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There were two main purposes of this quantitative study. The first purpose was to identify characteristics associated with the selected sample of academic advisors that comprise study. Secondly, the study sought to determine how well work related activities of a selected population of academic advisors correlate with professional characteristics constructs and professional standards constructs of academic advising as a profession.

The study used Habley's (1986) characteristics of a profession to derive the studies professional characteristic construct, education activities, research activities, and professional development activities as it relates to a selected group of academic advisors work related activities. The studies professional standards construct was derived from five Council for the Advancement of Standards (CAS) professional standards for academic as it relates to a selected group of academic advisors work related activities. The study of 78 out of 210 identified full-time academic advisors at two-and four-year public colleges and universities in the North Texas Region utilized a multidimensional researcher-developed Web survey instrument designed to measure professional standards and characteristic within the field of academic advising.

Study results reinforced current criticism of research and education activities within the field of academic advising showing that the lack of scholarly research and education activities among academic advisors decreases significantly their efforts
towards professionalization. Also, professional standards construct results suggest that the utilization of CAS standards for academic advising as an evaluation tool may enhance an academic advisor’s knowledge of professional standards within the field.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Academic advising has been an integral part of the higher educational system dating back to the late 1800s when faculty served multiple roles, one of which was advising students on academic course selection. Throughout the last few decades the demand for and desire to attend an institution of higher education has paralleled the availability of and use of academic advisors (Frost, 2000; Gordon & Habley, 2000; Habley, 2009; McGillian, 2000). Habley (1994) suggested that academic advising is the only structured activity on the campus in which all students have the opportunity for ongoing, one-to-one interaction with a concerned representative of the institution. Heisserer and Parette (2002) also agreed that “the only variable that has a direct effect on student persistence is the quality of a relationship with a significant member of the community college” (p. 72).

According to Kuhn and Padak (2008), academic advising has been referred to as a faculty responsibility, a service, a field, and a discipline. As strides are being made to establish academic advising as a profession, it is imperative that professionals currently working within the field be knowledgeable of current trends, research, and occurrences within the field. Prominent researchers agree that academic advising does not meet the standards of scholarship to be considered a field of inquiry, an academic discipline, or a profession (Habley, 1986/2009; Kuhn & Padak 2008; Schaffer, Zalewski, & Leveille, 2010).

Some researchers support the perception that academic advising is merely a field of inquiry (Habley, 2009) with many key components of professionalization (Kuhn &
Padak, 2008). Much of the criticism which keeps academic advising from being recognized as a profession focuses on the lack of educational programs for academic advising, the lack of professionals within the field who have completed a degree or training program focused on academic advising, limited scholarly publications in the field, limited professional organizations, and limited professional development. (Habley, 2009; Kuhn & Padak, 2008, & Schaffer, Zalewski, & Leveille, 2010).

Statement of the Problem

Most critics of the professionalization of academic advising concede that strides have been made in establishing academic advising as a professional field of inquiry (Habley, 2009), but these same critics state a need for improvement in the field before it can be recognized as an academic discipline or a profession (Kuhn & Padak, 2008). In fact, Habley (2009) compares the definition of a profession and a discipline stating that “both a discipline and a profession require specialized knowledge, extended training, and systemic scholarship and research that leads to a body of knowledge specific to the field” (p. 76).

Currently, significant progress is being made to move the field of academic advising from being merely recognized as a field of inquiry to being recognized as an established academic discipline or profession which, according to many researchers, has been a steady and timely process (Habley, 2009; Kuhn & Padak, 2008; Schaffer, Zalewski & Leveille, 2010). Researchers have found consistently that research on the practice of academic advisors could serve to aid in efforts to move the field toward a
Theoretical Framework

This research study used Habley’s (1986) five basic characteristics of a profession as a theoretical framework for professional characteristics.

1. A profession has a set of standards, commonly held expectations that are applied to advising activities.

2. A profession has a conceptual base, a set of commonly held concepts, theories and practices that guide actions.

3. A profession has a method of entry into the profession or a core of learning experiences expected for those who enter the field.

4. A profession “includes a significant number of individuals who have both a length of commitment to and a depth of understanding of the field” (p. 9).

5. A profession has an identifiable group of clients.

Habley’s basic characteristics of a profession were utilized in this research study to establish the three professional characteristic constructs, which are educational activities, research activities, and professional development activities. Further, a set of standards for academic advising defined by the Council for the Advancement of Standards (CAS) (2010) was used in this study as a theoretical framework to determine professional standards. According to White (2006), CAS produces and promotes standards for functional areas aligned with student affairs roles within higher education (para. 1). There are specific standards and guidelines and self-assessment guides specifically for academic advising. White (2006) states that “there are many but principally CAS Standards are used as a template for establishing or assessing an academic advising program on campus or in a particular department” (para. 3). The
following CAS standards for academic advising were used to assess professional standards survey construct within this study:

1. Mission: Academic advising program (AAP), must incorporate student learning and student development in their mission.

2. Organization and leadership: AAP must be structured purposefully and organized effectively.

3. Human resources: AAP must be staffed adequately by individuals qualified to accomplish mission and goals.

4. Ethics: AAP must review relevant professional ethical standards and must adopt or develop and implement appropriate statements of ethical practice.

5. Assessment and evaluation: AAP must have a clearly articulated assessment plan to document achievement of stated goals and learning outcomes that demonstrate accountability, provide evidence of improvement, and describe resulting changes in programs and services.

Although there are 12 CAS standards for academic advising, the aforementioned five standards—mission, organization and leadership, human resources, ethics, and assessment and evaluation—were selected for use in this study to assess academic advisor knowledge of and use of these standards. It is believed that the five CAS standards selected for this study are most appropriate for assessing professional standards of academic advisors and their work-related activities.

Purpose of the Study

There are two main purposes of this quantitative study. The first purpose is to identify characteristics associated with the selected sample of academic advisors that comprise this study. Secondly, the study seeks to determine how well work-related activities of a selected population of academic advisors correlate with professional
characteristics constructs and professional standards constructs of academic advising as a profession.

**Variables of Interest**

*Descriptive Variables*

Descriptive variables include study participants’ age, gender, race, institutional type (two-year college/university or four-year college/university), and status as full-time academic advisors. To enhance the study, academic advising participants' promotion paths are measured.

**Professional Characteristics Constructs Variables**

For the purposes of this study, professional characteristics encompass three major constructs developed utilizing Habley’s characteristics of a profession. Professional characteristic constructs include educational activities, research activities, and professional development activities. Survey questions associated with professional characteristics construct were derived from Habley’s characteristics of a profession. The questions were structured using a Likert scale ranging from 1 to 5. The complete survey is available for review in Appendix D, where the professional characteristics constructs and the associated questions are enumerated.

*Educational Activities*

The professional characteristics construct, educational activities involves identifying the highest level of education of study participants. The perceived relevance
of the college degrees of academic advising study participants and information on
advisors’ belief that the degrees prepared them for their positions is presented. Lastly,
educational activities also measures academic advising study participants’ familiarity
and interest in academic advising graduate degrees and certificate programs of study.

Research Activities

The professional characteristics construct, research activities includes identifying
scholarly research activities of academic advising study participants. The scholarly
research activities include study participants’ frequency of reading research on
academic advising and frequency of submitting scholarly research for publication
related to academic advising for publication. Also, the likelihood of study participants to
submit scholarly research for publication in refereed journals is included. Lastly,
research activities also measures study participants’ familiarity with scholarly research
on academic advising.

Professional Development Activities

The professional characteristics construct, professional development activities
includes study participants’ membership in the National Academic Advising Association
(NACADA) and other professional organizations that support their work as academic
advisors. Also, frequency of participation in professional development activities on and
off campus. Funding for professional development activities on and off campus will also
be measured with the professional development activities construct. Lastly, research
activities was also measure the relatedness of professional development activities to the field of academic advising.

Professional Standards Construct

Professional standards constructs are identified through Council on the Advancement of Standards (CAS) (2010). The following CAS standards for academic advising are used to determine current professional standards for those engaged in academic advising: (1) mission, (2) organization and leadership, (3) human resources, (4) ethics, and (5) assessment and evaluation. These five standards were specifically established for assessing advising programs, not academic advisors, but the content had more directives for academic advisors and their work-related activities. Survey questions associated with professional standards construct were derived from guidelines provided by the Council for Advancement of Standards in Higher Education. The questions were structured using a Likert scale ranging from 1 to 5. The complete survey is available for review in Appendix D, where the professional standards constructs and the associated questions are enumerated.

Professional standards constructs detail the work-related activities of academic advising study participants and measures the relatedness of study participants’ advising office mission to student learning and inclusion of student development. Also, the relatedness of educational plans to student goals, knowledge of institutional policies that affect students, advising office ethical standards and knowledge of assessment and evaluation process are measured by professional standards.
Dependent Variables

The three dependent variables (DV) of the study are survey constructs that attempt to measure the professional characteristics of the sample, more specifically, aspects of the work-related activities of a selected group of academic advisors.

Dependent Variable 1 (DV₁): Professional characteristic construct associated with educational activities

Dependent Variable 2 (DV₂): Professional characteristic construct associated with research activities

Dependent Variable 3 (DV₃): Professional characteristic construct associated with professional development activities

Independent Variable

The independent variable (IV) for this correlational study is the survey constructs associated with professional standards as measured by survey questions developed in accordance with guidelines provided by the Council for Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS) related to academic advisors’ work activities.

Research Questions

One purpose of this quantitative study is to identify characteristics associated with the selected group of academic advisors that comprise the study sample. Another aim is to determine how well three professional characteristics survey constructs, related to the work-related activities of a selected group of academic advisors correlate with professional standards constructs as developed under the auspices of the Council
for Advancement of Standards in Higher Education. Therefore, the following research questions are addressed:

Research Question (RQ1). What are the descriptive characteristics of the academic advisors in this study?

Research Question (RQ2). How well do responses of academic advisors regarding their educational activities correlate with professional standards responses with regard to work-related activities?

Research Question (RQ3). How well do responses of academic advisors regarding their research activities correlate with professional standards responses with regard to work-related activities?

Research Question (RQ4). How well do responses of academic advisors regarding their professional development activities correlate with professional standards responses with regard to work-related activities?

Significance of the Study

This study has implications for both practice and research. Full recognition of academic advising as a field of study and/or a profession is long overdue. This study is significant for research because it adds to the existing body of literature regarding the work-related activity of current professional academic advisors as they relate to professional characteristic constructs and professional standard constructs.

Definition of Terms

This section provides definitions of key terms that are used throughout the study.

- Academic advising. For the purposes of this study the author referenced O’Banion’s (1994/1972) definition of academic advising as a process whereby advisor and advisee enter a dynamic relationship respectful of the student’s concerns. Ideally, “the advisor serves as teacher and guide in an interactive partnership aimed at
enhancing the student’s self-awareness and fulfillment” (NACADA, 2003). Also, academic advising has been defined as a “situation in which an institutional representative gives insight or direction to a college student about an academic, social, or personal matter” (Kuhn, 2008, p. 3).

- Academic advisors. For the purposes of this study, an academic advisor holds at least a bachelor’s degree, is currently working within an academic advising role at a North Texas region public university and/or community college, and has the sole responsibility of advising students on a full-time basis.

- Academic discipline. In this study, an academic discipline is defined as “a branch of knowledge that is formally taught as a part of the curriculum and in which scholars publish the results of their research inquiries about practice and theory” (Kuhn & Padak, 2008, p. 3).

- Profession. The *Miriam-Webster Collegiate Dictionary (n.d.*) defines a profession as “a calling requiring specialized knowledge and often long and intensive preparation including instruction in skills and methods as well as in the scientific, historical, or scholarly principles underlying such skills and methods.”

- Professionalization. Houle (1980), and others define professionalization as process or strategy by which a profession gains more respect, privilege, and prestige.

- Characteristics of a profession. This study utilized Habley’s (1986) five basic characteristics of a profession:

  1. A profession has a *set of standards*, commonly held expectations which are applied to advising activities.

  2. A profession has a *conceptual base*, a set of commonly held concepts, theories, and practices that guide actions.
3. A profession has a *method of entry* into the profession or a core of learning experiences expected for those who enter the field.

4. A profession “*includes a significant number of individuals* who have both a length of commitment to and a depth of understanding of the field” (p.9).

5. A profession has an *identifiable group of clients*, (these are the students). (p.9).

- Professional standards. For the purpose of this research, CAS standards for academic advising are used to determine current professional standards for those engaged in academic advising: These standards are:

  1. Mission: Academic Advising Program (AAP), must incorporate student learning and student development in their mission.

  2. Organization and Leadership: AAP must be structured purposefully and organized effectively.

  3. Human Resources: AAP must be staffed adequately by individuals qualified to accomplish mission and goals.

  4. Ethics: AAP must review relevant professional ethical standards and must adopt or develop and implement appropriate statements of ethical practice.

  5. Assessment and Evaluation: AAP must have a clearly articulated assessment plan to document achievement of stated goals and learning outcomes, demonstrate accountability, provide evidence of improvement, and describe resulting changes in programs and services.

**Limitations of the Study**

The limitations of the study are those that were inherent to the design of the study. The first limitation is that the researcher-developed survey instrument was limited to the assessment of descriptive characteristics, professional characteristics, and professional standards of academic advising. The survey instrument was designed specifically to collect data on the work-related activities of academic advisors as they
relate to professional characteristics (educational activities, research activities, and professional development activities) and specific professional standards for academic advising as set forth by CAS.

Also, the researcher-developed survey instrument was administered during a season when academic advisors were involved in peak fall registration. Academic advisors are busy with their work responsibilities year round; however, once peak registration ends, they are usually engaged in case management, professional development, learning new college/university policies that affect their work with students, and preparing for the next registration period which is a continuous cycle. The summer months were an ideal time of the academic year to administer this research studies survey instrument because traditionally this period of the academic year is the least busy.

Delimitations

The study had two delimitations. The first study design delimitation is that potential study participants were limited to those who were identified by their college/university websites as being full-time. The second study design delimitation is that potential study participants were limited to those who were employed at two-year and four-year public colleges/universities in the North Texas region. Other higher education institutions such as proprietary schools, technical institutes/colleges, Bible colleges, medical schools, and private colleges/universities located in the north Texas region were excluded from this study. I eliminated these institutions based on their specialized focus.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

To examine academic advising as a developing profession, it was necessary to review the existing body of literature related to academic advising. This review of the literature includes discussion and review of the status of the movement of academic advising to recognition as a profession and the professional standards associated with the field. Also included in the review is a historical overview of academic advising and the various theoretical approaches.

Historical Overview of Academic Advising

The concept of academic advising has been an integral part of higher education since the establishment of the earliest colleges and universities in the United States of America. The earliest faculty of America’s higher education institutions advised students primarily regarding their course of study. In the late nineteenth century the notion that faculty should provide students advice and assistance inside and outside the classroom was developed (Gordon & Habley, 2000). This notion caused many college and universities to require that every student upon their entrance to college be referred to a faculty member who would serve as their advisor for all matters for which the student needed counsel (Bush, 1969). Unlike many other professions or academic disciplines “academic advising was adopted as a method to meet immediate and practical needs” (Schulenberg & Lindhorst, 2008, p. 46).

As the notion of providing college students advice grew, college and universities such as Johns Hopkins in 1889 established a formal system of academic advising.
Other early institutions of higher education also began to have their faculty advise students about their classes. According to Gordon and Habley (2000), Columbia University’s president in 1906 referred to the advisor system for selecting courses as the “fad of the moment at Columbia University” (p.8). By the 1930s, almost every college and university had established an academic advising program (Raskin, 1979). The 1930s and 1940s were very important times for the history of Academic Advising; college and university officials made great strides that formalized academic advising as we know it today. It was during these decades that many different components of academic advising were established; colleges and university administrators began to have faculty advisors encourage students to explore information about their interest and careers. The ideas of “student-personnel work,” and college student adjustment to academic demands emerged (Gordon & Habley, 2000, p. 9).

The student demographics changed from the earlier higher education institutions that were for males from wealthy families in 1847 when women were allowed to study. In 1862 and 1890 the passing of the Morrill Acts which authorized land grant colleges, opportunities were provided for male and female students from families with lower incomes to attend institutions of higher education. Meanwhile, minority populations established their own colleges and universities to serve their student population. By the mid 1950s with the establishment of the GI Bill, veteran students were provided financial resources to attend college. With the student body evolving increased public interested in higher education, and increased federal funding to institutions of higher education, colleges and universities had to continuously find ways to adjust to their evolving student body which not only included men from affluent families, but women, minorities,
veterans, and low-income families; all seeking higher education. Academic advising was just one of the ways colleges and universities sought to provide assistance to the continuously evolving student body (Schulenberg & Lindhorst, 2008). According to Schulenberg and Lindhorst, “professional academic advising grew out of the practical realities of complex modern colleges and universities and the rise of a developmental understanding of college students” (p. 46). Gordon and Habley (2000) state that by the late 1970s, academic advising had begun to resemble an organized profession (p. 11). The National Academic Advising Association (NACADA) was established in 1979, “to increase interest in informed and improved practice, advising-related research, a referred journal” (p. 11). The establishment of NACADA would be a vital step for the field of academic advising, because it would begin the move of academic advising from being recognized as a field of study to being recognized as a profession.

In 1979, the American College Testing Service (ACT) began a series of comprehensive surveys of advising practices. The ACT surveys provided the most comprehensive research on advising during the late 1970s and early 1980s with findings that the delivery of information to students was the primary goal of most academic advising programs. During this time period, the ACT surveys were the only formal evaluations of the field of academic advising (Gordon & Habley, 2000).

The Professionalization of Academic Advising

According to Schulenberg and Lindhorst (2008), similar to other growing academic disciplines “the emergence of academic advising as a distinct field is relatively recent in higher education…academic advising will continue to grow in complexity and
importance as higher education becomes more intricate and as the diversity of students increases” (p. 45). Throughout academic advisement advancement, many researchers and publications have questioned whether academic advisement is a profession or academic discipline within higher education. Kuhn and Padak (2008) were among the first of a few academic advising researchers to question what criteria would be met for academic advising to be considered a discipline within higher education. One of the researchers, Habley (2009) referred to academic advising as being merely a field of inquiry, Kuhn and Padak (2008) questioned academic advising recognition as a higher education academic discipline, and according to Schaffer, Zalewski, and Leveille, (2010), academic advising lacks key elements of professionalization. Others such as Cook (2009) observed the professionalization of academic advising as beginning with the chartering of NACADA in 1979, although many efforts had been made prior to the charter that contributed to the current state of professionalism in academic advising. Much of the criticism that detracts from academic advising being recognized as a professional discipline focuses on the lack of educational programs for academic advising, the lack of professionals within the field having an academic advising educational background, limited scholarly publications, and the limited professional organizations and educational programs available, all of which would essentially allow for academic advising to be recognized as a profession and an academic discipline in higher education (Habley, 2009; Kuhn & Padak, 2008; & Schaffer, Zalewski, & Leveille, 2010).

Habley (1986) identified eight challenges for the future of academic advising. Only four of these challenges are valid for this study. The first challenge is to include
the development of a significant body of research that enhances our understanding, assists in planning, and serves as a guide to decision making. Secondly, Habley suggested that academic advising needs to “provide evidence that quality advising assists in producing specific and positive outcomes other than persistence” (p.6). In his seventh challenge to the field of academic advising, Habley suggested that “advancing the field of advising as a profession should be a priority” (p. 9). Habley also challenged the field of advising by encouraging the establishment of academic advising as a career. Habley’s challenges were among the first to suggest that academic advising is a field of study needing to make progress and enhancements towards professionalization.

Kuhn and Padak (2008) defined an academic discipline as one that represents a branch of knowledge that is formally taught as a part of the curriculum and through which scholars publish. They went on to identify that a discipline “would include scholars who research and publish about the discipline in adjudicated journals… expecting that tenets…are taught in higher education institutions…” (p. 3). These researchers suggested that academic advising will be recognized as a discipline “…when it has a body of credible organized knowledge…when it has a clear delineation of the modes of inquiry by which it validates itself, creates new knowledge, and advances as a discipline, and when its intellectual content is offered as a coherent grouping of courses in degree granting majors at several institutions of higher education” (p. 3).

In their research on the professionalization of academic advising, Shaffer et al., (2010) paralleled sociologist, Wilensky’s (1964) stages of professionalization to the professionalization of academic advising. The authors describe Wilensky’s stages of professionalization as having the following four steps: creating occupations, establishing
schools, forming associations, and lastly ratifying codes. According to Schaffer et al. who compared academic advising to Wilensky’s stages of professionalization, step one “creating occupations” was evident in “the establishment of academic advising as a full-time occupation” (p. 70). In her research on important events in the development of academic advising, Cook (2009) notes the numerous occurrences of institutions of higher education implementing the use of professional academic advisors. Although it is the third step of Wilensky’s stages of professionalization, “forming associations”, Shaffer et al, identified the establishment of NACADA as the second step towards academic advising’s professionalization (p. 71).

Shaffer et al., (2010) went on to suggest that with the establishment of NACADA, and subsequently the development of a statement of core values, the field of academic advising met Wilensky’s final step of professionalization, “the establishment of a code of ethics for members” (p. 71). The second step to professionalization is establishing schools, Shaffer, Zalewski, and Leveille (2010) were careful to identify that for academic advising, this step actually occurred last. Shaffer et al., (2010) stated that “it makes logical sense that developing a knowledge base and establishing educational programs to deliver the transferable skills that the knowledge base makes possible should precede the development of a professional organization” (p. 71). These researchers concluded that academic advising was still an emerging profession in 2010.

Habley (1986) also identified five basic characteristics of a profession. The five characteristics of a profession included that a profession has (a) a set of standards or commonly held expectations, (b) a conceptual base or a set of common concepts, theories, and practices that guide actions, (c) a method of entry into the profession or
core learning experiences expected for those who enter the field, (d) a significant
number of individuals who have both a length of commitment to and a depth of
understanding of the field, and (e) an identifiable group of clients, proclaiming college
students as the clients for academic advising.

