lead to increased student issues and confusion, role disputes, expectations on advisors capacities, and increased workloads for advisors. Additional research into the profession of advisement, campus collaborative efforts to define and distinguish roles and procedures, and increased training for each impacted population to ensure proper referrals and support services are recommended.

Recommendations for Future Research

Future research should be focused on the primary themes uncovered by this study: the applicability of the O'Banion Model of Academic Advisement (1972), the prevalence of unincorporated dimensions of advisement on advisor workload, advisor role ambiguity and responsibility for the processes of academic advisement, school-centric vision and mission impacts upon student services roles. Multiple topics were also uncovered throughout the study which could use additional exploration, such as the impact of technology upon academic advisement processes, the impact of data and reporting on advising effectiveness, the nature of curriculum involvement by advisors, and advisors as agents of customer service to ensure both student success and a good college experience.

Time is an additional factor that requires additional exploration as academic advisement is a cyclical process with ebbs and flows of demand throughout different times of the calendar year.

The time of year this study was conducted, early spring, has the potential to impact the nature of the responses provided. At the institution of study, this timeline would err more upon general information, enrollment, triage, and critical tracking. The same study conducted at the end of the spring term or in the summer would likely yield greater results with new student orientation and withdrawals. The fall term may have included more concerning student recruitment, student involvement, first year success programming, and other campus events to welcome new students. A recommendation to conduct additional research across different time frames in the academic calendar is encouraged.

Applicability of the O'Banion Model in Modern Advisement

The O'Banion Model of Academic Advisement (1972) as a whole still remains a consistent and effective process for advisement; however the model requires updating to accommodate the change in higher education since its initial creation. Future research should focus on the absence of eight of the micro-dimensions in the O'Banion Model of Academic Advisement's framework. Research should focus on all elements of the theory and explore the presence of all dimensions in different institutional structures, with different missions and visions, and among a variety of advisement models. Additional focus should be placed on the eight sub-categories of advising topics that were not part of the theory's framework. At twenty-three themes, these dimensions of the unincorporated category have the potential to be a wealth of future research opportunities with which to define the roles, responsibilities, and processes of academic advisement better.

Distinctions between Professions

Since the 1970s, the largest growth of university employees has been seen in non-faculty professional roles (Rhoades, 2007). In the period of 1975 to 1985, the growth of administrative

level positions has grown at three times the rate of the faculty and support personnel have grown at three times the rate of administrative level positions (Rhoades, 2007). Higher education literature has not remained current with this development, including the growth of professional academic advising roles (Rhoades, 2007). It is no wonder academic advisement finds conflicts in defining the role, function, and areas of responsibility among other institutional personnel.

The three distinct areas of role conflicts found in this study were between academic advisors and career counselors, guidance counseling and therapeutic counselors, and academic advisors teaching and faculty. As discussed in prior sections, the distinction between career counseling and career advising can be a fine line that is easily crossed. This boundary is often philosophical in nature and presents limited risk for either profession or the student. The distinction between guidance counseling and therapeutic counseling should be more pronounced and is likely a combination of a lack of training and a pervasive desire to provide student assistance in any form. Counseling is certainly the most dangerous area for role confusion, as neglecting to refer someone properly to licensed and well-trained counseling personnel could have implications ranging from unaddressed emotional difficulties to those which may be life-threatening notwithstanding legal liability. The final element is confusion over the role of instruction and curriculum development. The role confusion over advisors and faculty perhaps has the potential to be the most detrimental to the organizational structure of higher education as instruction, research, and governance by faculty are at the core of higher education. Interestingly, a recent national survey (The 2010 National Student Satisfaction and Priorities Report, 2010) added additional confusion to this situation when it cited academic advising as receiving a higher rating than instructional effectiveness as the most important aspect of the student experience. This rating (The 2010 National..., 2010) should be used for additional context when investing the

differentiation of the two roles in future research. The role conflicts and ambiguity found in all three of these areas directly correlate to themes found in research (Frost, 1991; Gordon, 1992; Lowe & Toney, 2000) which attributes the lack of consensus over these functions to a lack of research on advisement and low quality training of advisement personnel. Exploration of each of these themes warrants additional research to clarify and define the roles.