Other Professionalization Standards and Criteria

Wrenn and Darley (1949) identified eight traditional criteria to determine whether
the field of student affairs was a profession. These criteria are as follows: (a) the
application of standards of selection and training, (b) the definition of job titles and
functions; (c) the self-imposition of standards of admission and performance, (d) the
legal recognition of the vocation, (e) the development of a professional consciousness
and of professional groups, (f) the performance of a socially necessary function, (g) the
possession of a body of specialized knowledge and skills, and (h) high moral and
personal integrity in lieu of the development of a code of ethics. Gordon, Swenson,
Spencer, Kline, Bogenschutz, & Seeger, (1987), noted that Wren and Darley found that
student affairs, a division under which academic advising may fall, did not meet the
definition of a profession as related to application of standards of selection and training,
definition of job titles and functions, self-imposition of standards of admission and
performance, and the legal recognition of a vocation.

Lieberman (1956) identified eight criteria for a profession in an educational
setting: (a) unique, definite, and essential social services; (b) an emphasis upon
intellectual techniques in performing its services; (c) a long period of specialized
training; (d) a broad range of autonomy for both the individual practitioners and for the
occupational group as a whole; (e) an acceptance by the practitioners of broad personal responsibility for judgments made and acts performed within the scope of professional autonomy; (f) an emphasis upon the service to be rendered, rather than the economic gain to the practitioners, as the basis for organization and performance of the social service delegated to the occupational group; (g) a comprehensive self-governing organization of practitioners; and (h) a code of ethics that has been clarified and interpreted at ambiguous and doubtful points by concrete cases (Gordon, Swenson, Spencer et al, 1987, p. 61).

Academic Advising Professional Organizations

In 1979, the establishment of The National Academic Advising Association (NACADA) would become the single most vital step for the field of academic advising towards professionalization, because it would begin the transition of academic advising from being recognized as a field of study to being recognized as a profession and academic discipline. NACADA hosts an annual national conference, conducts advising related research, publishes a refereed journal, and provides professional development opportunities for academic advisors (Frost, 2000).

According to Habley (2000), NACADA became the national organization and voice advocate for professional advisors in higher education. Currently, NACADA is the only national organization established that influences academic advising practices. NACADA identifies itself as an association “comprised of professional and faculty advisors, administrators, students, and others with a primary interest in the practice of academic advising” (NACADA Core Values, n.d.). This organization governs itself
according to six core values that advisors are “…responsible to the individuals they serve, responsible for involving others, when appropriate, in the advising process, responsible to their institutions, responsible to higher education in general, responsible to their educational community, {and}… responsible to their professional practices and for themselves personally” (NACADA Core Values-Exposition, n.d.).

NACADA commissioned a taskforce in 1987 whose primary focus was on the issue of advising as a profession. At the time there was very little research that “provided an accurate profile of professional advisers, the tasks they perform, and their perceptions of what “professional” advising means” (Gordon et al., 1988, p. 60). This task force was created to gather information regarding the “current state of full-time professional advising through the attitudes and experiences of NACADA members” (p. 60). The questionnaire developed by this task force and sent to current NACADA members “sought to gather information about the perceptions and attitudes of advisers” (p. 61) on the issue of professionalization. Members of the task force reported the following major findings of their study:

(a) The majority of respondents’ held responsibilities in addition to advising.

(b) Many respondents’ had been in advising for many years, with almost 60% being in their current position four to over ten years.

(c) What attracted these professionals to academic advising included the opportunity to help students, liking student contact and interaction, enjoying the academic environment, belief in the intrinsic value of higher education, liking to solve problems, or deriving personal satisfaction from seeing students.

(d) A very low number of advising professionals did not recommend research skills and knowledge for inclusion in a potential certification program for academic advising.

(e) Eighty-four percent of respondents’ recognized academic advising as a profession. (p. 61-62)
This NACADA study ascertained that professional full-time academic advisors perceived academic advising as a profession. It found that academic advisors gave many reasons as to their perception of academic advising as a profession acknowledging that advising has a body of knowledge and required skills are required and that certification was desirable although it would limit the job scope of advisors. (Gordon et al., 1988)). This study concluded that many professionals have an attraction to advising and that they are satisfied with their jobs. The advisors had been in their positions for what they considered a long time, and they had no plans to leave the field.

Academic Advising Education and Programs of Study

According to Shaffer et al., (2010) research on the professionalization of academic advising states that, “the obvious missing qualification is the failure, until the very recent past, to establish an educational program for training academic advisors and to require it for admission into the profession” (p. 71). Academic advising programs of study at the certification and graduate level are currently only being offered at two universities Kansas State University and Sam Houston State University. Kansas State University was the first to offer certifications and master's degrees in academic advising. Later, and in support of NACADA’s efforts, Sam Houston State University in Huntsville, Texas began offering a graduate level degree and certification in academic advising. Some colleges and university with programs of higher education are offering a few courses in academic advising, but not complete degrees. The offering of a doctoral degree in academic advising has yet to occur. Habley (2009) contends that “a coherent and widely delivered curriculum for advising is currently unavailable” (p. 83).
The lack of programs of higher education offering bachelor’s degrees and the limited number of higher education institutions offering graduate level degrees and certifications in academic advising has been a great criticism of researchers regarding the professionalization of academic advising ((Habley, 1978/1990; Schulenberg & Lindhorst, 2008; Shaffer et al, 2010).

Academic Advising Scholarship

Another key criticism of academic advising is the lack of published scholarship and research. According to Habley (2009), a unique and credible body of knowledge is nonexistent and evidence supporting the impact of advising is insufficient. Habley suggested that, “we dare not champion advising without research…we cannot affirm advising without research, and we will not advance advising without research” (p. 7). These are very strong statements regarding academic advising and the dire need for quality research and scholarship.

Habley (2009) presents five major reasons to conduct research within the field of academic advisement. First research is the primary way to realize a vision for academic advising. Secondly, he suggests that research is the “coin of the realm in the education kingdom” and identifies production and dissemination of knowledge as the two most fundamental purposes of higher education (p. 7). Thirdly, Habley details the fact that research affirms the work of advisors, stating that “it provides documentation of our accomplishments” (p. 7). Habley’s fourth reason that professional advisors should participate in research is that research guides decision making (p. 7). The last reason professional advisors should participate in research is that “research verifies theory,”
which he identifies as the top criticism of current academic advising literature (p. 7). Habley encourages all involved with academic advising to conduct research and present that research to the existing body of knowledge on academic advising.

Other researchers also support the idea that “all those who practice academic advising have a responsibility to also participate in scholarly endeavors related to academic advising, be that reading literature, conducting inquiry, or engaging in other forms of scholarship” (Schulenberg & Lindhorst, 2008, p. 44). These researchers go on to suggest three critical areas necessary to advance the field of academic advising “(a) development of a rich and varied custom of scholarly inquiry, making use of the diverse academic backgrounds of those who advise; (b) development of a clear scholarly identity and agenda at the national level; and (c) development of local-level purposes centered on educational goals that can be situated within each institution’s mission, vision, and values system, and the local encouragement of scholarly engagement for all advising professionals” (p. 49). Lastly, researchers suggest that the field of academic advising should focus more on building a scholarly identity built upon theory, which would enhance efforts towards professionalization (Creamer, 2000; Hagen, 2005).

CAS Standards for Academic Advising

The Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS), was founded in 1979, and was comprised of a consortium of over 43 professional associations (White, 2006). This consortium of professional associations believed that the field of higher education needed to have a standard that would guide practice and this standard would be an essential characteristic of any established profession (Miller,
2012, para.1). According to White (2006), CAS produces and promotes standards for functional areas aligned with student affairs roles within higher education (para.1). There are detailed standards and guidelines and self-assessment guides specifically for academic advising. White states that “there are many but principally CAS Standards are used as a template for establishing or assessing an academic advising program on campus or in a particular department (para.3). The CAS Standards and Guidelines for Academic Advising Programs (AAP) have the following twelve standards: Mission, Program; Organization and Leadership; Human Resources; Ethics; Law, Policy and Government; Diversity, Equity, and Access; Institutional and External Relations; Financial Resources; Technology; Facilities and Equipment; and Assessment and Evaluation (para.5). Each identified standard has guidelines “which either further elaborate on a particular Standard or provide additional suggestions for the continued improvement of a program” (para. 6).

For the purposes of this research, the following standards and guidelines were selected: (1) mission, (2) organization and leadership, (3) human resources, (4) ethics, and (5) assessment and evaluation. Although these five areas are standards for programs and not advisors specifically, their content has a direct relation to the work of the advisor. According to White (2006) within each General Standard criteria category there are standards that must be followed (para. 5). The CAS must statement says that the AAP must incorporate student learning and student development in their mission (CAS, 2009, p. 25). CAS recommends that the primary purpose of the AAP “is to assist student in the development of meaningful educational plans that are compatible with their life goals” (p. 25). The organization and leadership “must statement” states that
AAP must be structured purposefully and managed effectively to achieve its stated goal (p. 27). The primary purposes of the organization and leadership AAP “is to provide channels within the organization for regular review of administrative policies and procedures” (p. 27). The human resources must statement says that the AAP must be staffed adequately by individuals qualified to accomplish its mission and goals (CAS, 2009). This standard goes on to include that the academic advisors must hold an earned graduate degree in a field relevant to the position being held or must have an appropriate combination of education and experience. This section also recommends that “academic advisors should have an understanding of student development; a comprehensive knowledge of the institution’s programs, academic requirements, majors, minors, and support services…” (p. 28). The academic advising CAS standard and guidelines for ethics states that the AAP must review relevant professional ethical standards and must adopt or develop and implement appropriate statements of ethical practice (CAS, 2009).

Lastly, the assessment and evaluation CAS standard and guideline must statement states that regular assessment and evaluations be conducted. These regular assessments and evaluations must be complete to determine how well the AAP complements and enhances the institution’s stated mission and educational effectiveness (CAS, 2009).

Gaps in the Literature

There were two key gaps in the literature. One is limited information on educational programs of study relating to academic advising and academic advisors
perceptions of a profession. Much of the research regarding educational programs of study for academic advising discussed academic advising as it relates to student development. A limited number of higher education programs offered coursework solely for academic advising, and with the establishment of NACADA, Kansas State University offered the first graduate degree and graduate certification in academic advising in an effort to propel academic advising towards professionalization. In support of NACADA’s efforts, Sam Houston State University began offering graduate degrees and graduate certifications in academic advising. With only two universities nationwide offering graduate level degrees and graduate certificates, which is a primary component of professionalization, academic advising is not yet fully developed as a profession.

Another element missing from the literature is research on the work-related activities of academic advising practitioners, and whether or not their work can be considered professional. Most of the literature relating to academic advising is from the student’s perspective (Coll & Draves, 2009; Hale, Graham & Johnson, 2009; Mottarella, Fritzsche, & Cerabino, 2004; Smith, 2002; Smith & Allen, 2006). Student perceptions of the field of academic advising and academic advisors dominated the literature. Other research pertaining to academic advising professionals is related to job satisfaction (Donnelly, 2009), faculty perceptions of academic advising (Harrison, 2009), and career advisers’ perceptions and advising practices (Dalley-Trim, Alloway, Patterson, and Walker, 2007). Literature relating to perceptions of professionalization is abundantly evident, but for other professions such as student personnel work (Wrenn & Darley, 1949) medicine (Waddington, 1990), police (White, 1972), pharmacy (Denzin & Mettlin,

NACADA conducted a research study on academic advising professionals to determine professional full-time academic advisors’ perception of academic advising as a profession. This research study found that academic advising professionals gave many reasons for their perception of academic advising as a profession, which includes, “advising has a body of knowledge and skills are required, fifty-three percent of the respondents' indicated, they favor certification indicated it would limit the use of advisers” (Gordon, et al., 1988, p. 62). This taskforce concluded that “many professionals are attracted to advising, have been advisers for a long time, are satisfied with their jobs, and intend to stay in the field” (p. 64).

Theoretical Frameworks for the Academic Advising Profession

Academic advising as a developing profession has experienced several theoretical paradigm shifts or changes regarding how academic advisors approach advising with students. During the historic years of advising, faculty advisors mainly directed students to which class should be taken for a specific degree, known as a prescriptive approach to advising. Later Crookston (1972) introduced the idea of a more developmental theoretical approach to academically advising students where the student had greater opportunities to be involved in their own educational and personal development. As the needs and demographics of students changed, academic advisors shifted to a more intrusive approach. More recently, there is a trend rising in
the field of academic advising called appreciative advising. This is a positive, strengths-based and action-oriented approach to academically advising students.

Many academic advisors knowingly or unknowingly use either a prescriptive or developmental approach to academically advising students. As academic advising has progressed towards professionalization, many models, approaches, and theories of academic advising have been researched and submitted to the existing body of knowledge on academic advising. The theoretical paradigms for this research will present a review of five approaches academic advising (prescriptive, developmental, intrusive, integrated, and appreciative) and provide a review of the O’Banion’s (1972/1994) model for academic advising. This review of the five approaches to academic advising and review of a model for academic advising will provide insight the work of academic advising professionals. The most common approaches to academic advising include prescriptive advising, developmental advising, intrusive advising, integrated advising, and appreciative advising.

Academic Advising Approaches

Prescriptive vs. Developmental Approaches

Historically the relationship between academic advisors and the students they advise has been prescriptive in nature. “As implied by the term itself, the relationship is obviously based on authority; the advisor is the doctor and the student the patient. The doctor makes a diagnosis, prescribes something, or gives advice” (Crookston, 1994, p. 5). Through the use of a prescriptive model of academic advising, the relationship is that in which the student follows the advice provided by the academic advisor, where as
a developmental approach to academic advising seeks to involve the student in the advisor/advisee relationship.

Throughout his article, Crookston (1972/1994) identifies ten contrasting dimensions of prescriptive and developmental approaches in the academic advisor and student relationship. The ten contrasting dimensions include abilities, motivation, rewards, maturity, initiative, control, responsibility, learning output, evaluation, and relationship. The dimensions include both student and or advising professionals’ roles in both a prescriptive and developmental approach. According to Crookston (1994), prescriptive advisors use readily available achievement data such as student test scores and high school performance records to make judgments about the student abilities.

In the second contrasting dimension, motivation, Crookston (1994), asserts that the prescriptive advisor naturally assumes that students dislike work, a factor necessary for the academic advisor to control, direct, or issue incentives that will encourage the student to produce. In contrast, the developmental advisor “believes that students can find satisfaction in work accomplishment, stemming from a natural striving toward self-enhancement that is goal-oriented” (p. 6).

The third contrasting dimension identified by Crookston (1994), rewards, describes the prescriptive advisor as oftentimes viewing the students’ motivation to produce as limited largely to achieving a high grade, gaining credit for the course or obtaining a degree in order to realize a certain level of income, or as avoidance of parental censure or withdrawal of privileges. Higher education and academic advising have not steered too far from Burns Crookston’s aforementioned statement regarding
the academic advisors’ prescriptive views of student motivation. Academic advisors usually have to possess the skills to be able to identify when to use a prescriptive or developmental approach as well as on a continual basis determine where each student is in the developmental process.

Crookston (1994) also identifies student maturity as a contrasting dimension of prescriptive and developmental advising models. “The prescriptive advisor views the student as immature, irresponsible, needing close supervision, and often incapable of making sound decisions, the developmental advisor sees the student as growing, maturing, responsible, and capable of self-direction” (p. 7). The fifth contrasting dimension is initiative. Prescriptive advisors are described as more likely to take the initiative and identify requirements that must be fulfilled and leave the rest up to the student. The developmental advisors’ approach is described as more of a shared responsibility for initiating behavior (Crookston, 1994). Control, the fifth contrasting dimension takes on two perspectives with regard to a prescriptive advisor’s approach. If the prescriptive advisor is secure in the relationship with the student, then trust will exist with student, however if there is insecurity with the student, the academic advisor is more likely to “exercise firm control” (p. 7). Contrarily, control complicates efforts of the developmental advisor to move toward a developmental frame of reference. During his discussion on control as a contrasting dimension, Crookston (1994), identifies aspects of the higher education systems “good intention,” which require advisors signatures on such items as “the course of study for each term, dropping a subject, course changes, or withdrawing from school” (p. 7). He goes on the state that “despite good intentions that often motivate advisor “approval” requirements, such as forcing some advisor-
student interactions where it might not otherwise occur, the result is more likely to reinforce the student’s perception that his freedom to exercise options and take responsibility for them is being controlled” (p. 7).

Another issue where prescriptive advisors and developmental advisors differ is responsibility. The developmental advisor continues to take on the idea that responsibility is negotiated between advisor and student, whereas the prescriptive advisor may have a dilemma. Crookston (1994) describes the prescriptive advisors dilemma based on the fact that the advising professional feels some responsibility for the student to get “good” advice and meet mandated requirements, on the other hand the advisor feels the student must take responsibility to act on the advice, finding it difficult to handle situations where the student does not take their advice (p. 8).

As the variance between prescriptive and developmental approaches relates to learning output, the eighth contrasting dimension of Crookston’s approach, prescriptive advisors are traditional in that they view learning output similarly to that of a teacher: student relationship, “the teacher teaches, the students learn;” (Crookston, 1994, p. 8). The developmental advisor views learning output as a shared experience. The ninth contrasting dimension identified by Crookston (1994) is evaluation. Here the developmental advisor views evaluation as a “collaborative exercise in which decision is made on the manner in which evaluation is to take place and the responsibility each party has to the process” (p. 8). Comparatively, a prescriptive academic advisor has a tendency to “perceive evaluation in traditional terms” (p. 8).

Lastly, Crookston (1994) reviews the contrasting dimension of relationships as it relates to prescriptive and developmental advising approaches. He states that “most
critical of all is the nature and quality of the relationship existing between the advisor and the student” (p. 8). The relationship with prescriptive advisor demands respect for authority, whereas “the developmental relationship is based on the nature of the task, knowledge of the differential skills and competencies of the parties concerned are more likely to be formal and guarded” (p. 8). Crookston (1972/1994) commits that “developmental counseling or advising is concerned not only with a specific personal or vocational decision but also with facilitating the student’s rational processes, environmental and interpersonal interactions, behavior awareness, and problem-solving, decision-making, and evaluation skills” (p. 5).

**Academic Advising as Teaching**

Academic advising as teaching has long been an integral part of academic advising research and scholarly publication, this idea stems directly from Burns Crookston’s developmental academic advising approach. Crookston (1994) suggests that academic advising is not only concerned with “specific personal or vocational decisions but also with facilitating the students’ rational processes, environmental and interpersonal interactions, behavioral awareness, and problem-solving, decision-making, and evaluation skills” (p. 5). He went on to state that “not only are these advising functions but, deriving from the above assumptions, they are essentially teaching functions as well” (p. 5). Habley (1981) also supported the concept of advising as teaching suggesting that it can “enable students to clarify their educational goals and relate those goals to academic offerings on the campus” (p. 46).
Lowenstein (2005) enhanced the concept of academic advising as teaching is his writings and introduces the idea of learning-centered advising. “Teaching and advising both reflect an ongoing process requiring two way communications between student and teacher or student and adviser” (p. 68). Lowenstein (2005) went on to suggest that similar to effective teaching, effective academic advising should reflect a developmental relationship focusing “on the needs and personal growth requirements of the student/advisee” (p. 68). A comparison was made between effective teachers and advisors and the common characteristics they possess are “caring, good listeners, knowledgeable about their content areas, and prepared” (Lowenstein, 2005, p. 68). The view that academic advising is an efficient and effective teaching tool has enhanced the field of academic advising and lead to a structuring of advising interactions with students.

*Academic Advising Syllabus*

The use of an academic advising syllabus stems from the academic advising as teaching model. According to Trabant (2012) “an advising syllabus is a tool which allows individual advisors or offices to outline the advising relationship and experience for their advisees. Use of this tool is grounded in our understanding that advising is essential to the educational mission of our institutions. The academic advising syllabus is directly related to and compared to course syllabus provided to students in their academic classes. Appleby (2008) stated that “an advising syllabus can produce the same results for advisors by providing them with a tool that helps advisees understand the nature, purpose, and chronology of the advising process; comprehend the advisor-
advisee relationship; and become aware of the positive changes they can experience during the advising process” (p. 91). Many believe that the introduction of and use of an academic advising syllabus is an important step of the field academic advising towards being viewed and recognized as a “legitimate educational process” (p. 91).

Appleby (2008) presented five purposes of an academic advising syllabus: (a) it helps academic advisors plan and clarify their advising interactions with students, (b) it allows academic advisors to introduce themselves and set the tone for the academic advising interaction, (c) it allows for academic advisors to communicate with their advisees about the advising process, (d) it allows opportunity to explain the various aspects of the academic advising interaction, and finally (e) and it can communicate the nature and content of advising interactions with other administrators and faculty, thus providing a documented record of the advisors professional duties. The implementation of and use of an academic advising syllabus enhances the advisor/advisee relationship and sets the tone and expectation for the academic advising interactions, thus providing greater results for both the advisor and students.

Intrusive Approach

Earl (1988) defined the intrusive model of advising as action-oriented and involving and motivating students to seek help when needed. Intrusive advising uses the positive aspects of both prescriptive and developmental advising to enhance its own approach to students, especially students with an at-risk classification, freshman students, and probation/suspension students. Intrusive advising uses the expertise, awareness of student needs and structured programs aspects of prescriptive advising.
This advising approach borrows from developmental advising the concept of “relationship to a student’s total needs” (p. 28). Earl (1988), went on to state that “…intrusive advising is a direct response to identified academic crisis with a specific program of action…it is a process of identifying students at crisis points and giving them the message, ‘You have this problem; here is a help-service’” (p. 29). Earl suggests that an intrusive approach to advising was a “deliberated intervention…to enhance student motivation” (p. 27). Earl also described the theoretical framework of intrusive advising as being based on “three postulates from advising research,” professional academic counselors can be trained to identify freshman students who need orientation assistance, students DO respond to direct contact in which the potential problem in their academic life is identified and a resource of help is identified, and thirdly the postulate that the deficiencies in the necessary “fit” of a student to his/her academic environment are treatable (p. 30). Heisserer and Parette (2002) defined intrusive advising as “intensive advising intervention with an at-risk student that is designed to (a) facilitate informed, responsible decision-making, (b) increase student motivation toward activities in his/her social/academic community, and (c) ensure the probability of the student’s academic success.” (p. 74).

**Integrative Approach**

It is becoming more common for academic advisors to use a combination or integrated approach to academically advise students. Ideally, the integrated approach would be one where the student’s presenting variables would determine the approach used by the academic advisor. The presenting student variables include, but are not
limited to the following, the student’s reason for seeking advising, the confidence levels
or decision-making skill level of the student, and whether they are first time in college or
a returning student. The academic advisors choice of approach to working with the
student can also vary based on the students intended career choice and progression
toward a specific major. There are many other presenting student variables that affect
the academic advising approach used by advising professionals. Often, academic
advisors uses a combination or integration all four approaches (prescriptive,
developmental, intrusive, and appreciative) at various stages of the academic advising
process.

Church (2005), proposed the idea of an integrative theory that focuses on the
student and what is best for both the student and the institution (p. 1) Although the
advising approaches used to inform his integrative advising theory differ minimally from
this current research, he incorporated the prescriptive and developmental advising
approaches, adding the engagement model, academically centered advising model, and
student-centered advising models. Church defined Yarbrough’s (2002) engagement
model of advising as forming “an antithetical approach to prescriptive advising… where
the adviser focuses on developing a relationship with the advisee to enhance student
self-sufficiency in the pursuit of a degree” (p. 1). Church also described Lowenstein’s
(1999) academically centered advising model as an approach that “…facilitates the
student’s abilities to interact with an academic advisor benefits from institutional
academic programs, course sequencing, and complementary course scheduling, and
aims at gaining tools for lifelong learning” (p. 2). The third model, Melander’s (2002),
student-centered advising, contributed to Church’s integrative advising theory. The
student-centered advising model “…aids the student in developing the skills and behaviors needed to become a learner and expands the domain of concern to include learning through the whole college experience” (p. 2).

Church (2005) proposed that the goal of an integrative advising model is flexibility and utility. He went on to describe the integrative advising model as one that “… employs multiple approaches to suit differing student situations and is composed of aspects of the aforementioned approaches to academic advising, prescriptive, developmental, engagement model, student-centered, academically centered advising” (Church, 2005, p. 3).

**Appreciative Approach**

Bloom, Hutson, & He (2008) boasted that “the appreciative advising model can be a unifying force for the advising profession… with the heart and soul of appreciative advising being the student” (p. 6). “Appreciative advising is a social-constructivist advising philosophy that provides a framework for optimizing advisor interactions with students in both individual and group settings” (p. 11). Academic advisors who embrace this approach to advising learn to “use positive, active, and attentive listening and questioning strategies to build trust and rapport with students” (p. 11). The appreciative advising model is drawn from an organizational development theory, appreciative inquiry, (AI). Appreciative advising is also described as utilizing principles of reality therapy, involvement theory, and borrows two concepts from Vygotsky’s theory, the zone of proximal development (ZPD) and the concept of scaffolding (Bloom, et al., 2008). To carry out the stages of appreciative advising, an academic advisor
must embody the following six appreciative advising mindsets “caring about and believing in the potential of each student, display an attitude of gratefulness, acknowledge that an advisor can always become better at their craft, remember that they serve the students, being truly interested in students and enjoy learning from them, and are culturally aware and responsive in their interactions with students” (p. 32-33).

The appreciative advising model includes six phases for the advising process disarm, discover, dream, design, deliver, and don’t settle. During the disarm phase, academic advisors are encouraged to “recognize the importance of first impressions…conceptualized as the initial creation of a safe, welcoming environment for students” (Bloom, et al., 2008, p. 35). During the disarm phase the appreciative advisor demonstrates four key features, ensuring that the meeting space is warm and welcoming, establishing a safe and comfortable environment, demonstrates appropriate self-disclosure, and demonstrates appropriate nonverbal behavior. The discover phase is identified by Bloom et al., (2008) as “the most enjoyable for advising professionals” (p. 43). During this phase the appreciative advisor has the opportunity to learn from students through their stories. The appreciative advisors use positive open-ended questions “…through which they can help students identify their strengths, passions, and skills” (p. 43). The discover phase has three identified key features, “effective open-ended questioning, attending behavior and active listening, and strength-based story reconstruction” (p. 34).

After completing the disarm and discover phases, the appreciative advisor has “established trustworthiness so that students will reveal their wildest hopes and dreams for their lives” (Bloom, et al., 2008, p. 55). The dream phase has three key features,
creating powerful images, prospective framework for dreaming, and making purposeful connections between the dream and discover phases (Bloom et al., 2008). The Design phase is where the work begins, “the advisor understands the students’ vision for their future, and they can co-create a plan to make the dream come true” (p. 65). The identified key features of the design phase includes teaching students how make decisions, providing positive feedback, and making effective referrals (p. 34).

The deliver phase of appreciative advising is described as “where the student executes the plan that was co-created in the design phase” (Bloom et al., 2008, p. 87). The researchers suggest that although it is the student’s primary responsibility to carry out the co-created plan, the appreciative advisors’ role is to follow-up with the student and keep track of their progress. The deliver phase has four key features, energizing students to be their best, provide academic hope, to end the conversation well, and to follow-up (Bloom et al., 2008). The last phase of appreciative advising, don’t settle, is where the academic advisor is encouraged to build rapport with their advisees for the following reasons, “students who feel more comfortable sharing their hopes and dreams will be more likely to follow through on the plan that has been co-created with the advisor and will be more satisfied, as will the advisor” (p. 97). The final phase of appreciative advising has three identified key features, challenge and support the student, raise the bar of expectation for the student, and that appreciative advising is a virtuous cycle (Bloom et al., 2008).

An Academic Advising Model

Terry O’Banion (19872/1994) changed the course of academic advising
significantly when he developed an academic advising model. O'Banion’s primary goal for identifying “an academic advising model” was in response to a paradigm shift occurring amongst faculty as advisors to the utilization of professional advisors. O'Banion’s (1972/1994) asserts that this academic advising model was identified to be “more appropriate for community colleges and their students” (p.10). According to O'Banion’s (1972/1994), academic advising is composed of five dimensions that are developmental in nature. These five dimensions of academic advising include first the exploration of life goals, second the exploration of vocational/career goals, thirdly the student decision regarding choice of program of study or major, which is followed by a selection of courses, and finally the student scheduling the courses (p. 10).

These five dimensions provide sequential guidelines for academic advising professionals. The developmental academic advising model differs from the prescriptive advising model in that the advising professional does not function as someone who prescribes information to students, however these professionals “serve as a facilitator of communication, a coordinator of learning experiences through course and career planning and academic progress review, and an agent for referral to other campus agencies as necessary” (Gordon, 1988, p. 139).

To clearly understand the process of academic advising, O'Banion (1972/1994) provides insight regarding the skills, knowledge, and attitudes required by advising professionals that would assist students through the five dimensions of academic advising. The first step of the O'Banion (1972/1994) academic advising model for the advising process, exploring life goals, recommends that the advising professionals possess “(a) knowledge of student characteristics and development, (b) understanding
of decision-making process, (c) knowledge of psychology and sociology, (d) skills in
counseling techniques, (e) appreciation of individual differences, (f) belief in worth and
dignity of all men, (g) belief that all have potential.” (p. 11). The second step,
exploration of vocational goals, includes all of the aforementioned skills and knowledge
of the first dimension, but also includes the following, “(a) knowledge of vocational
fields, (b) skill in interpretation of tests, (c) understanding of changing nature work in
society, (d) acceptance of all fields of work as worthy and dignified” (p. 11). The third
step, program choice, is typically where most academic advising professional begin with
students. The dimensions of this step include, “(a) knowledge of programs available in
the college, (b) knowledge of requirements of program (special entrance requirements,
fees, time commitments), (c) knowledge of university requirements for transfer
programs, (d) knowledge of how others have performed in the program, (e) knowledge
of follow-up success of those who have completed the program” (p. 11). Step 4, course
selection, has the following recommendations for skills and knowledge, “(a) knowledge
of courses available, (b) knowledge of any special information regarding courses
(prerequisites, offered only in certain times, transferability; Does the course meet
graduation requirements? (What is appropriate sequence for the university?), (c) rules
and regulations of the college regarding probation and suspension, limit on course load
(academic and work limitations), (d) knowledge of honors courses or remedial courses,
(e) knowledge of instructors and their teaching styles, (f) knowledge of student’s ability
through tests scores, high school records, (g) knowledge of course content.” (p. 11).
Lastly, O’Banion (1972/1994) identifies the fifth dimension of the academic advising
process, scheduling courses; which includes the need “(a) knowledge of schedule, (b)
knowledge of the systems of scheduling and changing the schedule, (c) knowledge of work and commuting requirements” (p. 11).

O’Banion (1972/1994) explained that the academic advisors’ initial approach to the academic advising interaction with students typically begins with class selection as the primary goal of the advising process. Based on a developmental advising approach this act can be viewed as ineffective, because “it is assumed that students have already made choices regarding life goals and vocational goals when they enter college – a questionable assumption for college students in general and a harmful assumption for community college students in particular” (p. 10). It has been highly recommended and researched that academic advising as a developing profession should have academic advisors change their approach with students to one that focus on the outcome, which is the development of an educational and career plan for the students.

Summary

Habley (1994) suggested that “academic advising is the only structured activity on the campus in which all students have the opportunity for on-going, one-to-one interaction with a concerned representative of the institution” (p. 10). Academic advisors have a great amount of responsibility to the student and the institutions that employ them. Although the field of academic advising is undergoing professionalization and recognition as such, the tireless efforts of academic advisors and their contributions to student success and retention are widely documented throughout the existing body of knowledge (Habley 1994; Light 2001; Pascarella & Terenzini 1991/2005; Smith 2002;
According to Light (2001), “good advising may be the single most underestimated characteristic of a successful college experience” (p. B11).

A review of the literature showed that great strides toward professionalization of academic advising have been accomplished, yet key elements of professionalization are still lacking. Areas to be explored in this research are those elements of professionalization that are seemingly missing from the field of academic advising. Much of the research related to the field of academic advising and the journey towards professionalization cites the lack of professionals with educational backgrounds in advising, the limited number of higher education institutions offering academic advising as a degree or certificate, the limited number of professional advising organizations, the limited training of current professionals, and the limited ability to create new knowledge and validate or advance advising as an academic discipline as impediments to recognition of the field (Habley, 2009; Kuhn & Padak, 2008; & Schaffer, Zalewski, & Leveille, 2010). After reviewing the literature, this researcher concludes that the transition of academic advising from a field of study to an academic discipline or profession will require many purposeful tasks to be put in motion key constituents within the field of academic advising and higher education.
CHAPTER 3

 METHODOLOGY 

Research Design

This quantitative research study utilized a researcher developed survey to measure the studies survey constructs. Survey research allowed the researcher to appropriately determine how full-time academic advisors work-related activities correlate with professional characteristic constructs, educational activities, research activities, and professional development activities, and professional standards constructs.

Survey Research

According to Creswell (2009), “a survey design provides a quantitative or numeric description of trends, attitudes, or opinions of a population by studying a sample of that population” (p. 145). Survey research includes two approaches to collecting survey data, four types of data collection methods, and three types of survey designs. First, survey research is divided into two approaches, cross-sectional or longitudinal. A cross-sectional survey is when data is collected at one time and a longitudinal survey is when data is collected over time (Creswell, 2009, p. 146). Next, Creswell (2009) describes four types of survey data collection methods, self-administered questionnaires, interviews, structured record reviews, and structured observations. Lastly, Passmore, Dobbie, Parchman, and Tysinger (2002) identified three types of surveys, “descriptive, explanatory, and uni-dimensional and multidimensional” (p. 282). A descriptive survey is defined as reporting factual data or
opinions. The use of an explanatory survey is defined as “an attempt to link cause and effect” (p. 282). Lastly, a uni-dimensional and multi-dimensional survey is defined as “addressing one or more underlying construct(s)” (p. 282). Limitations of survey research include that “they rely on subject’s honesty and memory, the quality of data obtained depends on how well respondents understand the survey items or questions,” and “the response rate can also limit a survey’s usefulness” (p. 281).

The researcher-developed instrument utilized in this study was a descriptive, cross-sectional, self-administered, multidimensional Web survey questionnaire (Appendix D). Survey method research was the preferred data collection method of this study because of the many identified advantages of survey research throughout the literature. These advantages include economic factors, the rapid potential for data collection, surveys being well suited to gathering demographic data, and the fact that surveys can be used to study numerous variables (Creswell, 2009; Glasgow, 2005; McIntyre, 1999; & Passmore et al., 2002).

Survey Instrument

The researcher-developed survey instrument utilized in this study was created to measure the following study research questions:

Research Question (RQ1). What are the descriptive characteristics of the academic advisors in this study?

Research Question (RQ2). How well do responses of academic advisors regarding their educational activities correlate with professional standards responses with regard to work-related activities?

Research Question (RQ3). How well do responses of academic advisors regarding their research activities correlate with professional standards responses with regard to work-related activities?
Research Question (RQ4). How well do responses of academic advisors regarding their professional development activities correlate with professional standards responses, with regard to work-related activities?

The survey instrument developed for this study contained thirty-four items, with 32 items using a Likert scale ranging from 1 to 5 (Appendix D). The instrument was organized to measure three areas: descriptive characteristics of a select group of academics advisors (measured by age, gender, race, two-year vs. four-year college/university, and being identified as full time on their campuses as an academic advisor), professional characteristics constructs (measured by educational activities, research activities, and professional development), and professional standards constructs (measured by a selected number of CAS academic advising professional standards).

**Descriptive Survey Section**

The first section of the survey is the descriptive section which includes a brief description of the research study and includes confirmation of respondents' status as full-time academic advisors with the sole responsibility of advising students as their main job function. Other descriptive survey questions requested respondents to respond to questions regarding:

- Age
- Gender
- Race
- Years of experience
- Whether they are employed at a two year or four year public college/university
• Current position as a full-time academic advisor
• Identified promotion path

The complete survey is available for review in Appendix D, where the descriptive questions are enumerated.

**Professional Characteristic Constructs Survey Section**

For the purposes of this study, professional characteristic survey questions encompasses three major constructs derived from Habley’s characteristics of a profession. Professional characteristic constructs include educational activities, research activities, and professional development activities. The complete survey is available for review in Appendix D, where the professional characteristics constructs and the associated questions are enumerated.

**Educational Activities**

The professional characteristics construct, educational activities, included identifying the highest level of education of study participant. The relatedness of the college degrees of academic advising study participants and information on advisors belief that the degrees they hold prepared them for their positions is also a factor included. Lastly, educational activities also measures academic advising study participants’ familiarity and interest in academic advising graduate degrees and certificate programs of study.

**Research Activities**

The professional characteristics construct, research activities included identifying
sively the scholarly research activities of academic advising study participants. The scholarly research activities include frequency of reading research on academic advising and frequency of submitting scholarly research for publication related to academic advising. Also, the likelihood of study participants to submit scholarly research for publication in refereed journals is included. Lastly, research activities also measures study participants’ familiarity with scholarly research on academic advising.

**Professional Development Activities**

The professional characteristics construct, professional development activities included membership in NACADA and other professional organizations that support the work of academic advisors. Also, frequency of participation in professional development activities on and off campus is included. Funding for professional development activities on and off campus also measures with the professional development activities construct. Lastly, the relatedness of professional development activities to the field of academic advising will also be measured.

**Professional Standards Construct Survey Section**

Professional standards constructs questions were derived from guidelines provided by the Council for Advancement of Standards in Higher Education. The questions were structured using a Likert scale ranging from 1 to 5. The complete survey is available for review in Appendix D, where the professional standards constructs and the associated questions are enumerated.
Professional standards constructs detail the work-related activities of academic advising study participants and measure the relatedness of study participants advising office mission to student learning and inclusion of student development. Also, the relatedness of educational plans to student goals, knowledge of institutional policies that affect students, advising office ethical standards and knowledge of assessment and evaluation process are measured by professional standards.

Survey Instrument Expert Panel Review

The survey instrument designed for this study underwent review and revisions by a selected panel of experts ($n = 7$) prior to being disseminated to the target population. Members of the panel of experts were selected based on their expertise and experience in the field of academic advising. The expert panel consisted of professionals who formerly were employed as full-time academic advisors and had been promoted to administrative positions. Members of the expert panel identified as having a combined total of 40+ years of full-time academic advising experience at two-year and four-year colleges/universities in the North Texas region prior to their promotion to administrative roles within higher education. Also, members of the expert panel represented a diverse group of professionals.

First, members of the expert panel were contacted via electronic mail requesting their consent to review the researcher-developed survey instrument. The initial electronic mail sent out to members of the expert panel also provided the purpose of the study, study variables, and background information on how the survey instrument was
constructed. Once members of the expert panel provided their consent; the researcher-developed survey was sent via electronic mail to each member of the expert panel.

Survey Instrument Validity

The panel of experts were provided three weeks to the survey items to ensure that content validity was established and that each item accurately reflected the five areas of the survey (descriptive, professional characteristics constructs (educational activities, research activities, and professional development activities), and professional standard constructs. The panel of academic advising experts provided their judgment as to whether items met the criterion established for the research study. Based on the panel of academic advising experts’ feedback, the researcher restructured identified survey items that were of concern.

Survey Instrument Reliability

Internal consistency reliability was utilized to ensure the researcher designed survey instrument was reliable. The research performed a Cronbach’s Alpha to establish the survey instruments reliability.

The professional characteristics constructs, educational activities consisted of 8 items ($\alpha = .236$), research activities consisted of 5 items ($\alpha = .631$), and professional development activities consisted of 6 items ($\alpha = .626$). Professional standards constructs consisted of 7 items ($\alpha = .660$).

The survey instrument designed for this research study was determined to have good reliability (26 items; $\alpha = .783$). It is important to note that 8 items of the survey
Variables of Interest

Descriptive Variables

Descriptive variables included study participants' age, gender, race, institutional type (two year college/university or four year college/university), and status as full-time academic advisors. To enhance the study, academic advising participants' promotion path was measured.

Professional Characteristics Construct Variables

For the purposes of this study, professional characteristics encompass three major constructs developed utilizing Habley’s characteristics of a profession. Professional characteristic constructs included Educational Activities, research activities, and professional development activities. Questions associated with professional characteristics construct were derived from Habley’s Characteristics of a Profession. The questions were structured using a Likert Scale ranging from one to five. The complete survey is available for review in Appendix D, where the professional characteristics constructs and the associated questions are enumerated.

Educational Activities

The professional characteristics construct, educational activities included identifying the highest level of education of study participants. The relatedness of the...
college degrees of academic advising study participants and information on advisors’ belief that the degrees they hold prepared them for their positions are included. Lastly, Educational Activities also measures academic advising study participants’ familiarity and interest in academic advising graduate degrees and certificate programs of study.

Research Activities

The professional characteristics construct, research activities included identifying scholarly research activities of academic advising study participants. The scholarly research activities include frequency of reading research on academic advising and frequency of submitting scholarly research for publication related to academic advising. Also, the likelihood of study participants to submit scholarly research for publication in refereed journals is included. Lastly, research activities also measures study participants’ familiarity with scholarly research on academic advising.

Professional Development Activities

The professional characteristics construct, professional development activities, included study participants’ membership in NACADA and other professional organizations that support their work as academic advisors. Also measured was frequency of participation in professional development activities on and off campus. Funding for professional development activities on and off campus will also be measured with the professional development activities construct. Lastly, research activities will also measure the relatedness of professional development activities to the field of academic advising.
Professional Standards Construct

Professional standards constructs were identified through the Council on the Advancement of Standards (CAS) (2010). The following CAS standards for academic advising are used to determine current professional standards for those engaged in academic advising: (a) mission, (b) organization and leadership, (c) human resources, (d) ethics, and (e) assessment and evaluation. These five standards were specifically established for assessing advising programs, not academic advisors, but the content had more directives for academic advisors and their work-related activities. Questions associated with professional standards construct were derived from guidelines provided by the Council for Advancement of Standards in Higher Education. The questions were structured using a Likert scale ranging from 1 to 5. The complete survey is available for review in Appendix D, where the professional standards constructs and the associated questions are enumerated.

Professional standards constructs detail the work-related activities of academic advising study participants and measures the relatedness of study participants’ advising office mission to student learning and inclusion of student development. Also, the relatedness of educational plans to student goals, knowledge of institutional policies that affect students, advising office ethical standards, and knowledge of assessment and evaluation processes are measured by professional standards.

Dependent Variable

The dependent variables of this study are related to the survey constructs for professional characteristics and how they correlate with the professional standards
survey constructs.

- **DV1**: Professional characteristic construct associated with educational activities
- **DV2**: Professional characteristic construct associated with research activities
- **DV3**: Professional characteristic construct associated with professional development activities

**Independent Variable**

The independent variable of this study is the survey constructs for Professional Standards of academic advising. The questions associated with professional standards construct were derived from guidelines provided by CAS.

**Sampling**

A non-probability purposive or judgmental sampling method was utilized to obtain the population of this study. More specifically, a homogeneous purposive sampling method was utilized to identify current full-time academic advisors in the North Texas region for participation in this research study. Utilizing a non-probability purposive sampling allowed the researcher to use personal judgment in the identification of study participants. The homogeneous sampling method is a purposive sampling technique that allows the researcher to select a population that shares similar or the same characteristics.