School-Centric Impacts

Finally, future research should investigate further the impact of institutional vision and mission, specifically the impact of the school-centric model on student and academic affairs roles. Little is known about this model and the effectiveness of its associated structures upon the institution. More exploration is needed into how the school-centric environment might impact other service professions, other aspects of the student experience, and other dimensions of the institution. Exploration into the new efforts to standardize the student experience is also needed. Greg described his perceptions of this change:

“So things seem to be moving toward a more seamless and more encompassing experience for a student navigating the university. When I was an undergraduate they used to tell us that half of your college experience is learning how to deal with the bureaucracy much less getting through your courses and whatnot. It seems to be that ASU is taking steps to tame that so you can focus more on your studies and less on the bureaucracy” (Greg, personal communication, January 2014).

And it seems as if these steps are also in place to ensure academic advising processes can focus more on the items that matter most to the student and utilizes technology to take the load off career exploration, scheduling, course choice. The institution is providing other resources such

as success coaches, career counselors, and learning support to help ensure students have the right support mechanisms to help them navigate the curriculum and their goals. All of these elements merit additional study to determine their impact upon the student experience, institutional goals, and associated professions.

Finally, additional research is needed concerning the impact of critical tracking systems across the institution. Research should be done on retention and graduation rates and how academic advising satisfaction. Attention should be paid to the impact of critical tracking on referral services including financial aid, tutoring, counseling and consultation, registrar, and bursar student support services.

Closing Statement

This study sought to expand the knowledge of the profession of academic advisement and in the process, may have generated more questions than answers. Mixed findings regarding the applicability of the O'Banion Model of Academic Advisement (1972) and unincorporated workloads all require more research before any alterations to the central theory can be made. Disconnects between different professions and the individual processes of advisement are clearly present. Given the complexity of higher education and of the process of academic advisement, it seems illogical to assign all of the processes of academic advisement to a singular group of personnel. As O'Banion (2012) described, responsibility for the process should be assigned to a shared group of individuals each possessing specialized knowledge and skills. As George Kuh said "It is hard to imagine any academic support function that is more important to student success and institutional productivity than advising" (Kuh, 1997). It is with this importance in mind the profession of academic advising should continue to receive attention in

higher education research and hold a place of prominence alongside faculty in institutional priorities and strategic planning.

REFERENCES

- Abelman, R., Atkin, D., Dalessandro, A., Snyder-Suhy, S., & Janstova, P. (2007a). The trickle-down effect of institutional vision: vision statements and academic advising. *NACADA Journal*, 27 (1), 4-21.
- Abelman, R., Dalessandro, A., Snyder-Suhy, S., Janstova, P., & Pettey, G. (2007b). Charting the verbiage of institutional vision: implications for academic advising. *NACADA Journal*, 27 (1), pp. 22-38.
- Abelman, R. and Molina, A.D. (2006). Institutional vision and academic advising. *NACADA Journal* 26(2), pp. 5-12.
- About Michael Crow (2011). Retrieved on August 14, 2011 from <http://president.asu.edu/about/michaelcrow>.
- Academic Affairs Manual (2013). ACD 305-08: Academic Advisement. Retrieved on May 25, 2013 from <http://www.asu.edu/aad/manuals/acd/acd305-08.html>.
- Adams, A. C., Larson, J. M., & Barkemeyer, J. P. (2013). Academic advising as a profession: How advisors in Utah view the occupation. Retrieved on December 21, 2013 from <http://dus.psu.edu/mentor/2013/05/academic-advising-profession-utah/>.
- Appleby, D. (2001a). The teaching-advising connection: Part 3. *The Mentor*. Retrieved on March 2, 2014 from <http://dus.psu.edu/mentor/old/articles/appleby3.htm>.
- Appleby, D. (2001b). The teaching-advising connection: Part 5. *The Mentor*. Retrieved on March 2, 2014 from <http://dus.psu.edu/mentor/old/articles/appleby5.htm>.
- Auerbach, C. F. & Silverstein, L. B. (2003). *Qualitative data: An introduction to coding and analysis*. New York, NY: New York University Press.
- Barnes-Gregory, G. (2006). *Academic advising: Beyond course selection*. Saarbrucken, Germany: LAP LAMBERT Academic Publishing AG & Co. KG.
- Berg, B. L. (2007). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences*. Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Borgard, J. H. (1981). Toward a Pragmatic Philosophy of Academic Advising. *NACADA Journal*, 1(1), pp. 1-6.
- Burton, J. & Wellington, K. (1998). The O'Banion Model of Academic Advising: An Integrative Approach. *NACADA Journal* 18 (2), pp. 13-20.

- Creswell, J. W. (1994). *Research design: qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Inc.
- Crookston, B. B. (1972). A developmental view of academic advising as teaching. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 13, pp. 12-17.
- Crow, M. M. (2004). *Building a Comprehensive Metropolitan Research University*. Retrieved on August 14, 2011 from http://president.asu.edu/sites/default/files/2004_0127Acadassemb.pdf.
- Denzin, N. K. & Lincoln, Y. S. (2005). *The Sage handbook of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Inc.
- Fowle, Z. (2008). Advisers now Academic Success Specialists: New name reflects added responsibilities, comes with unfortunate acronym. *State Press*. Retrieved on September 16, 2008 from <http://www.statepress.com/archive/node/928>.
- Frost, S. H. (1991). *Academic advising for student success: A system of shared responsibility*. Washington D.C.: Association for the Study of Higher Education and the ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education.
- Frost, S. (1994). Advising alliances: Sharing responsibility for student success. *NACADA Journal*, 14 (2), 54–58.
- Gilroy, M. (2003). Academic advising: The critical difference; benefits and experts are largely unsung. *The Hispanic Outlook in Higher Education*, 13, 22.
- Gordon, V. N. (1992). *Handbook of academic advising*. Connecticut: Greenwood Press.
- Gordon, V. N. (1994). *Academic advising an annotated bibliography*. Connecticut: Greenwood Press.
- Gordon, V. N. (2004). The evolution of academic advising: One institution's historic path. *NACADA Journal*, 7 (1), 27-39.
- Gordon, V. N. (2006). *Career advising: An academic advisor's guide*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Gordon, V. N.; Habley, W. R.; Grites, T. J. (2008). *Academic advising: A comprehensive handbook*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Gore, P. A. & Metz, A. J. (2008). Advising for career and life planning. In Gordon, V. N.; Habley, W. R.; Grites, T. J., *Academic advising: A comprehensive handbook* (p.3-16). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

- Grites, T. J. (1979). Academic Advising: Getting Us Through the Eighties, AAHE-ERIC/Higher Education Research Report (Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1979), p. 1.
- Habley, W. R. (2004). Advisor load. Retrieved May 1, 2010 from <http://www.nacada.ksu.edu/Clearinghouse/AdvisingIssues/advisorload.htm>
- Habley, W. R. (2004). The status of academic advising: Findings from the ACT Sixth National Survey. (NACADA Monograph Series, no. 10) Manhattan, KS: National Academic Advising Association.
- Hagen, P. L. & Jordan, P. (2008). Theoretical foundations of academic advising. In Gordon, V. N.; Habley, W. R.; Grites, T. J., Academic advising: A comprehensive handbook (p.3-16). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- King, M. C. (1993). Academic advising: Organizing and delivering services for student success. New Directions for Community Colleges, No. 82. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kramer, G. L. (2003). Faculty advising examined: Enhancing the potential of college faculty as advisors. Anker Publishing Company, Inc, Bolton, MA.
- Kruger, R. A. & Casey, M. A. (2009). Focus groups: A practical guide for applied research. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Inc.
- Kuh, G. (1997). The student learning agenda: Implications for academic advisors. *NACADA Journal*, 17 (2), 7-12.
- Kuhn, T. L. (2008). Historical foundations of Academic Advising. In Gordon, V. N.; Habley, W. R.; Grites, T. J., Academic advising: A comprehensive handbook (p.3-16). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Lewin, K. (1997). Resolving social conflicts; and, Field theory in social science. American Psychological Association, Washington, DC.
- Light, R. J. (2001). Making the most of college: students speak their minds. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Lowe, A. & Toney, M. (2000). Academic advising: Views of the givers and takers. *Junior College Student Retention*, 2(2), 92-108.
- Lowenstein, M. (2005). If advising is teaching, what do advisors teach? *NACADA Journal*, 25(2), 65-73.
- Marshall, C. & Rossman, G. B. (1989). Designing qualitative research. Newbury Park, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