**Target Population/Sample**

Based on the homogeneous purposive sampling method, the researcher was able to identify approximately 210 academic advisors currently working full-time at
public colleges/universities and community colleges in the North Texas region. The target population of current academic advisors was selected and identified based on their job status of conducting academic advising at public colleges/universities and community colleges on a full-time basis. Academic advisors were selected for participation in this research study from public colleges/universities and community colleges in a specified geographic location, the North Texas region.

For the purposes of this study, proprietary schools, technical institutes/colleges, Bible colleges, medical schools, and private colleges/universities located in the North Texas region were excluded from this study. The researcher eliminated these types of institutions based on the specialized focus of these institutions of higher education.

**Sample Size/Response Rate**

For the researcher to ensure that results of this study are representative of the target population of academic advisors, a 38% response rate was necessary. The total number of completed Web surveys for this research study was 91, which resulted in a response rate of 43.3%. Due the limitation of this study that all research participants should have “academic advisor” in the assigned title with the college/university they are employed; 13 survey respondents did not have an official title of “academic advisor” and were removed from the sample population. The final data for this research study included data from a sample size of 78 respondents who identified themselves as being full-time academic advisors holding that title. The final response rate for this study was 37.1%. Although the final response rate for this research study was 0.9% lower than the necessary response rate, the researcher believes that the results of this research
study are representative of the target population. Studies on Web survey response rates have shown that decreased response rates are comparable to that of mail hard copy surveys (Kaplowitz, Hadlock, and Levine, 2004; Sheehan, 2001; & Baruch, 1999). According to Sheehan’s (2001) study results regarding response rates for Web Survey and e-mail survey response rates have been following the pattern of survey response rates overall in the United States.

Data Collection Procedure

Survey Monkey® was used for survey design, informed consent, and data collection for this research study (Survey Monkey®, n.d.).

For the purposes of this research study, the following steps were taken to contact the 210 members of the target population who were identified using the homogeneous purposive sampling technique. The target population’s contact information was obtained from institutional websites of all two-year and four-year colleges and universities in the North Texas region. In cases where the institutional website did not provide electronic mail address for all full-time academic advisors the researcher contacted the academic advising center by telephone to request contact information for full-time academic advisors, employed at the institution. For the most part all contact information on academic advisors was readily available on institutions website, with a few exceptions and in the case of small rural community college campuses. Once contact information was collected on all academic advising departmental supervisors and members of the target population, the researcher compiled the contact information into a database.
First all departmental supervisors for academic advising and counseling centers at two year and four year public colleges/universities and community colleges were contacted via electronic mail to obtain their permission for the academic advisors they supervise to be contacted for participation in the research study (Appendix A). The email request to academic advising supervisors electronic was sent out in June 2013. Once permission was provided by departmental supervisors, all members of the target population were sent an introductory electronic mail to their college/university assigned electronic mail addresses with the research study’s Web survey link included (Appendix B) July 2013. Informed consent was implemented as the first section of the Web survey instrument, so that those who did not provide informed consent would be redirected out of the Web survey and those who provided informed consent would be eligible to participate in the research study and allowed to complete the Web survey. Once the informational/introductory electronic Web survey was distributed to all members of the target population, the researcher closely monitored all completed surveys received on a regular basis.

During August 2013, as the deadline for survey responses approached, the researcher sent electronic reminders to all non-respondents on a weekly basis and provided an opportunity to participate in the research study (Appendix C). The reminders were sent out weekly, as it was prior to the start of the fall term, which is a busy time of year for academic advisors. Finally, once the survey submission deadline of August 31, 2013 had passed, the researcher proceeded with a visual inspection of raw data, reviewing for missing values and preparing data for import into SPSS for statistical analysis and interpretation.
Data Analysis

The researcher utilized a common statistical computer program, Statistical Product and Service Solutions (SPSS) to analyze all statistical data for this research study (Norušis, 1990 & Norušis & SPSS Inc., 1994). Initially, a descriptive analysis of data was performed to identify the characteristics of the sample of the study. Also, a descriptive analysis was performed on all dependent and independent variables. According to Creswell (2009), a descriptive data analysis should be conducted for “means, standard deviations, and range scores” (p.153). The descriptive analysis address the study’s following research question:

Research Question (RQ1). What are the descriptive characteristics of the academic advisors of this study?

Additional statistical analyses performed for this study utilized the Spearman correlation coefficient (Spearman’s rho). The Spearman’s correlation coefficient rho analysis was performed to analyze the relationship between variables for professional standards constructs and professional characteristics constructs. Data from the Web survey were collected using a Likert scale that produces rank or ordinal level data, for which the Spearman’s rho correlation coefficient was the best statistic to correlate data results. The Spearman’s rho correlation analysis addresses the following research questions:

Research Question (RQ2). How well do responses of academic advisors regarding their educational activities correlate with professional standards responses with regard to work-related activities?

Research Question (RQ3). How well do responses of academic advisors regarding their research activities correlate with professional standards responses with regard to work-related activities?
Research Question (RQ4). How well do responses of academic advisors regarding their professional development activities correlate with professional standards responses with regard to work-related activities?

Researcher Bias

The researcher for this study is a current full-time academic advisor for a community college in the North Texas region. For the purposes of this study the researcher did not participate in completing the Web survey to eliminate potential researcher bias.

Summary

Data for this study were collected through descriptive survey research. Specifically, the survey instrument was designed to collect data that is descriptive in nature. The survey instrument contained three sections, a descriptive, professional characteristics constructs (educational activities, research activities, and professional development activities), and academic advising professional standards constructs. Each of the survey question items were designed to describe how a select group of academic advisors work-related activities correlated with professional characteristic constructs and professional standards constructs of the research study. Members of the target population were selected for participation in this study based on homogeneous purposive sample because of their full-time status as academic advisors who are employed at two year and four year public colleges/universities in the North Texas region.

A descriptive data analysis and a Spearman’s rho rank order correlation analysis were performed to analyze this research study data. A Spearman’s rho was performed
to discover the strength of correlation amongst study variables relating to professional standards constructs and professional characteristics constructs (Educational Activities, research activities, and professional development activities). The Spearman’s rho correlation statistic was selected because both the dependent and independent variables are categorical in nature.
CHAPTER 4

INTERPRETATION OF FINDINGS

Introduction

There are two identified primary purposes of this quantitative study. The first purpose is to identify characteristics associated with the selected sample of academic advisors that comprise the study. The other purpose is to discover how work-related activities of a select group of academic advisors correlated with professional characteristics constructs (educational activities, research activities, and professional development activities) and professional standards constructs. This study used Habley’s (1986) characteristics of a profession, which posit that a profession has a set of standards, a conceptual base, a method of entry into the profession, a significant number of individuals with a commitment to understand the field, and an identifiable group of clients. Habley’s characteristics of a profession was utilized to establish the professional characteristics constructs (educational activities, research activities, and professional development activities) utilized in this research study.

Professional standards constructs utilized in this study defined by five standards selected from the Council on the Advancement of Standards (CAS) for academic advising. The five professional standards selected for the study to determine professional standards from CAS are mission, organization and leadership, human resources, ethics, and assessment and evaluation. The five CAS professional standards were established to access academic advising programs, but had content that provided directives for academic advisors and their work-related activities.
Research Study Measures

Research Question (RQ1). What are the descriptive characteristics of the academic advisors in this study?

Research Question (RQ2). How well do responses of academic advisors regarding their educational activities correlate with professional standards responses with regard to work-related activities?

Research Question (RQ3). How well do responses of academic advisors regarding their research activities correlate with professional standards responses with regard to work-related activities?

Research Question (RQ4). How well do responses of academic advisors regarding their professional development activities correlate with professional standards responses with regard to work-related activities?

Dependent Variable

The dependent variables of this study are related to the survey constructs for professional characteristics and how they correlate with the professional standards survey constructs.

DV1: Professional characteristic construct associated with educational activities

DV2: Professional characteristic construct associated with research activities

DV3: Professional characteristic construct associated with professional development activities

Independent Variable

The independent variable of this study is the survey constructs for professional standards of academic advising. The questions associated with professional standards construct were derived from guidelines provided by CAS.
Data Analysis

The data analysis section is divided into three sections, descriptive analysis, professional characteristics construct analysis, and professional standards construct analysis.

*Descriptive Data Analysis*

Descriptive variables in this research study include gender, age, race, sex, whether or not they have non-academic advising work duties, years of work experience, years of work experience as an academic advisor, whether they are employed at a two-year or four-year public college/university, and current position as a full-time academic advisor.

In response to RQ1, “What are the descriptive characteristics of the academic advisor in this study?” the researcher identified 210 potential academic advisors that are employed as full-time at two year and four year public colleges and universities in the North Texas region. The total number of completed Web surveys for this research study was 91. Due the limitation of this study that all research participants should have the assigned title of academic advisor, 13 survey respondents did not have that assigned were removed from the sample population. The final data for this research study included data from a sample size of 78 respondents who identified themselves as being full-time academic advisors. As a result, 100% of study participants were employed as full-time academic advisors.

Lastly, a descriptive analysis was performed on the study’s dependent and independent variables.
Sample Descriptive Characteristics

Descriptive characteristics of the sample of this present study are as follows: Seventy-five percent of academic advisors identified as female and 24.4% identified as male. The average age range of student participants was between the ages of 35-45. Sixty-five percent of research participants indicated that they are white, 21.8% indicated their race as black, and 12.8% reported “other” as their race.

Study participants were asked to indicate whether or not they are currently employed at a two-year or four-year public college or university. In the final sample, 55.1 % identified as employed at a two-year college, and 44.9 % identified as employed at a public four-year college/university.

Participants indicated whether or not they have duties outside of academic advising. In the final sample, 80.8% agreed that they had additional duties as academic advisors, whereas 19.9% did not agree that they had additional duties outside of academic advising, and 1.3% were neutral on the matter.

Participants’ years of work experience in higher education were identified. Based on the final sample, 65.4% of academic advisors had zero to ten years of work experience in higher education and 34.6% had eleven or more years of experience.

Table 4.1 depicts the descriptive data analysis results of study participants’ characteristics.
Table 4.1

*Descriptive Statistics for Characteristics of Study Participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>(%)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female (=1)</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>(75.6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male (=2)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>(24.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>1.185</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-24 (=1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34 (=2)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>(34.6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44 (=3)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>(32.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54 (=4)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(15.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64 (=5)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(12.8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74 (=6)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(3.8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>1.620</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (=1)</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>(65.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black (=2)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>(21.8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian (=3)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nat. Hawa/Pacific Isl. (=4)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amer. Indian/Alaska. (=5)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (=6)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>(11.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Advisor Title</strong></td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes (=1)</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No (=2)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>(%)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public College/University Type</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.501</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 year (=1)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>(44.9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 year (=2)</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>(55.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Academic Advising Duties</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>1.314</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree (=1)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(10.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree (=2)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(7.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral (=3)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree (=4)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>(34.6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree (=5)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>(46.2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Education Work Experience</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>1.206</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-5 years (=1)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>(25.6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years (=2)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>(39.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years (=3)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(15.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 years (=4)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>(11.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20+ years (=5)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(7.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Advising Work Experience</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>.909</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-5 years (=1)</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>(56.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years (=2)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>(29.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years (=3)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(6.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 years (=4)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(7.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20+ years (=5)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Professional characteristics constructs descriptive data analysis. The professional characteristics constructs in this research study included and measured responses related to Habley’s (1986) basic characteristics of a profession. Respondents’ were asked to respond to survey questions related to professional characteristics constructs, educational activities, research activities, and professional development activities, performed as a part of their work-related activities as an academic advisor. Table 4.2 depicts the educational activities descriptive data analysis results.

Descriptive Statistics Educational Activities

Educational activities were measured based upon the study participants’ highest level of education, the relatedness of the participants’ college degree to academic advising, and if study participants believed that their college degrees prepared them for the current position as an academic advisor. Study participants were also measured on their familiarity and interest in/with academic advising graduate degree programs and graduate certification programs.

*Education Levels*

Based on the final sample, 32.1% of academic advisors had undergraduate level education, 66.70% had graduate level education and 1.3% had no degree/some college work.
Table 4.2

Descriptive Statistics for Educational Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>(%)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College/No Degree (=1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associates Degree (=2)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree (=3)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>(30.8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Degree (=4)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>(59.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral/Terminal Degree (=5)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(7.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA degree Qualification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College/No Degree (=1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associates Degree (=2)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(10.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree (=3)</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>(84.6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Degree (=4)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(5.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral/Terminal Degree (=5)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA degree related to AA field</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree (=1)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>(11.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree (=2)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>(19.2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral (=3)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>(19.2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree (=4)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>(34.6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree (=5)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(15.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA degree prepared for AA field</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree (=1)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(6.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree (=2)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(3.8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral (=3)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>(19.2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree (=4)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>(51.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree (=5)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>(19.2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.2 (continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>(%)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Path for Promotion at AA institution</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>1.052</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree (=1)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>(29.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree (=2)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>(35.9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral (=3)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(17.9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree (=4)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>(16.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree (=5)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiarity w/ AA Graduate Programs</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>.949</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Knowledge (=1)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(15.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Knowledge (=2)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>(38.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Knowledge (=3)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>(32.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledgeable (=4)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(12.8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceptional Knowledge (=5)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in pursuing AA Graduate degree</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>1.077</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree (=1)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>(19.23)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree (=2)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>(35.9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral (=3)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>(29.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree (=4)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(10.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree (=5)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(5.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in pursuing AA Graduate Certificate</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>1.147</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree (=1)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>(16.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree (=2)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>(19.2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral (=3)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>(23.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree (=4)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>(39.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Relatedness of College Degree to Academic Advising

Study participants’ earned college degree(s) relatedness to academic advising variables results indicated that 30.8% of academic advisors did not believe that the college degrees they received were related to academic advising. Exactly 50.0% academic advisors believed that the college degrees they received were related to academic advising, with 19.23% being neutral on a decision.

Academic Advisor Position Degree Qualifications

Study participants’ position degree requirements results indicated that 94.9% of academic advisors positions required an undergraduate degree and 5.1% of academic advisors positions required a graduate degree.

College Degree Related to Academic Advising Field

Study participants’ sense of how their college degrees related to field of academic advising variables is also measured. Based on the final sample, 30.8% of academic advisors did not believe that the college degrees they received were related to the field of academic advising and exactly 50.0% agreed that their college degrees related to the field of academic advising, with 19.2% being neutral on a decision.

College Degree Prepared for Academic Advising

Study participants’ sense of how their college degrees prepared them to become academic advisors variables is also measured. Based on the final sample, 10.3% of academic advisors did not believe that the college degrees they received were related
to academic advising. Results showed that 70.5% of academic advisors believed that
the college degrees they received did prepare them for the field of academic advising
with 19.2% being neutral on a decision.

**Institutional Promotion Path for Academic Advisors**

Study participants indicated whether or not the institutions that employed them
had a path for promotion for the academic advising position. Based on the final sample,
16.7% of participants agreed that their institution had a promotion path for academic
advisors, 65.4% did not agree, with 17.9% being neutral on a decision.

**Familiarity with Graduate and Certificate Programs**

Based on the final sample, 53.8% of academic advisors indicated that they do
not possess any knowledge of graduate and certificate education programs of higher
education in academic advising. Only 46.2% of academic advisors indicated that they
possess knowledge of graduate and certificate education programs of higher education
in academic advising.

**Interest in Pursuing Graduate Degrees in Academic Advising**

Based on the final sample, 55.1% of academic advisors reported no interested in
pursuing graduate level education in academic advising. The percentage of academic
advisors identified as being interested in graduate level education was 15.4%, with
29.5% being neutral on a decision.
Interest in Pursuing Graduate Certificates In Academic Advising

Based on the final sample, 35.9% of academic advisors were not interested in pursuing graduate level education in academic advising. The percentage of academic advisors identified as being interested in graduate level certificate education was 39.7%, with 23.1% being neutral on a decision.

Descriptive Statistics for Professional Development Activities

Professional development activities constructs were measured based upon study participants' membership with NACADA and other professional organizations. Study participants were asked to provide the frequency of their participation in professional development activities on/off their college campuses, the relatedness of professional development received to academic advising, whether or not funding was provided by their college/universities to participate in professional development activities off campus. Table 4.3 depicts the professional development activities descriptive data analysis results.

Professional Organization Membership/NACADA Membership

For the purposes of professional development, study participants indicated their membership with NACADA and other professional organizations. The results for members and non-members of NACADA were both 50.0%. According to the final sample, 57.7% of academic advisors identified themselves as members of other professional organizations whereas 34.6% of participants identified has not being members of other professional organizations, with 7.7% being neutral on a decision.
Table 4.3

Descriptive Statistics for Professional Development Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>(%)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Member of professional Organization</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree (=1)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>(14.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree (=2)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>(20.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral (=3)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(7.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree (=4)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>(37.2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree (=5)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>(20.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member of NACADA</th>
<th>78</th>
<th></th>
<th>.50</th>
<th>.503</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes (=1)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>(50.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No (=0)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>(41.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure (=0)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(9.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of participation in AA PD on campus</th>
<th>78</th>
<th></th>
<th>3.44</th>
<th>.847</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never (=1)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(2.6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrequently (=2)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(9.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes (=3)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>(37.2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently (=4)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>(44.9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Frequently (=5)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(6.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of participation in AA PD off campus</th>
<th>78</th>
<th></th>
<th>2.53</th>
<th>.833</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never (=1)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>(11.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrequently (=2)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>(34.6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes (=3)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>(43.6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently (=4)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(10.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Frequently (=5)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
Table 4.3 (continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>(%)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of funding for AA PD off campus</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>.913</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never (=1)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(12.8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrequently (=2)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>(59.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes (=3)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(17.9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently (=4)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(6.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Frequently (=5)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(3.8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall rating of AA PD at AA institution</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>1.192</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost Never Related (=1)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(10.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usually Not Related (=2)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(9.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally Related (=3)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>(23.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usually Related (=4)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>(39.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost Always Related (=5)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(17.9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Professional Development Activity Participation On/Off Campus

The frequency of academic advisors’ participation in professional development activities on/off campus related to the field of academic advising was measured. Study participants indicated their frequency of participation in professional development activities on/off campus related to academic advising. Study participants identified the frequency with which they participated in professional development activities on campus related to academic advising. According to the final sample, 11.5% of academic advisors identified themselves as non-frequently participating in professional development activities on campus relating to academic advising, whereas 88.5% of participants identified as frequently participating in professional development activities on campus.

Study participants identified the frequency with which they participated in professional development activities off campus related to academic advising. According to the final sample, 46.2% of academic advisors identified themselves as non-frequently participating in professional development activities off campus relating to academic advising, whereas 53.8% of participants identified as frequently participating in professional development activities off campus.

Institutional Funding for Off Campus Professional Development Activity

The frequency with which of academic advisor receives institutional funding for participation in professional development activities off campus related to the field of academic advising is measured. Study participants identified the frequency with which they participated in professional development activities off campus related to academic
advising funded by their institutions. According to the final sample, 88.5% of academic advisors identified themselves as non-frequently received funding for participation in professional development activities off campus relating to academic advising and those participants who indicated that they frequently received funding for off campus professional development activities was 28.2%.

**Institutional Overall Rating of Professional Development**

Based on the final sample, 19.2% of academic advisors did not believe that professional development activities they participated in were related to academic advising, whereas 80.8% of academic advisors believed that the professional development activities they participated in were related to the field of academic advising.

**Descriptive Statistics for Research Activities**

Research activities is measured based upon study participants indicating whether or not their institutions expected them to participate in scholarly research as a part of their job responsibilities as well as the frequency with which participants read scholarly research articles on academic advising. Study participants indicated the number of scholarly research articles they have submitted for journal publication. Participates were also measured on the likelihood that they would submit scholarly research for publication in refereed journals. Lastly, study participants were measured on their knowledge of the existing body of published research on academic advising. Table 4.4 depicts the research activities descriptive data analysis results.
Table 4.4

Descriptive Statistics for Research Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>(%)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Expectation of AA participate</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>.873</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree (=1)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>(34.6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree (=2)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>(43.6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral (=3)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(15.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree (=4)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(6.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree (=5)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of AA read scholarly research</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>.908</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 articles (=1)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(15.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3 articles (=2)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>(32.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5 articles (=3)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>(39.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-8 articles (=4)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(12.8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9+ articles (=5)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of submitted journal articles</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>.194</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 articles (=1)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>(96.2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3 articles (=2)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(3.8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5 articles (=3)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-8 articles (=4)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9+ articles (=5)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood of submitting journal articles</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>.956</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all likely (=1)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>(23.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlikely (=2)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>(39.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Likely (=3)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>(29.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likely (=4)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(5.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Likely (=5)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(2.6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
Table 4.4 (continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>(%)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of AA existing body of research</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>.833</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Knowledge (=1)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(10.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Knowledge (=2)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>(42.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Knowledge (=3)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>(35.9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledgeable (=4)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>(11.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceptional Knowledge (=5)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Institutional Expectation to Participate in Scholarly Research

Study participants' indication of institutional expectation to participate in scholarly research as a part of academic advisors job responsibilities results indicated that 78.2% of academic advisors were not employed by institutions that required scholarly research activities as a part of their job responsibilities, whereas 5.0% academic advisors believed that their employer expected they participate in scholarly research activities, and 15.4% being neutral on a decision.

Frequency of Reading Scholarly Research

The frequency of academic advisors reading scholarly research on academic advising was measured. According to the final sample, 47.4% of academic advisors identified themselves as non-frequently reading scholarly research and 52.6% of participants identified as frequently reading scholarly research.