- McLaren, J. (2004). The Changing Face of Undergraduate Academic Advising. *Guidance & Counseling*, 19(4), 173-175.
- Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative Research: A guide to design and implementation*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Miles, M. B. & Huberman, A. M. (1984). *Analyzing qualitative data: A source book for new methods*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publishing Inc.
- NACADA. (2005). NACADA statement of core values of academic advising. Retrieved August 2, 2011 from <http://www.nacada.ksu.edu/Clearinghouse/AdvisingIssues/Core-Values.htm>
- NACADA. (2003). Paper presented to the *Task force on defining academic advising*. Retrieved May 1, 2010 from http://www.nacada.ksu.edu/Clearinghouse/Research_Related/definitions.htm.
- Noel, & Levitz, R. (1989). *Managing retention through early intervention*. Iowa: Noel Levitz Centers for Institutional Effectiveness and Innovation, Inc.
- O'Banion, T. (1972). An academic advising model. *Junior College Journal*, 42 (6), 62-69.
- O'Banion, T. (2012). Updating the traditional academic advising model for the 21st century. *Community College Journal*, October/November, 42-47.
- OHR Department Job Title Description (2009). Retrieved December 2, 2009 from <http://jobtitledescriptions.asu.edu/>.
- One University in Many Places: Transitional Design to Twenty-First Century Excellence (2004). Retrieved on August 2, 2011 from <http://www.asu.edu/president/udt/UDTwhitepaper.pdf>.
- Rankey, R. (1994). Reflections in a rearview mirror – Revisiting the O'Banion Model. *NACADA Journal*, 14(2), 39-42.
- Reinarz, A. G. & White, E. R. (1995). *Teaching thorough academic advising: A faculty perspective*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Rhoades, G. (2007). The study of the academic profession. In Gumport, P. J., *Sociology of higher education: Contributions and their contexts*, p. 128-129. Baltimore, MD, The John Hopkins University Press.
- Rooney, M. (1994). Back to the future: Crookston and O'Banion revisited. *NACADA Journal*, 14(2), 35-38.

- Saldaña, J. (2009). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Inc.
- Seidman, I. (2006). *Interviewing as qualitative research: a guide for researchers in education and the social sciences*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Self, C. (2008). Advising delivery: Professional advisors, counselors, and other staff. In Gordon, V. N., Habley, W. R., & Grites, T. J. (2008). *Academic advising: A comprehensive handbook*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Schein, H. K. (1994). From the Editor, *NACADA Journal*, 14(2), 4.
- Schulenberg, J. K. & Lindhorst, M. J. (2008). Advising is advising: toward defining the practice and scholarship of academic advising. *NACADA Journal*, 28 (1), 43-53.
- Shaffer, L. S., Zalewski, J. M., & Leveille, J. (2010). The professionalization of academic advising: Where are we in 2010? *NACADA Journal*, 30 (1), 66-77.
- Smith, C. L. & Allen, J. M. (2006). Essential functions of academic advising: what students want and get. *NACADA Journal*, 26 (1), 56-66.
- Spokane, A. R. (1994). The agile academic advisor. *NACADA Journal*, 14 (2), 68-70.
- Stake, R. E. (2005). Qualitative case studies. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed.) (pp.443-466). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Inc.
- The 2010 National Student Satisfaction and Priorities Report (2010). Noel-Levitz, Inc. Retrieved on March 1, 2014 from <https://www.noellevitz.com/papers-research-higher-education/2010/2010-national-student-satisfaction-and-priorities-report>.
- Thelin, John, R. (2004). *A History of American Higher Education*. Baltimore, MD: The John Hopkins University Press.
- University Design Process: The College/School Centric Model (2011). Retrieved on August 14, 2011 from <http://president.asu.edu/oneuniversity/process>.
- Wilson, N. L., (2010). Counseling theories for student affairs professionals. In Harper, R.; Wilson, N. L.; Associates. *More than listening: A casebook for using counseling skills in student affairs work*. Washington, D.C.: National Association of Student Personnel Administrators.
- Winston, R., Miller, T., Ender, S., Grites, T. & Assoc. (1984). *Developmental Academic Advising*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

Yarbrough, B. & Brown, M. H. (2003). Understanding organizational socialization: insight for academic advisors. *NACADA Journal*, 23 (1 & 2), 66-72.

Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case study research: Design and methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Inc.

Zunker, V. G. (2002). *Career counseling: Applied concepts of life planning*. Pacific Grove, CA: Wadsworth Group.

APPENDIX A

IRB APPROVAL LETTER

EXEMPTION GRANTED

Christine Wilkinson
Senior Vice President and Secretary for the University
480/965-7782
C.Wilkinson@asu.edu

Dear Christine Wilkinson:

On 12/20/2013 the ASU IRB reviewed the following protocol:

Type of Review:	Initial Study
Title:	A Case Study on the Processes of Academic Advising in a School-Centric Environment
Investigator:	Christine Wilkinson
IRB ID:	STUDY00000272
Funding:	None
Grant Title:	None
Grant ID:	None
Documents Reviewed:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • App for Exempt Research, Category: IRB Protocol; • CITI_Completion Report.pdf, Category: Recruitment Materials; • Question Set and Protocol_Sept9_2013.pdf, Category: Recruitment Materials; • Recruitment_Information_Letter.pdf, Category: Recruitment Materials; • verbal-script.pdf, Category: Recruitment Materials; • CITI_Completion Report_ConflictofInterest.pdf, Category: Recruitment Materials; • CITI_Completion Report_ResponsibleConductReport.pdf, Category: Recruitment Materials;

The IRB determined that the protocol is considered exempt pursuant to Federal Regulations 45CFR46 (2) Tests, surveys, interviews, or observation on 12/20/2013.

In conducting this protocol you are required to follow the requirements listed in the INVESTIGATOR MANUAL (HRP-103).

Sincerely,

IRB Administrator

cc:

Thomas Dickson
Christine Wilkinson

APPENDIX B
RECRUITMENT LETTER

Study Title: A Case Study on the Processes of Academic Advising in a School-Centric Environment

I, Thomas Dickson, am a graduate student under the direction of Professor, Christine Wilkinson in the Higher and Postsecondary Education Doctoral program in the Mary Lou Fulton Teacher's College at Arizona State University. I am conducting a research study to analyze the experiences of academic advisors in the processes of academic advisement in a school-centric environment.

I am inviting individuals to participate in a single interview which will take no longer than 90 minutes. Interviews will be recorded on a digital audio recorder and transcribed for coding. In order to participate, volunteers must:

- serve in an academic advising role,
- have a minimum of one year of academic advisement experience at Arizona State University,
- be responsible for advisement of undergraduate students,
- and volunteers must not be classified as a faculty member as their primary employment classification.

Interviews will be recorded on digital audio for later transcription. This recording will not occur without your expressed permission. Please let me know if you do not want the interview to be recorded. You may change your mind during or after the interview. Should a change occur, please let the researcher know as soon as possible. Names and personally identifying characteristics of all participants will be changed to protect identities. Transcriptions and digital recordings will be stored on a password protected computer and will be destroyed 3 years after the completion of the study, in accordance with institutional policies and standards.

Your participation in this study is entirely voluntary. All participants may choose to discontinue participation or withdraw from the study at any time; there are no penalties for withdrawal or discontinuation.

If you have any questions concerning the research study, please call me at (480) 236-3755 or email at Thomas.Dickson@asu.edu. If you have any questions about your rights as a subject/participant in this research, or if you feel you have been placed at risk, you can contact the Chair of the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board, through the ASU Office of Research Integrity and Assurance, at (480) 965-6788. Please let me know if you wish to be part of the study.

APPENDIX C
INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

1. Thank for Participating
2. Interview Process Review
 - a. Interview Length
 - b. IRB Statements: Opt Out and Rights of Participants
 - c. Audio Recording and Transcription Process
 - d. Participant Coding for Anonymity
 - e. Records Storage
3. Review of Topic
 - a. Process of Academic Advising
 - b. School-Centric
4. Notification of Recording Start
5. Interview Questions
6. End Recording
7. Thank Participant

APPENDIX D
INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Interview Questions

1. Tell me about your background.
2. What is your definition of advising?
3. Describe your work with students.
4. What discussions occur through advising?
5. What are your primary goals for a student as a result of advising?
6. If any, are there others you rely on to assist you in these advising goals?
7. How does your school impact your advising? Are there different expectations, processes, or requirements of advisors in your school that differ from others?
8. Are other campus advisors doing the same type of work in advising?
9. Do you think ASU's school-centric model impacts how advising is conducted?
10. Is there anything else I should know about how advising is conducted?
11. Is there anything I did not ask about that I should have in order to understand the advising process better?