Submitted Research Articles for Publication

The number of research articles submitted for publication was measured. Study participants indicated the number of research articles on academic advising that they have submitted for publication. According to the final sample, 3.8% of academic advisors indicated that they have submitted research articles on academic advising for publication and 96.2% of participants indicated that they had not submitted scholarly articles on academic advising for publication.
**Likelihood of Submitting Scholarly Research for Publication**

Based on the final sample, 62.8% of academic advisors identified as non-likely to submit research scholarly research on academic advising to refereed journals, whereas 37.2% of participants identified as likely to submit scholarly research.

**Knowledge of the Existing Body of Research on Academic Advising**

Based on the final sample, 52.6% of academic advisors indicated that they did not possess any knowledge of the existing body of research on academic advising and 47.7% of academic advisors indicated that they possessed knowledge of the existing body of research on academic advising.

**Professional Standards Construct Descriptive Data Analysis**

The professional standards constructs in this research study include and measure responses related to professional standards as set forth by CAS standards for academic advising. Professional standards as a construct is measured by the academic advisors’ beliefs that the work they perform has a standard of practice and that they possess knowledge of the mission statements of their offices. Participants indicated whether or not the educational plans they developed with students were meaningful and effective. Lastly, study participants were measured on their knowledge of institutional policy affecting students and their knowledge of academic advising ethical standards, and assessment and evaluation. Table 4.5 depicts the professional standards constructs descriptive data analysis.
### Table 4.5

**Descriptive Statistics for Professional Standards Construct**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>(%)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AA work has Standard of Practice</strong></td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>.925</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost Never True (=1)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(2.6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usually Not True (=2)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(2.6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally True (=3)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(10.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usually True (=4)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>(38.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost Always True (=5)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>(46.2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mission</strong></td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>.912</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree (=1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree (=2)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(3.8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral (=3)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(15.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree (=4)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>(34.6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree (=5)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>(44.9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AA work-related Student Educational Plans</strong></td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>.638</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost Never Related (=1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usually Not Related (=2)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(2.6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally Related (=3)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(2.6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usually Related (=4)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>(14.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost Always Related (=5)</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>(80.8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effectiveness of Educational Plans</strong></td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>.658</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost Never Effective (=1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usually Not Effective (=2)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally Effective (=3)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(6.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usually Effective (=4)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>(50.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost Always Effective (=5)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>(42.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>(%)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of Student Institutional Policy</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>.670</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Knowledge (=1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Knowledge (=2)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Knowledge (=3)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(7.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledgeable (=4)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>(50.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceptional Knowledge (=5)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>(41.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of Ethical Standards</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>.737</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Knowledge (=1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Knowledge (=2)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(3.8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Knowledge (=3)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(6.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledgeable (=4)</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>(52.6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceptional Knowledge (=5)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>(37.2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of Assessment and Evaluation</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>.957</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Knowledge (=1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Knowledge (=2)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>(14.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Knowledge (=3)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>(21.8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledgeable (=4)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>(47.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceptional Knowledge (=5)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(15.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Belief that the Work They Perform has a Standard of Practice

Based on the final sample, 94.87% of study participants believed their work to have a standard of practice, while 5.13% did not believe their work had a standard of practice.

Academic Advisors’ Familiarity with Office Mission Statement

Based on the final sample 5.13% of academic advisors indicated that they did not possess any knowledge of an office mission statement. Whereas 79.49% of academic advisors were knowledgeable of their offices mission statement, 1.538% indicated that they were neutral on the possessed knowledge of their office mission statement.

Relatedness of Academic Advising to Meaningful Student Educational Plans

Based on the final sample 2.56% of academic advisors did not believe that work as an academic advisor related to a meaningful student education plan, whereas 97.44% of academic advisors believed that their work did relate.

Effectiveness of Student Educational Plans

Based on the final sample, 1.28% of academic advisors did not believe that educational plans established with students were effective, whereas 98.72% of academic advisors believed that the educational plans were effective.

Knowledge of Institutional Policy Affecting Students

Based on the final sample, 1.28% of academic advisors indicated that they had
Knowledge of Ethical Standards for Academic Advising

Based on the final sample, 3.85% of academic advisors indicated that they had no knowledge of academic advisors' ethical standards, whereas 96.15% of academic advisors indicated that they possessed knowledge of academic advisors' ethical standards.

Knowledge of Institutional Assessment and Evaluation Plans

Based on the final sample, 1.53% of academic advisors indicated that they had no knowledge of their institutions' assessment and evaluation plans, whereas 84.62% of academic advisors indicated that they possessed knowledge of their institutions' assessment and evaluation plans.

Spearman’s Rho Correlation Data Analysis

The Spearman’s rho correlation analysis correlated the variables measuring academic advisors’ work-related activities with professional characteristics constructs (educational activities, research activities, and professional development activities) and professional standards constructs. Only those variables that resulted in a statistically significant relationship are reported and discussed. The effect size for each statistically significant relationship revealed from the Spearman’s rho correlation analysis was...
determined utilizing Cohen’s (1988) correlation effect size threshold; .0-0.3 (small effect size), 0.3-0.5 (medium effect size), and 0.5-higher (high effect size).

Correlations between Educational Activities

Table 4.6 depicts the Spearman’s rho data results for educational activities. The Spearman’s rho revealed a statistically significant relationship between the degree required for an academic advising position and the level of education of the academic advisors’, \( r_s(78) = .272, p< .05 \). The effect size of this relationship is small (Cohen, 1988). Squaring the correlation coefficients indicated that 7.4% of the variance in the degree required for an academic advising position was explained by the level of education of the academic advisors’. Similarly, 7.4% of the variance in the percent of degree required for an academic advising position and evaluation was explained by the level of education of the academic advisors’.

The Spearman’s rho revealed a statistically significant relationship between advisors’ beliefs that the degrees they hold prepared them for the field of academic advising and the degree required for an academic advising position \( r_s(78) = .228, p< .05 \). The effect size of this relationship is small (Cohen, 1988). Squaring the correlation coefficients indicated that 5.2% of the variance in the advisors’ beliefs that the degrees they hold prepared them for the field of academic advising was explained by the degree required for an academic advising position. Similarly, 5.2% of the variance in the percentage of the respondents’ degree required for an academic advising position was explained by an advisor’s beliefs that the degrees they hold prepared them for the field of academic advising.
### Table 4.6

**Spearman’s Rho Correlations between Educational Activities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>AA Position Required</th>
<th>Degree Related to AA</th>
<th>Degree Prepared for AA</th>
<th>Defined Promotion Path</th>
<th>Familiar w/ AA Grad. Programs</th>
<th>Interest in AA Grad. Prog.</th>
<th>Interest in AA Cert.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education Level rho</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Level n</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA rho</td>
<td>.272*</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position rho</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree rho</td>
<td>-.067</td>
<td>-.071</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree n</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related rho</td>
<td>.558</td>
<td>.535</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree rho to AA n</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree rho Prepared for AA n</td>
<td>.155</td>
<td>.228*</td>
<td>.270*</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree rho Prepared for AA n</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defined rho Promo. rho</td>
<td>-.131</td>
<td>-.050</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>-.076</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defined rho Promo. rho n</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defined rho Grad. Path rho</td>
<td>-.146</td>
<td>-.164</td>
<td>.212</td>
<td>-.043</td>
<td>-.023</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defined rho Grad. Path rho n</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiar w/ AA rho</td>
<td>-.351**</td>
<td>-.042</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>-.133</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiar w/ AA rho n</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest rho in AA rho</td>
<td>-.230*</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>-.130</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.484**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest rho in AA rho n</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest rho Cert. rho</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.797</td>
<td>.339</td>
<td>.255</td>
<td>.724</td>
<td>.737</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest rho Cert. rho n</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlation Significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed); ** Correlation Significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)
Also, the Spearman’s rho revealed a statistically significant relationship between advisors’ belief that the degrees they hold prepared them for the field of academic advising and the advisors belief that the degrees they hold are related to the field of academic advising, \( r_s(78) = .270, p < .05 \). The effect size of this relationship is small (Cohen, 1988). Squaring the correlation coefficients indicated that 7.29% of the variance an advisor’s beliefs that the degrees they hold prepared them for the field of academic advising was explained by the advisors’ beliefs that the degrees they hold are related to the field of academic advising. Similarly, 7.29% of the variance in the percent of the advisors’ beliefs that the degrees they hold are related to the field of academic advising was explained by the advisors’ beliefs that the degrees they hold are related to the field of academic advising.

The academic advisors’ interest in pursuing graduate programs of study in academic advising and the advisors’ education level also resulted in the Spearman’s rho revealing a statistically significant negative relationship, \( r_s(78) = -.351, p < .01 \). The effect size of this relationship is medium (Cohen, 1988). Squaring the correlation coefficients indicated that 12.32% of the variance the advisors’ interest in pursuing graduate programs of study in academic advising was explained by the advisors’ education level. Similarly, 12.32% of the variance in the percent of educational level was explained by the advisors’ interest in pursuing graduate programs of study in academic advising.

The Spearman’s rho revealed a statistically significant relationship between an academic advisors’ interest in pursuing a certificate program of study in academic advising and the level of education of an academic advisor, \( r_s(78) = -.230, p < .05 \). The
effect size of this relationship is small (Cohen, 1988). Squaring the correlation coefficients indicated that 5.29% of the variance of the academic advisors’ interest in pursuing a certificate program of study in academic advising was explained by the level of education of an academic advisor. Similarly, 5.29% of the variance in the percent the level of education of an academic advisor was explained by the academic advisors’ interest in pursuing a certificate program of study in academic advising.

Lastly, the Spearman’s rho revealed a statistically significant negative relationship between the academic advisors’ interest in pursuing a certificate program of study in academic advising and interest in pursuing graduate programs of study in academic advising, \( r_s(78) = -.484, p < .01 \). The effect size of this relationship is medium (Cohen, 1988). Squaring the correlation coefficients indicated that 23.43% of the variance of the academic advisors’ interest in pursuing a certificate program of study in academic advising was explained by the level of education of an academic advisor. Similarly, 23.43% of the variance in interest in pursuing graduate programs of study in academic advising was explained by the academic advisors’ interest in pursuing a certificate program of study in academic advising.

*Correlations between Educational Activities and Professional Development Activities*

Table 4.7 depicts the Spearman’s rho data results for educational activities and professional development activities. Interestingly this table depicts a relationship between the academic advisors’ beliefs that the degrees they hold are related to academic advising and all professional development activities.
### Table 4.7

**Spearman’s Rho Correlations between Educational Activities and Professional Development Activities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Member of Other Organization</th>
<th>NACADA Member</th>
<th>PD Act. On Campus</th>
<th>PD Act. Off Campus</th>
<th>Fund. Off Camp PD</th>
<th>PD Related AA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>( r_h )</td>
<td>-0.135</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>-0.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>( \rho )</td>
<td>0.237</td>
<td>0.461</td>
<td>0.986</td>
<td>0.960</td>
<td>0.901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( n )</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>( r_h )</td>
<td>0.139</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>-0.021</td>
<td>-0.041</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>( \rho )</td>
<td>0.224</td>
<td>0.572</td>
<td>0.856</td>
<td>0.723</td>
<td>0.985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>( r_h )</td>
<td>0.358**</td>
<td>-0.227*</td>
<td>0.325**</td>
<td>0.352**</td>
<td>0.241*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related</td>
<td>( \rho )</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to AA</td>
<td>( n )</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>( r_h )</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>-0.091</td>
<td>0.185</td>
<td>0.177</td>
<td>0.226*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepared</td>
<td>( \rho )</td>
<td>0.738</td>
<td>0.426</td>
<td>0.104</td>
<td>0.121</td>
<td>0.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for AA</td>
<td>( n )</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defined</td>
<td>( r_h )</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>-0.093</td>
<td>0.232*</td>
<td>0.171</td>
<td>0.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promo.</td>
<td>( \rho )</td>
<td>0.346</td>
<td>0.420</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>0.135</td>
<td>0.753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Path</td>
<td>( n )</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiar</td>
<td>( r_h )</td>
<td>0.144</td>
<td>-0.065</td>
<td>0.317**</td>
<td>0.327**</td>
<td>0.279*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/AA</td>
<td>( \rho )</td>
<td>0.208</td>
<td>0.573</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad. Prog.</td>
<td>( n )</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>( r_h )</td>
<td>0.199</td>
<td>-0.085</td>
<td>-0.095</td>
<td>0.177</td>
<td>0.121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in AA</td>
<td>( \rho )</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td>0.460</td>
<td>0.407</td>
<td>0.121</td>
<td>0.292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad. Prog.</td>
<td>( n )</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>( r_h )</td>
<td>0.210</td>
<td>-0.185</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>0.242*</td>
<td>0.126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in AA</td>
<td>( \rho )</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>0.106</td>
<td>0.808</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cert. Prog.</td>
<td>( n )</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlation Significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed); ** Correlation Significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)
The Spearman’s rho revealed a statistically significant relationship between the academic advisors’ beliefs that the degrees they hold are related to academic advising and being members of other professional organizations that support their work as academic advisors’, 
\( r_s(78) = .358, p < .01 \). The effect size of this relationship is medium (Cohen, 1988). Squaring the correlation coefficients indicated that 12.82% of the variance the academic advisors’ beliefs that the degrees they hold are related to academic advising was explained by being members of other professional organizations that support their work as academic advisors’. Similarly, 12.82% of the variance in being members of other professional organizations that support their work as academic advisors was explained by the academic advisors’ beliefs that the degrees they hold are related to academic advising.

The Spearman’s rho also revealed a statistically significant negative relationship between the academic advisors’ beliefs that the degrees they hold are related to academic advising and NACADA membership, 
\( r_s(78) = -.227, p < .05 \). The effect size of this relationship is small (Cohen, 1988). Squaring the correlation coefficients indicated that 5.15% of the variance the academic advisors’ beliefs that the degrees they hold are related to academic advising was explained by respondents’ NACADA membership. Similarly, 5.15% of the variance in interest respondents’ NACADA membership was explained by the academic advisors’ beliefs that the degrees they hold are related to academic advising.

Another statistically significant relationship revealed by the Spearman’s rho is between the academic advisors’ beliefs that the degrees they hold are related to academic advising and respondents’ professional development received on campus
being related to academic advising, \( r_s(78) = .325, p< .01 \). The effect size of this relationship is medium (Cohen, 1988). Squaring the correlation coefficients indicated that 10.56% of the variance of the academic advisors’ beliefs that the degrees they hold are related to academic advising was explained by respondents’ professional development received on campus being related to academic advising. Similarly, 10.56% of the variance in interest respondents’ professional development received on campus being related to academic advising was explained by the academic advisors’ beliefs that the degrees they hold are related to academic advising.

Also, the Spearman’s rho revealed a statistically significant relationship between the academic advisors’ beliefs that the degrees they hold are related to academic advising and professional development received off campus is related to academic advising, \( r_s(78) = .352, p< .05 \). The effect size of this relationship is medium (Cohen, 1988). Squaring the correlation coefficients indicated that 12.39% of the variance the academic advisors’ beliefs that the degrees they hold are related to academic advising was explained by professional development received off campus is related to academic advising. Similarly, 12.39% of the variance in professional development received off campus is related to academic advising was explained by the academic advisors’ beliefs that the degrees they hold are related to academic advising.

The Spearman’s rho also revealed a statistically significant relationship between the academic advisors’ beliefs that the degrees they hold are related to academic advising and funding for professional development received off campus, \( r_s(78) = .241, p< .05 \). The effect size of this relationship is small (Cohen, 1988). Squaring the correlation coefficients indicated that 5.81% of the variance the academic advisors’
beliefs that the degrees they hold are related to academic advising was explained by funding for professional development received off campus. Similarly, 5.81% of the variance in funding for professional development received off campus was explained by the academic advisors’ beliefs that the degrees they hold are related to academic advising.

The academic advisors’ beliefs that the degrees they hold are related to academic advising and professional development received is related to academic advising, was also revealed by the Spearman’s rho to have a statistically significant relationship, \( r_s (78) = .233, p < .05 \). The effect size of this relationship is small (Cohen, 1988). Squaring the correlation coefficients indicated that 5.43% of the variance the academic advisors’ beliefs that the degrees they hold are related to academic advising was explained by professional development received is related to academic advising. Similarly, 5.43% of the variance of professional development received is related to academic advising was explained by the academic advisors’ beliefs that the degrees they hold are related to academic advising.

The Spearman’s rho revealed that statistically significant relationship between the academic advisors’ beliefs that they the degrees they hold prepared them for the field of advising and receiving funding for off campus professional development, \( r_s (78) = .226, p < .05 \). The effect size of this relationship is small (Cohen, 1988). Squaring the correlation coefficients indicated that 5.11% of the variance the academic advisors’ beliefs that the degrees they hold are related to academic advising was explained by receiving funding for off campus professional development. Similarly, 5.11% of the variance of receiving funding for off campus professional development was explained by
the academic advisors’ beliefs that the degrees they hold are related to academic advising.

Also, the Spearman’s rho revealed a statistically significant relationship between the academic advisors’ beliefs that the degrees they hold prepared them for the field of advising and the belief that the professional development received was related to academic advising, \( r_s(78) = .245, p < .05 \). The effect size of this relationship is small (Cohen, 1988). Squaring the correlation coefficients indicated that 6.0% of the variance the academic advisors’ beliefs that the degrees they hold are related to academic advising was explained by the belief that the professional development received was related to academic advising. Similarly, 6.0% of the variance of respondents’ belief that the professional development received was related to academic advising was explained by the academic advisors’ beliefs that the degrees they hold are related to academic advising.

The Spearman’s rho revealed a statistically significant relationship between a defined promotion path and professional development activities on campus, which was statistically significant \( r_s(78) = .232, p < .05 \). The effect size of this relationship is small (Cohen, 1988). Squaring the correlation coefficients indicated that 5.38% of the variance a defined promotion path was explained by professional development activities on campus. Similarly, 5.38% of the variance of professional development activities on campus was related to academic advising was explained by a defined promotion path.

Spearman’s rho also revealed a statistically significant relationship between the academic advisors’ familiarity with graduate programs of study for academic advising and professional development activities on campus, \( r_s(78) = .317, p < .01 \). The effect
size of this relationship is medium (Cohen, 1988). Squaring the correlation coefficients indicated that 10.05% of the variance of the academic advisors’ familiarity with graduate programs of study for academic advising was explained by professional development activities on campus. Similarly, 10.05% of the variance of professional development activities on campus was related to academic advising was explained by the academic advisors’ familiarity with graduate programs of study for academic advising.

The Spearman’s rho revealed a statistically significant relationship between the academic advisors’ familiarity with graduate programs of study for academic advising and professional development activities off campus, \( r_s(78) = .327, p < .01 \). The effect size of this relationship is medium (Cohen, 1988). Squaring the correlation coefficients indicated that 10.69% of the variance of the academic advisors’ familiarity with graduate programs of study for academic advising was explained by professional development activities off campus. Similarly, 10.69% of the variance of professional development activities off campus was related to academic advising was explained by the academic advisors’ familiarity with graduate programs of study for academic advising.

Familiarity with graduate programs of study for academic advising and funding received for off campus professional development, was also revealed by the Spearman’s rho to have a statistically significant relationship, \( r_s(78) = .279, p < .05 \). The effect size of this relationship is small (Cohen, 1988). Squaring the correlation coefficients indicated that 7.78% of the variance of the academic advisors’ familiarity with graduate programs of study for academic advising was explained by professional development activities off campus. Similarly, 7.78% of the variance of professional development activities off campus was related to academic advising was explained by
the academic advisors’ familiarity with graduate programs of study for academic advising.

The Spearman’s rho revealed a statistically significant relationship between the academic advisors’ familiarity with graduate programs of study for academic advising and professional development received being related to academic advising, \( r_s(78) = .345, p< .01 \). The effect size of this relationship is medium (Cohen, 1988). Squaring the correlation coefficients indicated that 11.90% of the variance of the academic advisors’ familiarity with graduate programs of study for academic advising was explained by professional development received being related to academic advising. Similarly, 11.90% of the variance of professional development received being related to academic advising was explained by the academic advisors’ familiarity with graduate programs of study for academic advising.

The Spearman’s rho also revealed a statistically significant relationship between the academic advisors’ interest in pursuing a certificate program of study in academic advising and professional development received off campus, \( r_s(78) = .242, p< .05 \). The effect size of this relationship is small (Cohen, 1988). Squaring the correlation coefficients indicated that 5.85% of the variance of the academic advisors’ familiarity with graduate programs of study for academic advising was explained by professional development received being related to academic advising. Similarly, 5.85% of the variance of professional development received being related to academic advising was explained by the academic advisors’ familiarity with graduate programs of study for academic advising.

Lastly the Spearman’s rho revealed a statistically significant relationship between
the academic advisors’ interest in pursuing a certificate program of study in academic advising and professional development received being related to academic advising, which was statistically significant ($r_s(78) = .241, p< .05$). The effect size of this relationship is small (Cohen, 1988). Squaring the correlation coefficients indicated that 5.81% of the variance of the academic advisors’ interest in pursuing a certificate program of study in academic advising was explained by professional development received being related to academic advising. Similarly, 5.81% of the variance of professional development received being related to academic advising was explained by the academic advisors’ interest in pursuing a certificate program of study in academic advising.

**Correlations between Educational Activities and Research Activities**

A Spearman’s rho rank order correlation analysis was run to determine the relationship between educational activities and research activities. Table 4.8 depicts the Spearman’s rho data results for educational activities and research activities.

The Spearman’s rho revealed a statistically significant negative relationship between respondents’ degrees required for academic advising position and frequency of reading research on academic advising, ($r_s(78) = -.256, p< .05$). The effect size of this relationship is small (Cohen, 1988). Squaring the correlation coefficients indicated that 6.55% of the variance of respondents’ degrees required for academic advising position was explained by frequency of reading research on academic advising. Similarly, 6.55% of the variance of frequency of reading research on academic advising was explained by respondents’ degrees required for academic advising position.
### Table 4.8

**Spearman’s Rho Correlations between Educational Activities and Research Activities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education rho</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>-.135</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>-.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education rho</td>
<td>.493</td>
<td>.516</td>
<td>.237</td>
<td>.566</td>
<td>.856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education n</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA rho</td>
<td>-.101</td>
<td>-.256*</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>-.110</td>
<td>-.298**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position rho</td>
<td>.379</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.805</td>
<td>.340</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position n</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree rho</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>.191</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.152</td>
<td>.267*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree rho</td>
<td>.330</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>.523</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree rho</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>.307**</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>.208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree rho</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.738</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree n</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defined rho</td>
<td>.157</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>-.176</td>
<td>-.017</td>
<td>-.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defined rho</td>
<td>.171</td>
<td>.782</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.883</td>
<td>.986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defined n</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiar rho</td>
<td>.260*</td>
<td>.253*</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>.259*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiar rho</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.675</td>
<td>.509</td>
<td>.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiar n</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest rho</td>
<td>-.044</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest rho</td>
<td>.703</td>
<td>.510</td>
<td>.687</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>.618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest n</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest rho</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>.235*</td>
<td>.133</td>
<td>.282*</td>
<td>.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest rho</td>
<td>.390</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.245</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest n</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlation Significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed); ** Correlation Significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)
The Spearman’s rho also revealed a statistically significant negative relationship between respondents’ degrees required for academic advising position and knowledge of academic advising research, \( r_s(78) = -0.298, p < .05 \). The effect size of this relationship is small (Cohen, 1988). Squaring the correlation coefficients indicated that 8.88% of the variance of respondents’ degrees required for academic advising position was explained by knowledge of academic advising research. Similarly, 8.88% of the variance of knowledge of academic advising research was explained by respondents’ degrees required for academic advising position.

Another statistically significant relationship revealed by the Spearman’s rho is between respondents’ belief that the degrees held related to academic advising and knowledge on academic advising research, \( r_s(78) = 0.307, p < .05 \). The effect size of this relationship is medium (Cohen, 1988). Squaring the correlation coefficients indicated that 9.92% of the variance of respondents’ belief that the degrees held related to academic advising was explained by knowledge on academic advising research. Similarly, 9.92% of the variance of knowledge of academic advising research was explained by respondents’ belief that the degrees held related to academic advising.

Familiarity with graduate programs of study on academic advising and respondents’ institutional research expectation as an academic advisor, revealed statistically significant results with the Spearman’s rho, \( r_s(78) = 0.260, p < .05 \). The effect size of this relationship is small (Cohen, 1988). Squaring the correlation coefficients indicated that 6.76% of the variance of respondents’ familiarity with graduate programs of study on academic advising was explained respondents’ institutional research expectation as an academic advisor. Similarly, 6.76% of the
variance of respondents’ institutional research expectation as an academic advisor was explained by familiarity with graduate programs of study on academic advising.

The Spearman’s rho revealed a significant relationship between respondents’ familiarity with graduate programs for academic advising and frequency of reading research on academic advising, ($r_s(78) = .253, p< .05$). The effect size of this relationship is small (Cohen, 1988). Squaring the correlation coefficients indicated that 6.40% of the variance of respondents’ familiarity with graduate programs for academic advising was explained by frequency of reading research on academic advising. Similarly, 6.40% of the variance of frequency of reading research on academic advising was explained by respondents’ familiarity with graduate programs for academic advising.

The Spearman’s rho revealed a statistically significant relationship between respondents’ familiarity with graduate programs of study and knowledge of research on academic advising, ($r_s(78) = .259, p< .05$). The effect size of this relationship is small (Cohen, 1988). Squaring the correlation coefficients indicated that 6.71% of the variance of respondents’ familiarity with graduate programs for academic advising was explained by knowledge of research on academic advising. Similarly, 6.71% of the variance of frequency and knowledge of research on academic advising was explained by respondents’ familiarity with graduate programs for academic advising.

The Spearman’s rho revealed a statistically significant relationship between interest in pursuing certificate programs of study on academic advising and respondents’ frequency of reading research on academic advising ($r_s(78) = .235, p< .05$). The effect size of this relationship is small (Cohen, 1988). Squaring the correlation coefficients indicated that 5.55% of the variance of respondents’ interest in pursuing certificate programs of study on academic advising was explained by frequency of reading research on academic advising. Similarly, 5.55% of the variance of frequency of reading research on academic advising was explained by respondents’ interest in pursuing certificate programs of study on academic advising.
coefficients indicated that 6.71% of the variance of respondents’ interest in pursuing certificate programs of study on academic advising was explained by respondents’ frequency of reading research on academic advising. Similarly, 6.71% of the variance respondents’ frequency of reading research on academic advising was explained by respondents’ interest in pursuing certificate programs of study on academic advising.

Lastly, the Spearman’s rho revealed a statistically significant relationship between interest in pursuing certificate programs of study on academic advising and respondents’ likelihood of submitting researching on academic advising ($r_s(78) = .282$, $p < .05$). The effect size of this relationship is small (Cohen, 1988). Squaring the correlation coefficients indicated that 7.95% of the variance of respondents’ interest in pursuing certificate programs of study on academic advising was explained by respondents’ likelihood of submitting researching on academic advising. Similarly, 7.95% of the variance respondents’ likelihood of submitting researching on academic advising was explained by respondents’ interest in pursuing certificate programs of study on academic advising.

**Correlations between Professional Development Activities**

A Spearman’s rho rank order correlation analysis was run to determine the relationship between professional development activities. Table 4.9 depicts the Spearman’s rho correlations between professional development activities.
Table 4.9

*Spearman’s Rho Correlations between Professional Development Activities*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Member of Other Organization</th>
<th>NACADA Member</th>
<th>PD Act. On Campus</th>
<th>PD Act. Off Campus</th>
<th>Fund. Off Camp PD</th>
<th>PD Related to AA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Member of Other Organ.</td>
<td>$\rho$</td>
<td>$-\rho$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\rho$</td>
<td>$\rho$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$n$</td>
<td>$n$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member NACADA</td>
<td>$\rho$</td>
<td>$\rho$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$n$</td>
<td>$n$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD Act. On Campus</td>
<td>$\rho$</td>
<td>$\rho$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$n$</td>
<td>$n$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD Act. Off Campus</td>
<td>$\rho$</td>
<td>$\rho$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$n$</td>
<td>$n$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund. Off Camp PD</td>
<td>$\rho$</td>
<td>$\rho$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$n$</td>
<td>$n$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD Related to AA</td>
<td>$\rho$</td>
<td>$\rho$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$n$</td>
<td>$n$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlation Significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed); ** Correlation Significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)
The Spearman’s rho revealed a statistically negative relationship between membership of other professional organization that supports advisors work and NACADA membership, \((r_s(78) = -.545, p< .01)\). The effect size of this relationship is large (Cohen, 1988). Squaring the correlation coefficients indicated that 29.70% of the variance of respondents’ membership of other professional organization that supports advisors work was explained by respondents’ NACADA membership. Similarly, 29.70% of the variance respondents’ NACADA membership was explained by respondents’ membership of other professional organization that supports advisors work.

Professional development activities relating to academic advising on campus and membership of other professional organizations was revealed by the Spearman’s rho to be statistically significant \((r_s(78) = .318, p< .01)\). The effect size of this relationship is medium (Cohen, 1988). Squaring the correlation coefficients indicated that 10.11% of the variance of respondents’ Professional development activities relating to academic advising on campus was explained by respondents’ membership of other professional organizations. Similarly, 10.11% of the variance respondents’ membership of other professional organizations was explained by professional development activities relating to academic advising on campus.

Also, the Spearman’s rho revealed a statistically significant negative relationship between respondents’ professional development activities relating to academic advising off campus and NACADA membership, \((r_s(78) = -.237, p< .05)\). The effect size of this relationship is small (Cohen, 1988). Squaring the correlation coefficients indicated that 5.62% of the variance of respondents’ professional development activities relating to academic advising off campus was explained by respondents' NACADA membership.
Similarly, 5.62% of the variance respondents’ NACADA membership was explained by professional development activities relating to academic advising off campus.

Professional development activities relating to academic advising off campus had and professional development activities relating to academic advising on campus, was revealed by the Spearman’s rho to have a statistically significant relationship, ($r_s(78) = .581$, $p < .01$). The effect size of this relationship is large (Cohen, 1988). Squaring the correlation coefficients indicated that 33.76% of the variance of respondents’ professional development activities relating to academic advising off campus was explained by respondents’ professional development activities relating to academic advising on campus. Similarly, 33.76% of the variance respondents’ professional development activities relating to academic advising on campus was explained by respondents’ professional development activities relating to academic advising off campus.

Funding for off campus professional development activities and respondents’ membership with other professional organizations that support work of academic advisors, was revealed by the Spearman’s rho to have a statistically significant relationship, ($r_s(78) = .239$, $p < .05$). The effect size of this relationship is small (Cohen, 1988). Squaring the correlation coefficients indicated that 5.71% of the variance of funding for off campus professional development activities was explained by respondents’ membership with other professional organizations that support work of academic advisors. Similarly, 5.71% of the variance respondents’ membership with other professional organizations that support work of academic advisors was explained by funding for off campus professional development activities.
The Spearman’s rho revealed a statistically significant relationship between funding for off campus professional development and professional development activities on campus relating to academic advising, \( (r_s(78) = .441, p < .01) \). The effect size of this relationship is medium (Cohen, 1988). Squaring the correlation coefficients indicated that 19.45% of the variance of respondents’ funding for off campus professional development was explained by respondents’ professional development activities on campus relating to academic advising. Similarly, 19.45% of the variance respondents’ professional development activities on campus relating to academic advising was explained by funding for off campus professional development.

Another Spearman’s rho revealed a statistically significant relationship between funding for off campus professional development activities and professional development activities off campus relating to academic advising, \( (r_s(78) = .631, p < .01) \). The effect size of this relationship is large (Cohen, 1988). Squaring the correlation coefficients indicated that 39.81% of the variance of respondents’ funding for off campus professional development activities was explained by funding for off campus professional development activities and professional development activities off campus relating to academic advising. Similarly, 39.81% of the variance respondents’ funding for off campus professional development activities and professional development activities off campus relating to academic advising was explained by funding for off campus professional development activities.

Professional development received related to academic advising and membership in other professional organizations that support the work of advising was revealed by the Spearman’s rho to have a statistically significant relationship, \( (r_s(78) = \)
The effect size of this relationship is medium (Cohen, 1988). Squaring the correlation coefficients indicated that 12.53% of the variance of respondents’ funding for off campus professional development was explained by respondents’ professional development activities on campus relating to academic advising. Similarly, 12.53% of the variance respondents’ professional development activities on campus relating to academic advising was explained by funding for off campus professional development.

The Spearman’s rho revealed a statistically significant negative relationship between professional development received relating to academic advising and NACADA membership, \( r_s(78) = -0.329, p < .05 \). The effect size of this relationship is medium (Cohen, 1988). Squaring the correlation coefficients indicated that 10.82% of the variance of respondents’ professional development received relating to academic advising was explained by respondents’ NACADA membership. Similarly, 10.82% of the variance respondents’ NACADA membership was explained by professional development received relating to academic advising.

Also, the Spearman’s rho revealed a statistically significant relationship between professional development received relating to academic advising and professional development activities on campus related to academic advising, which was statistically significant \( r_s(78) = 0.538, p < .01 \). The effect size of this relationship is large (Cohen, 1988). Squaring the correlation coefficients indicated that 28.94% of the variance of respondents’ professional development received relating to academic advising was explained by professional development activities on campus related to academic advising. Similarly, 28.94% of the variance respondents’ professional development
activities on campus related to academic advising was explained by professional
development received relating to academic advising

The Spearman’s rho revealed a statistically significant relationship between
professional development received relating to academic advising and professional
development activities off campus related to academic advising, ($r_s(78) = .578, p< .01$).
The effect size of this relationship is large (Cohen, 1988). Squaring the correlation
coefficients indicated that 33.41% of the variance of professional development received
relating to academic advising was explained by professional development activities off
campus related to academic advising. Similarly, 33.41% of the variance respondents’
professional development activities of campus related to academic advising was
explained by professional development activities off campus related to academic
advising.

Lastly, the Spearman’s rho revealed a statistically significant relationship
between professional development received relating to academic advising and funding
received for professional development activities off campus, ($r_s(78) = .455, p< .05$). The
effect size of this relationship is medium (Cohen, 1988). Squaring the correlation
coefficients indicated that 20.70% of the variance of respondents’ professional
development received relating to academic advising was explained by funding received
for professional development activities off campus. Similarly, 20.70% of the variance
respondents’ funding received for professional development activities off campus was
explained by professional development received relating to academic advising.
Correlations between Professional Development Activities and Research Activities

A Spearman’s rho rank order correlation analysis was run to determine the relationship between professional development activities and research activities. Table 4.10 depicts the Spearman’s rho correlation results between professional development and research activities.

The Spearman’s rho revealed a statistically relationship between respondents’ professional development activities on campus and institutional expectation to participate in research activities, \( r_s(78) = .281, p < .05 \). The effect size of this relationship is small (Cohen, 1988). Squaring the correlation coefficients indicated that 7.89% of the variance of respondents’ professional development activities on campus was explained by institutional expectation to participate in research activities. Similarly, 7.89% of the variance of institutional expectation to participate in research activities was explained respondents’ professional development activities on campus.

The Spearman’s rho also revealed a statistically significant relationship between respondents’ professional development activities relating to academic advising on campus and frequency of reading research on academic advising, \( r_s(78) = .300, p < .01 \). The effect size of this relationship is small (Cohen, 1988). Squaring the correlation coefficients indicated that 9.0% of the variance of respondents’ professional development activities relating to academic advising on campus was explained by frequency of reading research on academic advising. Similarly, 9.0% of the variance of frequency of reading research on academic advising was explained by respondents’ professional development activities relating to academic advising on campus.
### Table 4.10

**Spearman’s Rho Correlations between Professional Development Activities and Research Activities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rho</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of Other Organ.</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>.148</td>
<td>.116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.983</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>.786</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td>.312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td>-.107</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>-.125</td>
<td>-.193</td>
<td>-.208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NACADA</td>
<td>.351</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>.275</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD Act. On Campus</td>
<td>.281*</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>.300**</td>
<td>-.104</td>
<td>.190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.365</td>
<td>.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD Act. Off Campus</td>
<td>.400**</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>.517**</td>
<td>-.117</td>
<td>.276*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.307</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund. Of Campus PD</td>
<td>.360**</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>.477**</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.459</td>
<td>.566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD Related to AA</td>
<td>.185</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>.342**</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.914</td>
<td>.083</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlation Significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed); ** Correlation Significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)
The Spearman’s rho revealed a statistically significant relationship between professional development activities relating to academic advising off campus and institutional expectation to participate in research activities ($r_s(78) = .400, p< .01$), with a medium effect size (Cohen, 1988). Squaring the correlation coefficients indicated that 16.0% of the variance of respondents’ professional development activities relating to academic advising off campus was explained by institutional expectation to participate in research activities. Similarly, 16.0% of the variance of institutional expectation to participate in research activities was explained respondents’ professional development activities relating to academic advising off campus.

Also, the Spearman’s rho revealed a statistically significant relationship between professional development activities relating to academic advising off campus and frequency of reading research on academic advising, ($r_s(78) = .477, p< .01$), with a medium effect size (Cohen, 1988). Squaring the correlation coefficients indicated that 22.75% of the variance of respondents’ professional development activities relating to academic advising off campus was explained by frequency of reading research on academic advising. Similarly, 22.75% of the variance of frequency of reading research on academic advising was explained respondents’ professional development activities relating to academic advising off campus.

The Spearman’s rho revealed a statistically significant relationship between professional development activities relating to academic advising off campus and respondents’ likelihood of submitting scholarly research on academic advising ($r_s(78) = .276, p< .05$), with a small effect size (Cohen, 1988). Squaring the correlation coefficients indicated that 7.62% of the variance of respondents’ professional
development activities relating to academic advising off campus was explained by respondents' likelihood of submitting scholarly research on academic advising. Similarly, 7.62% of the variance of respondents' likelihood of submitting scholarly research on academic advising was explained by respondents' professional development activities relating to academic advising off campus.

The Spearman's rho revealed a statistically significant relationship between professional development activities relating to academic advising off campus and respondents' knowledge of research on academic advising, ($r_s(78) = .485, p< .01$), with a medium effect size (Cohen, 1988). Squaring the correlation coefficients indicated that 23.52% of the variance of respondents' professional development activities relating to academic advising off campus was explained by respondents' knowledge of research on academic advising. Similarly, 23.52% of the variance of respondents' knowledge of research on academic advising was explained respondents' professional development activities relating to academic advising off campus.

The Spearman's rho revealed a statistically significant relationship between funding for off campus professional development activities and respondents' institutional expectation to participate in research activities ($r_s(78) = .360, p< .01$), with a medium effect size (Cohen, 1988). Squaring the correlation coefficients indicated that 12.96% of the variance for funding for off campus professional development activities was explained by respondents' institutional expectation to participate in research activities. Similarly, 12.96% of the variance of respondents’ institutional expectation to participate in research activities was explained by funding for off campus professional development activities.
The Spearman’s rho revealed a statistically significant relationship between funding for off campus professional development activities and frequency of reading research on academic advising, ($r_s(78) = .477, p< .01$), with a medium effect size (Cohen, 1988). Squaring the correlation coefficients indicated that 22.75% of the variance for funding for off campus professional development activities was explained by frequency of reading research on academic advising. Similarly, 22.75% of the variance of frequency of reading research on academic advising was explained by funding for off campus professional development activities.

The Spearman’s rho revealed a statistically significant relationship between funding for off campus professional development activities and respondents’ knowledge of research on academic advising, ($r_s(78) = .429, p< .01$), with a medium effect size (Cohen, 1988). Squaring the correlation coefficients indicated that 18.40% of the variance for funding for off campus professional development activities was explained by respondents’ knowledge of research on academic advising. Similarly, 18.40% of the variance of respondents’ knowledge of research on academic advising was explained by funding for off campus professional development activities.

The Spearman’s rho revealed a statistically significant relationship between professional development related to academic advising and respondents’ frequency of reading research on academic advising, which was statistically significant ($r_s(78) = .342, p< .01$). The effect size of this relationship is medium (Cohen, 1988). Squaring the correlation coefficients indicated that 11.70% of the variance of professional development related to academic advising was explained by respondents’ frequency of reading research on academic advising. Similarly, 11.70% of the variance of
respondents’ frequency of reading research on academic advising was explained by professional development related to academic advising.

Lastly, the Spearman’s rho revealed a statistically significant relationship between professional development related to academic advising and knowledge of research on academic advising, which was statistically significant ($r_s(78) = .279, p< .05$), with a small effect size (Cohen, 1988). Squaring the correlation coefficients indicated that 7.78% of the variance of professional development related to academic advising was explained by knowledge of research on academic advising. Similarly, 7.78% of the variance of respondents’ knowledge of research on academic advising was explained by professional development related to academic advising.

**Correlations between Research Activities**

A Spearman’s rho rank order correlation analysis was run to determine the relationship between research activities. Table 4.11 depicts the Spearman’s rho relationship between research activities.

The Spearman’s rho revealed a statistically significant relationship between respondents’ frequency of reading research on academic advising and institutional expectation to participate in research, ($r_s(78) = .418, p< .01$), with a medium effect size (Cohen, 1988). Squaring the correlation coefficients indicated that 17.47% of the variance of respondents’ frequency of reading research on academic advising was explained by and institutional expectation to participate in research. Similarly, 17.47% of the variance of institutional expectation to participate in research was explained by respondents’ frequency of reading research on academic advising.
Table 4.11

*Spearman's Rho Correlations between Research Activities*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research Activity</td>
<td>rho</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expect .</td>
<td>ρ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read</td>
<td>rho</td>
<td>.418**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research on AA</td>
<td>ρ</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit</td>
<td>rho</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>.126</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research on AA</td>
<td>ρ</td>
<td>.400</td>
<td>.270</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likely Submit Research on AA</td>
<td>rho</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>.401**</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research on AA</td>
<td>ρ</td>
<td>.420</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.307</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>rho</td>
<td>.229*</td>
<td>.609**</td>
<td>.210</td>
<td>.274*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Knowl.</td>
<td>ρ</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlation Significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed); ** Correlation Significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)
The Spearman’s rho revealed a statistically significant relationship between the likelihood of respondents’ to submitting research on academic advising and frequency of respondents’ reading research on academic advising, \((r_s(78) = .401, p < .01)\); the effect size is medium (Cohen, 1988). Squaring the correlation coefficients indicated that 16.08% of the variance was explained by frequency of respondents’ reading research on academic advising. Similarly, 16.08% of the variance of frequency of respondents’ reading research on academic advising was explained by the likelihood of respondents’ to submitting research on academic advising.

The Spearman’s rho revealed a statistically significant relationship between respondents’ knowledge of academic advising research and institutional expectation to participate in research had a strong positive relationship, \((r_s(78) = .609, p < .01)\); the effect size is large (Cohen, 1988). Squaring the correlation coefficients indicated that 37.09% of the variance was explained by institutional expectation to participate in research had a strong positive relationship. Similarly, 37.07% of the variance of institutional expectation to participate in research had a strong positive relationship was explained by respondents’ knowledge of academic advising research.