Prompts

Additional prompts seeking clarification or additional information for the questions above could include the following:

1. Can you tell me more
2. Can you describe that in more detail
3. Can you elaborate

These prompts were meant only to clarify, not to guide the direction of responses. The interviewer refrained from identifying the specific items for clarification, rather only providing a prompt for clarification and allowing the participant to derive their own meaning and explanation of personally salient topics. The only exception to specific prompts was in clarification of years of service related to advisement experience, years at the current institution, years in the current role, and years in higher education.

APPENDIX E

PARTICIPANT EXPERIENCE TABLE

Table 1

Years of Experience of Academic Advising Participants

Advisor	Higher Education	Advising	ASU	Current Role
1. Alice	15	15	6	6
2. Beth	9	7	9	5
3. Carol	6	6	6	5
4. Dan	11	11	11	1
5. Emma	8	8	8	8
6. Felix	6	6	6	6
7. Greg	16	15	16	12
8. Holly	8.5	7	7	7
9. Ivy	20	8	8	8
10. Joe	9	9	4.5	3
11. Kate	8	6	6	3
Average	10.59	8.91	7.95	5.81

Note. The first column outlines the pseudonyms of the eleven participants, followed by the advisor's years of experience in higher education, years of experience in academic advising, years of experience at Arizona State University in any role, and years of experience in their current advisement role. The final row displays the average number of years among all participants.

APPENDIX F

MENTIONS CODED BY O'BANION MODEL BY DIMENSION

Table F1

O'Banion Model Mentions by Participant: Exploration of Life Goals

Micro-dimensions	Number of Mentions by Participant											Mentions	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	Total	Average
A. Development	1	1	5	3	3	0	2	0	0	2	3	20	1.82
B. Decision	4	2	5	4	3	0	1	3	0	4	4	30	2.73
C. Psychology	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00
D. Counseling	2	1	1	4	5	5	1	1	1	1	0	22	2.00
E. Differences	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0.09
F. Dignity	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00
G. Potential	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00

Note. Distribution and summary of O'Banion Model of Academic Advisement (1972) topic mentions for the first dimension, exploration of life goals, by the eleven participants. The seven micro-dimensions are listed in the first column, followed by the number of mentions each topic received by individual participants in columns two through twelve, and the total and average mentions for the micro-dimension in the final two columns.

^a Refer to the O'Banion Model of Academic Advisement (1972) for complete micro-dimension descriptions .

Table F2

O'Banion Model Mentions by Participant: Exploration of Career Goals

Micro-dimensions	Number of Mentions by Participant											Mentions	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	Total	Average
A. Vocations	2	1	1	0	2	1	3	3	8	2	6	29	2.64
B. Assessments	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00
C. Nature	2	0	0	0	2	0	2	1	2	0	2	11	1.00
D. Worthwhile	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00

Note. Distribution and summary of O'Banion Model of Academic Advisement (1972) topic mentions for the first dimension, exploration of career goals, by the eleven participants. The four micro-dimensions are listed in the first column, followed by the number of mentions each topic received by individual participants in columns two through twelve, and the total and average mentions for the micro-dimension in the final two columns.

^a Refer to the O'Banion Model of Academic Advisement (1972) for complete micro-dimension descriptions .

Table F3

O'Banion Model Mentions by Participant: Exploration of Programs

Micro-dimensions	Number of Mentions by Participant											Mentions	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	Total	Average
A. Programs	2	1	5	4	3	2	5	0	5	4	3	34	3.09
B. Requirements	0	3	3	3	3	1	4	0	8	8	5	38	3.45
C. Transfer	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.09
D. Performance	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	2	2	0	6	0.55
E. Success	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00

Note. Distribution and summary of O'Banion Model of Academic Advisement (1972) topic mentions for the first dimension, exploration of programs, by the eleven participants. The five micro-dimensions are listed in the first column, followed by the number of mentions each topic received by individual participants in columns two through twelve, and the total and average mentions for the micro-dimension in the final two columns.

^a Refer to the O'Banion Model of Academic Advisement (1972) for complete micro-dimension descriptions .