Lastly, the Spearman’s rho revealed a statistically significant relationship between respondents’ knowledge of academic advising research and likelihood of respondents’ submitting scholarly research on academic advising, \((r_s(78) = .274, p < .05)\); the effect size is small (Cohen, 1988). Squaring the correlation coefficients indicated that 7.50% of the variance of respondents’ knowledge of academic advising research was explained by likelihood of respondents’ submitting scholarly research on academic advising. Similarly, 7.50% of the variance of likelihood of respondents’
submitting scholarly research on academic advising was explained by respondents’ knowledge of academic advising research.

**Correlations between Professional Standards Constructs**

Table 4.12 depicts the Spearman’s rho correlation amongst professional standards variables.

The Spearman’s rho revealed a statistically significant relationship between respondents’ familiarity with office mission and respondents’ work performed having a standard of practice, \( r_s (78) = .259, p< .05 \); the effect size is small (Cohen, 1988). Squaring the correlation coefficients indicated that 6.71% of the variance of respondents’ familiarity with office mission was explained by respondents’ work performed having a standard of practice. Similarly, 6.71% of the variance of respondents’ work performed having a standard of practice was explained by respondents’ familiarity with office mission.

The Spearman’s rho also revealed a statistically significant relationship between the work advisors perform relating to educational plans developed with students and respondents’ work performed having a standard of practice, \( r_s (78) = .358, p< .01 \); the effect size is medium (Cohen, 1988). Squaring the correlation coefficients indicated that 12.82% of the variance of the work advisors perform relating to educational plans developed with students was explained by respondents’ work performed having a standard of practice. Similarly, 12.82% of the variance of respondents’ work performed having a standard of practice was explained by the work advisors perform relating to educational plans developed with students.
Table 4.12

*Spearman’s Rho Correlations between Professional Standards Constructs*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Standards of Practice</th>
<th>Familiar w/ Mission</th>
<th>Work Relates to Stdt EP</th>
<th>EP Effectiveness</th>
<th>Stdt Policy Knowledge</th>
<th>Ethical Standard Knowledge</th>
<th>Assessment/ Evaluation Knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard of Practice</td>
<td>$\rho$</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiar w/ Mission</td>
<td>$\rho$</td>
<td>.259*</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Relates to Stdt EP</td>
<td>$\rho$</td>
<td>.358**</td>
<td>.233*</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP Effective</td>
<td>$\rho$</td>
<td>.915</td>
<td>.955</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stdt Policy</td>
<td>$\rho$</td>
<td>.205</td>
<td>.311**</td>
<td>.213</td>
<td>.226*</td>
<td>.374**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical Standard Knowledge</td>
<td>$\rho$</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>.322**</td>
<td>.175</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>.374**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment/ Evaluation Knowledge</td>
<td>$\rho$</td>
<td>.238*</td>
<td>.522**</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.314**</td>
<td>.446**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlation Significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed); ** Correlation Significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)
Work advisors perform relating to educational plans and respondents’ familiarity with office mission, were revealed by the Spearman’s rho to have statistically significant relationship, \( r_s(78) = .233, p< .05 \). The effect size of this relationship is small (Cohen, 1988). Squaring the correlation coefficients indicated that 5.43% of the variance of work advisors perform relating to educational plans was explained by respondents’ familiarity with office mission. Similarly, 5.43% of the variance of respondents' familiarity with office mission was explained by work advisors perform relating to educational plans.

Another statistically significant relationship revealed by the Spearman’s rho was between respondents’ knowledge of policies effecting students and respondents’ familiarity with the mission of the department, which was statistically significant \( r_s(78) = .311, p< .01 \). The effect size of this relationship is medium (Cohen, 1988). Squaring the correlation coefficients indicated that 9.67% of the variance of respondents’ knowledge of policies effecting students was explained by respondents’ familiarity with the mission of the department. Similarly, 9.67% of the variance of respondents’ familiarity with the mission of the department was explained by respondents’ knowledge of policies effecting students.

Also, the Spearman’s rho revealed a statistically significant relationship between respondents’ knowledge of policies effecting students and respondents’ knowledge of policies effecting students, \( r_s(78) = .226, p< .05 \). The effect size of this relationship is small (Cohen, 1988). Squaring the correlation coefficients indicated that 5.11% of the variance of respondents’ knowledge of policies effecting students was explained by respondents’ familiarity with the mission of the department. Similarly, 5.11% of the
variance of respondents' knowledge of policies effecting students was explained by
respondents' knowledge of policies effecting students.

The Spearman's rho revealed a statistically significant relationship between
respondents' knowledge of ethical standards and respondents' knowledge of
departmental mission, which was statistically significant ($r_s(78) = .322, p< .01$). The
effect size of this relationship is medium (Cohen, 1988). Squaring the correlation
coefficients indicated that 10.37% of the variance of respondents' knowledge of ethical
standards was explained by respondents' familiarity with the mission of the department.
Similarly, 10.37% of the variance of respondents' knowledge of departmental mission
was explained by respondents' knowledge of ethical standards.

Also, the Spearman's rho revealed a statistically significant relationship between
respondents' knowledge of ethical standards and respondents' knowledge of policies
that effect students, which was statistically significant ($r_s(78) = .374, p< .01$). The effect
size of this relationship is medium (Cohen, 1988). Squaring the correlation coefficients
indicated that 13.99% of the variance of respondents' knowledge of ethical standards
was explained by respondents' knowledge of policies that effect students. Similarly,
13.99% of the variance of respondents' knowledge of policies that effect students was
explained by respondents' knowledge of ethical standards.

Another statistically significant relationship revealed by the Spearman's rho is
between respondents' knowledge of assessment and evaluation and the respondents'
work being performed having a standard of practice ($r_s(78) = .238, p< .05$). The effect
size of this relationship is small (Cohen, 1988). Squaring the correlation coefficients
indicated that 5.66% of the variance of respondents' knowledge of assessment and
evaluation was explained by respondents’ work being performed having a standard of practice. Similarly, 5.66% of the variance of respondents' work being performed having a standard of practice was explained by respondents’ knowledge of assessment and evaluation.

Respondents’ knowledge of assessment and evaluation and respondents’ being familiar with departmental mission, was revealed to be statistically significant by the Spearman’s rho, ($r_s(78) = .522, p < .01$). The effect size of this relationship is large (Cohen, 1988). Squaring the correlation coefficients indicated that 27.25% of the variance of respondents’ knowledge of assessment and evaluation was explained by respondents’ being familiar with departmental mission. Similarly, 27.25% of the variance of respondents’ being familiar with departmental mission was explained by respondents’ knowledge of assessment and evaluation.

Also, the Spearman’s rho revealed a statistically significant relationship between respondents’ knowledge of assessment and evaluation and respondents' knowledge of policies effecting students, ($r_s(78) = .314, p < .01$). The effect size of this relationship is medium (Cohen, 1988). Squaring the correlation coefficients indicated that 9.86% of the variance of respondents’ knowledge of assessment and evaluation was explained by respondents’ knowledge of policies effecting students. Similarly, 9.86% of the variance of respondents’ knowledge of policies effecting students was explained by respondents’ knowledge of assessment and evaluation.

Lastly, the Spearman’s rho revealed a statistically significant relationship between respondents’ knowledge of assessment and evaluation and respondents’ knowledge of ethical standards, ($r_s(78) = .446, p < .01$). The effect size of this
relationship is medium (Cohen, 1988). Squaring the correlation coefficients indicated that 9.86% of the variance was explained by respondents’ knowledge of ethical standards. Similarly, 9.86% of the variance of respondents’ knowledge of policies affecting students was explained by respondents’ knowledge of ethical standards.

Correlations between Professional Standards Constructs and Educational Activities

Table 4.13 depicts the Spearman’s rho correlations for professional standards constructs and educational activities.

The Spearman’s rho revealed a statistically significant relationship between respondents’ work performed having a standard of practice and respondents’ interest in pursuing a certificate level program of study in academic advising, \( r_s(78) = .232, p < .05 \); the effect size is small (Cohen, 1988). Squaring the correlation coefficients indicated that 5.38% of the variance was explained by respondents’ work being performed having a standard of practice. Similarly, 5.38% of the variance of respondents’ interest in pursuing a certificate level program of study in academic advising was explained by respondents’ work performed having a standard of practice.

The Spearman’s rho revealed a statistically significant relationship respondents’ being familiar with the departmental mission and the educational degree level of academic advisors, \( r_s(78) = -.364, p < .01 \); the effect size is medium (Cohen, 1988). Squaring the correlation coefficients indicated that 13.25% of the variance was explained by the educational degree level of academic advisors. Similarly, 13.25% of the variance of the educational degree level of academic advisors was explained by respondents’ being familiar with the departmental mission.
Table 4.13

*Spearman’s Rho Correlations between Professional Standards Construct and Educational Activities*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Education AA Position Degree Required</th>
<th>Degree Related to AA</th>
<th>Degree Prepared for AA</th>
<th>Defined Promotion Path</th>
<th>Familiar w/ AA Grad. Programs</th>
<th>Interest w/ AA Grad Prog.</th>
<th>Interest AA Cert. Prog.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>( \rho )</td>
<td>0.073</td>
<td>0.186</td>
<td>0.136</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>0.199</td>
<td>0.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of Practice</td>
<td>( \rho )</td>
<td>0.525</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td>0.235</td>
<td>0.458</td>
<td>0.081</td>
<td>0.645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiar</td>
<td>( \rho )</td>
<td>0.364**</td>
<td>0.279*</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>0.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>( \rho )</td>
<td>0.166</td>
<td>0.735</td>
<td>0.959</td>
<td>0.763</td>
<td>0.237</td>
<td>0.211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>( \rho )</td>
<td>0.159</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>-0.035</td>
<td>0.135</td>
<td>0.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP</td>
<td>( \rho )</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.122</td>
<td>-0.086</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>-0.048</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective EP</td>
<td>( \rho )</td>
<td>0.842</td>
<td>0.287</td>
<td>0.452</td>
<td>0.961</td>
<td>0.679</td>
<td>0.995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stdt.</td>
<td>( \rho )</td>
<td>0.299**</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.174</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>-0.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>( \rho )</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.938</td>
<td>0.129</td>
<td>0.921</td>
<td>0.712</td>
<td>0.837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowl.</td>
<td>( \rho )</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical</td>
<td>( \rho )</td>
<td>-0.233*</td>
<td>-0.186</td>
<td>0.115</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>-0.059</td>
<td>0.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>( \rho )</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td>0.315</td>
<td>0.772</td>
<td>0.607</td>
<td>0.277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowl</td>
<td>( \rho )</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asses.</td>
<td>( \rho )</td>
<td>-0.230*</td>
<td>-0.135</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td>-0.013</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>0.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evalua.</td>
<td>( \rho )</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>0.237</td>
<td>0.410</td>
<td>0.912</td>
<td>0.676</td>
<td>0.660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowl</td>
<td>( \rho )</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Correlation Significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed); **Correlation Significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)
Also, the Spearman’s rho revealed a statistically significant negative relationship between respondents’ knowledge of policies effecting students and respondents’ level of educational degree, which was statistically significant \((r_s(78) = -.299, p< .01)\). The effect size of this relationship is small (Cohen, 1988). Squaring the correlation coefficients indicated that 8.94% of the variance of respondents' work performed having a standard of practice was explained by respondents’ work being performed having a standard of practice. Similarly, 8.94% of the variance of respondents' interest in pursuing a certificate level program of study in academic advising was explained by respondents’ work performed having a standard of practice.

Another statistically significant negative relationship was revealed by the Spearman’s rho between respondents’ knowledge of ethical standards and respondents’ level of educational degree, \((r_s(78) = -.233, p< .01)\). The effect size of this relationship is small (Cohen, 1988). Squaring the correlation coefficients indicated that 5.42% of the variance of respondents’ knowledge of ethical standards was explained by respondents’ level of educational degree. Similarly, 5.42% of the variance of respondents’ level of educational degree was explained by respondents’ knowledge of ethical standards.

Lastly, the Spearman’s rho revealed a statistically negative relationship between respondents’ knowledge of assessment and evaluation and respondents' level of educational degree, \((r_s(78) = -.230, p< .05)\). The effect size of this relationship is small (Cohen, 1988). Squaring the correlation coefficients indicated that 5.29% of the variance of respondents’ knowledge of assessment and evaluation was explained by respondents’ level of educational degree. Similarly, 5.29% of the variance of
respondents’ level of educational degree was explained by respondents’ knowledge of assessment and evaluation.

Correlations between Professional Standards Constructs and Professional Development Activities

Table 4.14 depicts the Spearman’s rho correlation between professional standards constructs and professional development activities.

The Spearman’s rho revealed a statistically significant relationship between respondents’ work being performed having a standard of practice and respondents’ membership of other professional organization that supports advisors work, \( r_s(78) = .410, p< .01 \); the effect size is medium (Cohen, 1988). Squaring the correlation coefficients indicated that 16.81% of the variance was explained by respondents’ level of educational degree. Similarly, 16.81% of the variance of respondents’ membership of other professional organization that supports advisors work was explained by respondents’ work being performed having a standard of practice.

The Spearman’s rho revealed a statistically significant relationship respondents’ work being performed having a standard of practice and respondents’ work being performed having a standard of practice, \( r_s(78) = .253, p< .05 \); the effect size is medium (Cohen, 1988). Squaring the correlation coefficients indicated that 6.40% of the variance of respondents’ work being performed having a standard of practice was explained by respondents’ work being performed having a standard of practice. Similarly, 6.40% of the variance of respondents’ work being performed having a standard of practice was explained by respondents’ work being performed having a standard of practice.
Table 4.14
Spearman’s Rho Correlations between Professional Standards Constructs and Professional Development Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Member of Other Organization</th>
<th>NACADA Member</th>
<th>PD Act. On Campus</th>
<th>PD Act. Off Campus</th>
<th>Fund. Off Camp PD</th>
<th>PD Related AA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard of Practice</td>
<td>$\rho$</td>
<td>.410**</td>
<td>-.106</td>
<td>.253*</td>
<td>.196</td>
<td>.199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\rho$</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.354</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiar w/ Mission</td>
<td>$\rho$</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>-.200</td>
<td>.191</td>
<td>.293**</td>
<td>.289*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\rho$</td>
<td>.301</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Relates to Stdrt. EP</td>
<td>$\rho$</td>
<td>.306**</td>
<td>-.108</td>
<td>.215</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>.230*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\rho$</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.348</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.265</td>
<td>.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP Effective Stdt. EP</td>
<td>$\rho$</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>-.074</td>
<td>-.039</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>-.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\rho$</td>
<td>.321</td>
<td>.521</td>
<td>.736</td>
<td>.724</td>
<td>.851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\rho$</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>.205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical Standard Knowl. Asses. Evalua. Knowl.</td>
<td>$\rho$</td>
<td>.159</td>
<td>-.308**</td>
<td>.149</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td>.191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\rho$</td>
<td>.163</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.193</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\rho$</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>-.163</td>
<td>.211</td>
<td>.331**</td>
<td>.233*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\rho$</td>
<td>.700</td>
<td>.155</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.040</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlation Significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed); ** Correlation Significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)
Also, the Spearman’s rho revealed a statistically significant relationship between respondents’ work being performed having a standard of practice and respondents’ professional development received being related to academic advising, \( r_s(78) = .421, p < .01 \). The effect size of this relationship is medium (Cohen, 1988). Squaring the correlation coefficients indicated that 17.72% of the variance of respondents’ work being performed having a standard of practice was explained by respondents’ professional development received being related to academic advising. Similarly, 17.72% of the variance of respondents’ professional development received being related to academic advising was explained by respondents’ work being performed having a standard of practice.

Respondents’ being familiar with departmental mission and respondents’ professional development activities off campus was revealed by the Spearman’s rho to have a statistically significant relationship, \( r_s(78) = .293, p < .01 \). The effect size of this relationship is small (Cohen, 1988). Squaring the correlation coefficients indicated that 8.58% of the variance of respondents’ being familiar with departmental mission was explained by respondents’ professional development activities off campus. Similarly, 8.58% of the variance of respondents’ professional development activities off campus was explained by respondents’ being familiar with departmental mission.

Another Spearman’s rho revealed a statistically significant relationship between respondents’ being familiar with departmental mission and respondents’ funding for off campus professional development, \( r_s(78) = .289, p < .05 \). The effect size of this relationship is small (Cohen, 1988). Squaring the correlation coefficients indicated that 8.35% of the variance of respondents’ being familiar with departmental mission was
explained by respondents' funding for off campus professional development. Similarly, 8.35% of the variance of respondents' funding for off campus professional development was explained by respondents' being familiar with departmental mission.

The Spearman’s rho also revealed a statistically significant relationship between respondents’ being familiar with departmental mission and respondents’ professional development related to academic advising, ($r_s(78) = .289, p< .05$). The effect size of this relationship is small (Cohen, 1988). Squaring the correlation coefficients indicated that 8.35% of the variance of respondents' being familiar with departmental mission was explained by respondents’ funding for off campus professional development. Similarly, 8.35% of the variance of respondents’ professional development related to academic advising was explained by respondents’ being familiar with departmental mission.

The Spearman’s rho revealed a statistically significant relationship between respondents’ work being performed relating to educational plans developed with students and respondents' membership with other organizations that support the work of advisors, which was statistically significant ($r_s(78) = .306, p< .01$). The effect size of this relationship is medium (Cohen, 1988). Squaring the correlation coefficients indicated that 9.36% of the variance of respondents’ work being performed relating to educational plans developed with students was explained by respondents’ membership with other organizations that support the work of advisors. Similarly, 9.36% of the variance of respondents’ membership with other organizations that support the work of advisors was explained by respondents’ work being performed relating to educational plans developed with students.
Another statistically significant relationship revealed by the Spearman’s rho is between respondents’ work being performed relating to educational plans developed with students and funding for off campus professional development activities, \( (r_s(78) = .230, p< .05) \). The effect size of this relationship is small (Cohen, 1988). Squaring the correlation coefficients indicated that 5.29% of the variance of respondents’ work being performed relating to educational plans developed with students was explained by funding for off campus professional development activities. Similarly, 5.29% of the variance of funding for off campus professional development activities was explained by respondents’ work being performed relating to educational plans developed with students.

Respondents’ knowledge of policies effecting students and respondents’ membership in other professional organizations support the work of advisors was found by the Spearman’s rho to have a statistically significant relationship, \( (r_s(78) = .355, p< .01) \). The effect size of this relationship is medium (Cohen, 1988). Squaring the correlation coefficients indicated that 12.60% of the variance of respondents’ knowledge of policies effecting students was explained by respondents’ membership in other professional organizations support the work of advisors. Similarly, 12.60% of the variance of respondents’ membership in other professional organizations support the work of advisors was explained by respondents’ knowledge of policies effecting students.

The Spearman’s rho found statistical significance between respondents’ knowledge of policies effecting students and respondents’ professional development activities on campus, \( (r_s(78) = .238, p< .05) \). The effect size of this relationship is small
(Cohen, 1988). Squaring the correlation coefficients indicated that 5.66% of the variance of respondents’ knowledge of policies effecting students was explained by respondents’ professional development activities on campus. Similarly, 5.66% of the variance of respondents’ membership in other professional organizations support the work of advisors was explained by respondents’ knowledge of policies effecting students.

The Spearman’s rho revealed a statistically significant relationship between respondents’ knowledge of policies effecting students and respondents’ professional development activities relating to academic advising, \( r_s(78) = .290, p< .01 \). The effect size of this relationship is small (Cohen, 1988). Squaring the correlation coefficients indicated that 8.41% of the variance of respondents’ knowledge of policies effecting students was explained by and respondents’ professional development activities relating to academic advising. Similarly, 8.41% of the variance of respondents’ professional development activities relating to academic advising was explained by respondents’ knowledge of policies effecting students.

Respondents’ knowledge of ethical standards and respondents’ membership with NACADA were found by the Spearman’s rho to have a statistically significant negative relationship, \( r_s(78) = -.308, p< .01 \). The effect size of this relationship is medium (Cohen, 1988). Squaring the correlation coefficients indicated that 9.48% of the variance of respondents’ membership with NACADA was explained by and respondents’ professional development activities relating to academic advising. Similarly, 9.48% of the variance of respondents’ membership with NACADA was explained by knowledge of ethical standards.
Also, the Spearman’s rho found a statistically significant relationship between respondents’ knowledge of ethical standards and respondents’ professional development related to academic ($r_s(78) = .223, p< .05$). The effect size of this relationship is small (Cohen, 1988). Squaring the correlation coefficients indicated that 4.97% of the variance of respondents’ knowledge of ethical standards was explained by professional development related to academic. Similarly, 4.97% of the variance of professional development related to academic was explained by respondents’ knowledge of ethical standards.

The Spearman’s rho also found a statistically significant relationship between respondents’ knowledge of assessment and evaluation and respondents’ professional development activity off campus, ($r_s(78) = .331, p< .01$). The effect size of this relationship is medium (Cohen, 1988). Squaring the correlation coefficients indicated that 10.96% of the variance respondents’ knowledge of assessment and evaluation was explained by respondents’ professional development activity off campus. Similarly, 10.96% of the variance of respondents’ professional development activity off campus was explained by respondents’ knowledge of assessment and evaluation.

Another statistically significant relationship found by the Spearman’s rho is between respondents’ knowledge of assessment and evaluation and respondents’ funding for off campus professional development, ($r_s(78) = .233, p< .05$). The effect size of this relationship is small (Cohen, 1988). Squaring the correlation coefficients indicated that 4.97% of the variance respondents’ knowledge of assessment and evaluation was explained by respondents’ funding for off campus professional development. Similarly, 4.97% of the variance of respondents’ funding for off campus professional development.
professional development was explained by respondents’ knowledge of assessment and evaluation.