Table F4

O'Banion Model Mentions by Participant: Course Options

Micro-dimensions	Number of Mentions by Participant											Mentions	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	Total	Average
A. Courses	0	1	3	2	2	19	4	9	3	5	5	53	4.82
B. Information	1	2	4	4	1	6	1	4	5	3	6	37	3.36
C. Rules	0	0	1	1	2	2	0	0	1	0	0	7	0.64
D. Special	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00
E. Instructors	0	0	0	1	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	5	0.45
F. Ability	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	3	0.27
G. Content	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	3	0.27

Note. Distribution and summary of O'Banion Model of Academic Advisement (1972) topic mentions for the first dimension, course options, by the eleven participants. The seven micro-dimensions are listed in the first column, followed by the number of mentions each topic received by individual participants in columns two through twelve, and the total and average mentions for the micro-dimension in the final two columns.

^a Refer to the O'Banion Model of Academic Advisement (1972) for complete micro-dimension descriptions .

Table F5

O'Banion Model Mentions by Participant: Scheduling of Courses

Micro-dimensions	Number of Mentions by Participant											Mentions	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	Total	Average
A. Schedule	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	2	2	2	2	12	1.09
B. Systems	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	4	0	9	0.82
C. Circumstance	3	2	2	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	11	1.00

Note. Distribution and summary of O'Banion Model of Academic Advisement (1972) topic mentions for the first dimension, scheduling of courses, by the eleven participants. The three micro-dimensions are listed in the first column, followed by the number of mentions each topic received by individual participants in columns two through twelve, and the total and average mentions for the micro-dimension in the final two columns.

^a Refer to the O'Banion Model of Academic Advisement (1972) for complete micro-dimension descriptions .

APPENDIX G
UNINCORPORATED THEMES

Table G1

Unincorporated Mentions by Participant: Data and Reporting Micro-dimension

Theme	Number of Mentions by Participant											Mentions	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	Total	Average
Reports	3	4	3	4	0	0	0	0	5	7	0	26	2.36
Tracking	5	6	9	7	9	5	5	1	12	7	12	78	7.09
Retention	2	1	3	2	0	3	2	0	4	1	1	19	1.73
Technology	3	3	8	3	0	0	7	0	3	8	1	36	3.27

Note. Distribution and summary of topic mentions for the first micro-dimension of unincorporated elements, data and reporting, as discussed by the eleven participants. The four themes are listed in the first column, followed by the number of mentions each topic received by individual participants in columns two through twelve, and the total and average mentions for the theme in the final two columns.

^a Refer to chapter four of this dissertation for complete theme descriptions .

Table G2

Unincorporated Mentions by Participant: Customer Service Micro-dimension

Micro-dimensions	Number of Mentions by Participant											Mentions	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	Total	Average
Resources	9	5	9	5	0	5	4	2	5	9	0	53	4.82
Triage	6	2	5	6	0	1	6	0	15	8	1	50	4.55
Connection	2	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	8	0.73

Note. Distribution and summary of topic mentions for the second micro-dimension of unincorporated elements, customer service, as discussed by the eleven participants. The three themes are listed in the first column, followed by the number of mentions each topic received by individual participants in columns two through twelve, and the total and average mentions for the theme in the final two columns.

^a Refer to chapter four of this dissertation for complete theme descriptions .

Table G3

Unincorporated Mentions by Participant: Student Engagement Micro-dimension

Micro-dimensions	Number of Mentions by Participant											Mentions	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	Total	Average
Involvement	1	0	0	3	2	0	0	5	2	4	2	19	1.73
Programming	2	2	5	4	0	1	0	6	6	6	0	32	2.91

Note. Distribution and summary of topic mentions for the third micro-dimension of unincorporated elements, student engagement, as discussed by the eleven participants. The two themes are listed in the first column, followed by the number of mentions each topic received by individual participants in columns two through twelve, and the total and average mentions for the theme in the final two columns.

^a Refer to chapter four of this dissertation for complete theme descriptions .

Table G4

Unincorporated Mentions by Participant: Administrative Micro-dimension

Micro-dimensions	Number of Mentions by Participant											Mentions	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	Total	Average
Policies	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	5	0.45
Withdrawals	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0.18
Conduct	6	0	6	5	7	2	0	0	0	1	0	27	2.45

Note. Distribution and summary of topic mentions for the fourth micro-dimension of unincorporated elements, administrative, as discussed by the eleven participants. The three themes are listed in the first column, followed by the number of mentions each topic received by individual participants in columns two through twelve, and the total and average mentions for the theme in the final two columns.

^a Refer to chapter four of this dissertation for complete theme descriptions .

Table G5

Unincorporated Mentions by Participant: Curriculum and Instruction Micro-dimension

Micro-dimensions	Number of Mentions by Participant											Mentions	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	Total	Average
Curriculum	1	1	3	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	12	1.09
Instruction	6	3	1	2	1	1	0	1	2	0	1	18	1.64

Note. Distribution and summary of topic mentions for the fifth micro-dimension of unincorporated elements, curriculum and instruction, as addressed by the eleven participants. The two themes are listed in the first column, followed by the number of mentions each topic received by individual participants in columns two through twelve, and the total and average mentions for the theme in the final two columns.

^a Refer to chapter four of this dissertation for complete theme descriptions .

Table G6

Unincorporated Mentions by Participant: Counseling Micro-dimension

Micro-dimensions	Number of Mentions by Participant										Mentions		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	Total	Average
Counseling	3	1	2	2	4	0	2	3	0	4	0	21	1.91

Note. Distribution and summary of topic mentions for the sixth micro-dimension of unincorporated elements, counseling, as mentioned by the eleven participants. The one theme is listed in the first column, followed by the number of mentions each topic received by individual participants in columns two through twelve, and the total and average mentions for the theme in the final two columns.

^a Refer to chapter four of this dissertation for complete theme descriptions .

Table G7

Unincorporated Mentions by Participant: Transitions Micro-dimension

Micro-dimensions	Number of Mentions by Participant											Mentions	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	Total	Average
Orientations	1	1	4	0	0	0	3	1	0	3	0	13	1.18
Post-Graduate	2	0	0	6	0	3	4	1	0	0	4	20	1.82
Recruitment	3	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	4	2	0	13	1.18

Note. Distribution and summary of topic mentions for the seventh micro-dimension of unincorporated elements, transitions, as discussed by the eleven participants. The three themes are listed in the first column, followed by the number of mentions each topic received by individual participants in columns two through twelve, and the total and average mentions for the theme in the final two columns.

^a Refer to chapter four of this dissertation for complete theme descriptions .

Table G8

Unincorporated Mentions by Participant: Outliers Micro-dimension

Micro-dimensions	Number of Mentions by Participant											Mentions	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	Total	Average
Graduate	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0.18
Supervision	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0.27
Social Media	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0.09
Scholarships	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.09
International	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.09

Note. Distribution and summary of topic mentions for the eighth micro-dimension of unincorporated elements, outliers, as mentioned by the eleven participants. The outliers category was constructed to group dissimilar items which were unable to be incorporated into other micro-dimensions. The five themes are listed in the first column, followed by the number of mentions each topic received by individual participants in columns two through twelve, and the total and average mentions for the theme in the final two columns.

^a Refer to chapter four of this dissertation for complete theme descriptions .

APPENDIX H

UNITS RECEIVING ADVISING REFERRALS

Table 2

Referral Destination for Assistance with Advisement Goals

# Advisors	Mentions	Referral Destination
5	8	Career Services
8	14	Financial Aid
2	3	Counseling and Consultation
4	7	Admissions
3	4	Registrar
1	1	Success Coaches
2	3	Tutoring
1	1	DARS team
1	2	Peer Advisors
7	18	Faculty

Note. This chart reflects the total number of academic advisors who mentioned a campus service as a unit of referral for accomplishing the goals of the advisement process. Total mentions by the participants were recorded in the second column. The third column reflects the unit or entity the participants identified.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Thomas Matthew Dickson was born in Phoenix, Arizona on December 26, 1980. He received his elementary education at Sunrise Elementary School. His secondary education was completed at Bourgade Catholic High School in Phoenix, Arizona. In 1999, Thomas entered Arizona State University where he majored in psychology. After graduation in 2003, Thomas entered Northern Arizona University where he pursued a Master of Education in Counseling, with an emphasis in Student Affairs. Upon graduation in 2005 he became employed at Arizona State University as an academic advisor and later an advising administrator. In 2008 he decided to pursue a doctorate in higher and post-secondary education at Arizona State University. In 2011 he left Arizona State University for employment at The University of Arizona in Tucson, Arizona where he resides today.