Lastly, the Spearman’s rho revealed a statistically significant relationship between respondents’ knowledge of assessment and evaluation variable and respondents’ professional development related to academic advising, \( (r_s(78) = .230, p< .05) \). The effect size of this relationship is small (Cohen, 1988). Squaring the correlation coefficients indicated that 5.29% of the variance respondents’ knowledge of assessment and evaluation was explained by respondents’ professional development related to academic advising. Similarly, 5.29% of the variance of respondents’ professional development related to academic advising was explained by respondents’ knowledge of assessment and evaluation.

**Correlations between Professional Standards Constructs and Research Activities**

Table 4.15 depicts the Spearman’s rho relationship between professional standards constructs and research activities. The Spearman’s rho revealed a statistically significant relationship between respondents’ being familiar with department mission and respondents’ knowledge of research on academic advising, which was statistically significant \( (r_s(78) = .298, p< .01) \). The effect size of this relationship is small (Cohen, 1988). Squaring the correlation coefficients indicated that 8.88% of the variance respondents’ being familiar with department mission was explained by respondents’ knowledge of research on academic advising. Similarly, 8.88% of the variance of respondents’ knowledge of research on academic advising was explained by respondents’ being familiar with department mission.
Table 4.15

*Spearman’s Rho Correlations between Professional Standards Constructs and Research Activities*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard of Practice</td>
<td>$\rho$ .307</td>
<td>.558</td>
<td>.400</td>
<td>.764</td>
<td>.795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\rho$ 78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiar w/ Mission</td>
<td>$\rho$ .331</td>
<td>.259</td>
<td>.353</td>
<td>.716</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\rho$ 78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Relates to Stdt. EP</td>
<td>$\rho$ .104</td>
<td>.502</td>
<td>.397</td>
<td>.642</td>
<td>.906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\rho$ 78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Policy Ethical Standard Knowl. Assess. Evalua.</td>
<td>$\rho$ 78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\rho$ .117</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>-.035</td>
<td>-.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\rho$ 78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\rho$ .112</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.298**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\rho$ 78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\rho$ .185</td>
<td>-.077</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>-.053</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\rho$ 78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\rho$ .104</td>
<td>.502</td>
<td>.397</td>
<td>.642</td>
<td>.906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\rho$ 78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\rho$ -.016</td>
<td>-.033</td>
<td>-.124</td>
<td>-.080</td>
<td>.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\rho$ 78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\rho$ .893</td>
<td>.772</td>
<td>.281</td>
<td>.487</td>
<td>.645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\rho$ 78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\rho$ .119</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.155</td>
<td>.260*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\rho$ 78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\rho$ .166</td>
<td>.229*</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>-.005</td>
<td>.253*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\rho$ 78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlation Significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed); ** Correlation Significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)
The Spearman’s rho found a statistically significant relationship between respondents’ knowledge of ethical standards and respondents’ knowledge of ethical standards, \((r_s(78) = .260, p< .05)\). The effect size of this relationship is small (Cohen, 1988). Squaring the correlation coefficients indicated that 6.76% of respondents’ knowledge of ethical standards was explained by respondents’ knowledge of ethical standards. Similarly, 6.76% of the variance of respondents’ knowledge of ethical standards was explained by respondents’ knowledge of ethical standards.

Also the Spearman’s rho revealed a statistically significant relationship between respondents’ knowledge of assessment and evaluation and respondents’ frequency of reading research on academic advising had positive relationship, \((r_s(78) = .229, p< .05)\). The effect size of this relationship is small (Cohen, 1988). Squaring the correlation coefficients indicated that 8.94% of respondents’ knowledge of assessment and evaluation was explained respondents’ frequency of reading research on academic advising. Similarly, 8.94% of the variance of respondents’ frequency of reading research on academic advising was explained by respondents’ knowledge of assessment and evaluation.

Lastly, the Spearman’s rho revealed a statistically significant relationship between respondents’ knowledge of assessment and evaluation and respondents’ knowledge of academic advising research, \((r_s(78) = .253, p< .05)\). The effect size of this relationship is small (Cohen, 1988). Squaring the correlation coefficients indicated that 6.40% of respondents’ knowledge of assessment and evaluation was explained respondents’ knowledge of academic advising research. Similarly, 6.40% of the
variance of respondents' knowledge of academic advising research was explained by respondents' knowledge of assessment and evaluation.
CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Introduction

The purposes of this research study was to identify descriptive characteristic of the study’s academic advisors and to determine how professional characteristic constructs (educational activities, research activities, and professional development activities) correlated with professional standards regarding academic advisors’ work-related activities. Habley’s (1986) Characteristics of a Profession states that a profession has a set of standards, a conceptual base, a method of entry into the profession, a significant number of individuals with a commitment to understand the field, and an identifiable group of clients and was utilized to establish the studies professional characteristics constructs. Professional standards constructs were defined utilizing five Council on the Advancement of Standards (CAS) for academic advising. The five professional standards selected for the study to determine professional standards from CAS was mission, organization and leadership, human resources, ethics, and assessment and evaluation. The five CAS professional standards were established to assess academic advising programs, but had content that provided directives for academic advisors and how their work-related activities.

Data analysis for this study included a descriptive statistical analysis for the IV (professional standards constructs) and the DV (educational activities, research activities, and professional standards activities) in this study. The researcher performed a series of Spearman’s rank order correlation coefficients (Spearman’s rho) and descriptive statistical analysis. The Spearman’s correlation coefficient analysis was
performed to discover the strength of correlation amongst study variables relating to professional characteristics and professional standards. The following discussion will address the findings of this research study by research question. All data results from the descriptive statistical analysis are discussed and only statistically significant data results from the Spearman’s rho rank order correlation are discussed.

Discussion of Findings

Professional Characteristics Constructs Discussion of Findings

The professional characteristics constructs descriptive analysis findings included educational activities, professional development activities, and research activities performed as a part of the work-related activities of academic advisor represented in this study. The following discussion will address RQ2, RQ3, and RQ4 regarding how professional characteristics constructs (educational activities, research activities, and professional development activities) correlate with professional standards constructs, respectively.

Academic advisors were asked to respond to survey questions related to educational activities, research activities, and professional development activities performed as a part of their work-related activities. Much of the criticism that detracts from academic advising being recognized as a professional discipline focuses on the lack of educational programs for academic advising, the lack of professionals within the field having an academic advising educational background, limited scholarly publications, and the limited professional organizations and educational programs available, all of which would essentially allow for academic advising to be recognized as
a profession and an academic discipline in higher education (Habley, 2009; Kuhn & Padak, 2008; & Schaffer, Zalewski, & Leveille, 2010).

This study’s RQ2 and RQ3 inquired as to how well responses of academic advisors regarding their Educational Activities and Research Activities correlate with Professional Standards responses, with regard to work-related activities. Based on the overall results of the survey research data collected on educational activities and research activities, current full-time academic advisors who participated in the survey reported very little interest in identified areas of professionalization that would promote the field of academic advising towards recognition as a profession. As it relates to the academic advisors’ familiarity with graduate and certificate programs of study for academic advising, 46% of study participants reported very little to no knowledge of these programs of study. This was an expected finding because the North Texas region has no local programs of study specifically for academic advising. Based on study results 55% or respondents’ reported not being interested in pursuing academic advising graduate programs of study and 35% indicated that they were not interested in pursuing academic advising certificate programs. These findings echo the current criticisms of academic advising being recognized as a profession. If interest in and knowledge of graduate or certificate level education in academic advising does not increase among current academic advisors, the availability of graduate-level academic advising programs of study will continue to be limited. Academic advisors may indeed be seeking and participating in graduate-level education not within the field of academic advising. Quite possibly advisors are seeking graduate level education within other areas of higher education such as student development services and leadership areas.
that currently have more accessible educational programs of study. Also, with the increased pursuit of on-line education, advisors very well may be seeking graduate-level education in fields of study outside of higher education and academic advising.

Another aspect of this study that may affect interest in graduate and certificate level education in academic advising is that this study results indicate that 65% of advising respondents’ do not perceive a defined path for promotion within their current positions as academic advisors. An advisor may be more likely to have an interest in academic advising graduate level education and certification if there were more incentives, such as opportunities for promotion coupled with a perception of skills enhancement, to do so.

Regarding academic advisors’ belief that they have a defined path for promotion within their position as an academic advisor, results indicate that there was no statistical significance identified between the perception of a defined promotion path for advisors and interest in graduate or certification level education in academic advising amongst study variables. Ideally, there may be a promotion path for academic advisors who possess graduate degrees, especially if the graduate degrees they hold are within the higher education arena. Unfortunately, it appears that a significant number academic advisors did not report a defined promotion path. This may be because academic advisors often become limited or “boxed-in” the academic advising position. Unless they seek employment opportunities in other areas within or outside of higher education, they are limited to the scope of the academic advising position. Once someone becomes an academic advisor, unless they seek graduate education; the only promotion may be to become an advising departmental director or supervisor; which are
limited and rarely vacated. More often than not, once an advisor obtains graduate level education, he or she is more likely to leave the field because of the perceived limited opportunities for promotion or the fact that they may indeed be limited / “boxed-in” the position at their institutions.

Based on study results, I would suggest that if more higher education institutions employing academic advisors would create, establish, and implement promotion paths that included required graduate level degrees or certifications in academic advising as a requirement for promotion. then quite possibly interest in pursuing programs of study in academic advising would most likely increase and could possibly retain more experienced and knowledgeable advisors in the field.

Another key criticism to field of academic advising toward professionalization is published scholarship and research. Most criticism regarding academic advising and professionalization is based on the significant lack of research-related activities within the field of academic advising amongst practitioners. One of Habley’s (1986) eight challenges for the future of academic advising was to include the development of a significant body of research that enhances understanding, assists in planning, and serves as a guide to decision making. Kuhn and Padak (2008) suggested that an academic discipline “would include scholars who research and publish about the discipline in adjudicated journals… expect that tenets of are taught in higher education institutions…” (p. 3). These researchers suggest that academic advising will be recognized as a discipline “…when it has a body of credible organized knowledge…when it has a clear delineation of the modes of inquiry by which it validates itself, creates new knowledge, and advances as a discipline, and when its intellectual
content is offered as a coherent grouping of courses in degree granting majors at several institutions of higher education” (p. 3). Also, Habley (2009) went on to suggest that, “we dare not champion advising without research…we cannot affirm advising without research, and we will not advance advising without research” (p. 7). Habley encouraged all involved with academic advising to conduct research and present that research to the existing body of knowledge on academic advising.

Kuhn and Padak (2008) and Habley (2009) expressed concerns regarding research and scholarly activities within the field of advising; and the results of this research study echoed their concerns. Overwhelmingly, 78% of academic advising respondents’ indicated that their employing institutions do not have an expectation for academic advisors to participate in scholarly research as a part of their job responsibilities. Also, a majority, or 96%, of respondents’ indicated that they had not submitted scholarly articles on academic advising for publication, yet more than half of respondents’ indicate that they frequently read scholarly research on academic advising. According to the results of the present study. academic advisors are reading research on academic advising, which most likely can be attributed to the fact that half of the study respondents’ indicated that they are members of NACADA, a professional organization that provides its members access to their refereed journal. In reference to research activities, 62% of respondents’ indicated that they would not be likely to submit scholarly research on academic advising to referee journals. These results could be attributed to the fact that 33% of study respondents’ indicated they do not possess graduate level education, which provides students with exposure and knowledge of
research and research methodology. Simply stated, many academic advisors may simply not know how to conduct research.

Another reason academic advisors may not be interested in conducting research is because of the day-to-day operation and time constraints during heavy advising periods, the reported lack of institutional requirements for advisors to conduct research, or quite simply advising directors/supervisors may have the task of conducting research as a part of their responsibilities and not include practitioners in the research process. With results indicating such a lack of interest in research-related activities among academic advising practitioners, opportunities for the field of academic advising to be fully recognized as a profession will continue to remain unlikely.

A positive finding based on Habley’s (1986) Characteristics of a Profession suggests that there should be a method of entry in the profession or a core of learning experiences expected for those who enter the field. For example, in terms of educational activities and based on survey data results, over half of academic advisors indicated that they believed that the degrees they held were related to the field of academic advising. An overwhelming 85% of academic advisors agreed that their position of academic advisor at the least required an undergraduate degree. Based on study results, 95% of academic advisors reported that they held at least a bachelor’s degree with 50% reporting that the degrees they held were believed to be related to the field of academic advising. This finding was interesting because this appears to be at least one acknowledged minimum standard to gain entry into the advising profession, which means that the field of advising has made efforts towards requiring certain standards to gain entry into the field. This point raises a concern is that it would be very
difficult for those who seek graduate degrees or certificates in academic advising to gain entry into the field of advising because of over-qualification. Another qualification to gain entry into the advising field is years of experience as an academic advisor. In many instances many who seek employment in the advising field do so as a way to gain experience and move on to other positions within the institution, which subsequently leaves the field of advising in constant turn over and less likely to be recognized as a profession.

Based on a study finding, academic advisors reported that the degrees they held prepared them for their career in academic advising. These results could be expected because academic advising as a career field is so universal, that once a practitioner has been appropriately trained and has gained basic knowledge of university policies, they can advise students. Advising is such a career field that if an advisor has an educational background from another area or sector, they can provide that discipline-specific insight to students throughout the advising relationship. Admittedly, the beauty of academic advising as a career field is that practitioners do come to the position with varied backgrounds and educational experiences which enhances the knowledge base for field.

Another promising area of this research study results was that of the academic advisors’ professional development activities. RQ4 inquired as to how well do responses of academic advisors regarding their professional development activities correlate with professional standards responses with regard to work-related activities. Training or professional development is a key component towards the field of academic advising’s journey towards professionalization. Professional development can be a
significant avenue that provides current academic advisors with knowledge of educational programs of study in academic advising, and provides academic advisors with information on current research and best practices within the field of academic advising. Unless administrators provide training and information regarding their profession to academic advisors the field of study will not move toward being recognized as a profession. Currently academic advising has one established national association, NACADA; of which more than half of study respondents’ identified as being members. NACADA has done well in organizing the field of academic advising and creating an established body of research on academic advising, but it should not be the only national professional organization working towards the professionalization of academic advising. Study respondents’ reported that they were members of other professional organizations that support their roles as academic advisors, which may suggest that other professional organizations are being established, which would enhance the efforts towards professionalization and efforts of NACADA.

Eighty-eight percent of academic advisor respondents' from this research study reported having ample opportunity to participate in professional development activities on campus that relate to academic advising than opportunities off campus. This was an expected result, because oftentimes academic advisors are being provided professional development opportunities which are more related to their positions and campus responsibilities. As far as professional development activities being provided off campus relating to academic advising, 54% of academic advisors reported frequently experiencing these opportunities. Overall, academic advisor respondents' believed that
the professional development activities in which they participate at their college/university were related to the field of academic advising.

Professional Standards Construct Discussion of Findings

The professional standards variables in this research study included and measured survey responses related to professional standards constructs, as set forth by five CAS standards for academic advising utilized within this study. Professional standards constructs were measured by the academic advisors belief that the work they perform having a standard of practice. This section addresses the research question regarding how do standards of a profession correlate with academic advisors work-related activities.

The results of this study with regard to professional standards constructs were very promising, possibly due to an increased awareness of and implementation of CAS professional standards as an assessment and evaluation tool utilized extensively throughout higher education. According to Habley's (1986) Characteristics of a Profession, a field should have a set of standards or commonly held expectations which are applied to advising activities. According to the results of this study 95% of respondents' believe that the work they perform to have a standard of practice. This finding was anticipated, because it confirms that, through the utilization of CAS, the field of academic advising has made great efforts to implement a standard of practice within the field. CAS recommends that the primary purpose of the mission AAP “is to assist student in the development of meaningful educational plans that are compatible with their life goals” (p. 25). The mission AAP is at the core of academic advising.
Academic advising is a field of study that was birthed out a need to have a professional lead and guide students on their educational journey. The fact that such a great percentage, or 99% of advisors in this research study identify as being greatly knowledgeable of student policies indicates that this area of academic advising is thriving.

Academic advising as a field of study has grown simply because the professionals that represent institutions of higher education in the area of advising are indeed helping students develop educational plans and assisting students in meeting their stated academic goals. This is the reason institutions of higher education continue to utilize professional academic advising practitioners.

The human resource standard was another area of interest regarding professional standards. Human resources results states that an academic advising office must be staffed adequately by individuals qualified to accomplish its mission and goals (CAS, 2009). Work experience in higher education and academic advising, and level of education results from this research study indicate that academic advisors more than meet the human resource CAS standard. Advisors are remaining in the field for ten or more years. This is probably due to the perception that promotion paths within the field of advising are bleak. Of those advisor who do pursue graduate level education, oftentimes due to the limited promotion paths; set their sights on high level administration positions within their institution for promotion.
Spearman’s Rho Correlation Discussion of Findings

The Spearman’s correlation coefficient analysis was performed to discover the significance of relationships among study variables. The variables measuring professional characteristic constructs (educational activities, professional development activities, and research activities) and professional standards constructs were statistically correlated. When performing Spearman’s rho statistical analysis, many correlations resulted amongst study variables. This discussion addresses the results relating to the studies research questions addressing, what professional characteristic constructs (educational activities, research activities, and professional development activities) correlate with professional standards constructs as it relates to academic advisors work-related activities. Although, there were numerous study variables that resulted in statistically significant correlations, primarily only those variables that resulted in a large positive and/or a large negative correlation with each other will be discussed.

According to Habley (1986), characteristics of a profession include a significant number of individuals who have both the length of commitment to and a depth of understanding of the field. According to the correlation results for demographic variables, the first large positive correlation was between respondents’ age and years of higher education years of work experience. Also, academic advising years’ work experience had a large positive correlation with higher education work experience. Based on descriptive and correlation data many of the study participants indicated that they have worked within higher education and subsequently academic advising for at least ten years with 65% of academic advising respondents’ reporting having at least
ten years of work experience in higher education and 35% reported having eleven or
more years of work experience in higher education. Eighty-six percent of respondents’
also reported having at least ten years of work experience in academic advising and
14% reported having more than eleven years of work experience in academic advising.
These correlation findings were significant in that they demonstrate that academic
advisors of this study have a commitment to the field of advising merely based on the
number of years they have been employed within higher education and within the field
of academic advising. These correlation results could also by symbolic of the fact that
academic advisors reported not having defined promotion path within the field and are
“boxed-in” their positions with limited opportunities for promotion.

Although academic advising years of work experience resulted in a small positive
correlation with both frequency of submitting research on academic advising and
knowledge of academic advising research. This finding was interesting because as the
number of years that an advisor is employed within the field increases, their likelihood of
submitting research on academic advising and knowledge of academic advising
research decreases. Basically the longer the academic advisors’ works in the field, the
less likely they are to participated in research related activities. This result is
concerning because, research related activities are at the center of criticism of the fields
of advising’s plight to professionalization.

The professional development construct resulted in several large negative and
large positive correlation results. Firstly, respondents’ membership in other professional
organizations that support their work as advisors resulted in a large negative correlation
with NACADA membership. This result may be because NACADA is the only
professional organization for academic advising, and that respondents’ may be members of other professional organizations that aren’t related specifically to the field of academic advising, but may inadvertently support their work as academic advisors. Also, professional development activities relating to academic advising off campus resulted in a large positive correlation with both respondents’ reading research on academic advising and knowledge of research on academic advising. As eluded to previously, quite often funding for off campus professional development is attendance to a NACADA conference or seminar, of which NACADA provides its members access to their referred journal of which academic advisors are more likely to read and become more knowledgeable with research on academic advising.

Professional development activities relating to academic advising off campus resulted in a large positive correlation with professional development activities relating to academic advising on campus. Professional development received relating to academic advising resulted in a large positive correlation with professional development activity on campus relating to academic advising. These results could be attributed to the fact that academic advisors’ serve as the gateway of information sharing between the institution and students, therefore often, professional development of academic advisors on campus occur more prevalently and are highly related to the academic advising position.

Lastly, funding for off campus professional development resulted in a large positive correlation with respondents” professional development off campus relating to academic advising. These two variables may be highly correlated due to the fact that if an institution is providing funding for off campus professional development, it is more
likely to be related to their position as an academic advisor and most likely may be
attendance of NACADA conference; whether it be NACADA’s regional or national
conferences or seminars.

Although the results were small, the most interesting correlation was established
between the following study variables, belief that the degrees advisors held related to
academic advising and professional development activities constructs. This correlation
finding is significant because the degrees held by academic advisors in this study were
significantly correlated with an advisors professional development activity. This finding
suggests that the higher the degree held by the academic advisors, the more likely an
advisor would be to participate in professional development, be an active members of
professional organizations, and to receive institutional funding to participate in
professional development activities.

Another interesting correlation finding was that familiarity with graduate programs
of study resulted in a small positive correlation with professional development activities
on and off campus, funding for off campus professional development activities and
professional development activities being related to academic advising. This finding
also implies that those advisors who report significant participation in professional
development activities to be more knowledgeable and familiar with graduate programs
of study on academic advising. This may be due to the fact that through increased
exposure and participation in professional development activities they are more to learn
about graduate programs of study on academic advising.

Interestingly, all professional development activities constructs were significantly
correlated, with the exception of professional development activities on campus and
NACADA membership. This was interesting because it may indicate that although over half of the study respondents’ reported being members of NACADA, the professional development activities on campus may not be solely related to academic advising. The other variables that were not significantly correlated was funding for off-campus professional development activities and NACADA membership. This was interesting because advisors who report being members of NACADA may not be provided institutional funding opportunities to seek professional development off campus.

With research activities being the weakest finding of this study and among the most highly criticized in literature relating to the professionalization of academic advising, study results indicated significant relationships regarding institutional expectation to participate in research activities. The likelihood of submitting research on academic advising, frequency of reading research on academic advising, and overall general knowledge of research on academic advising were all significantly correlated with institutional expectation to participate in research activities. These results imply that the greater the employing institution’s expectation that the academic advisor participate in research activities, the greater is the increase in the frequency of advisors to reading more research on academic advising. Also, the advisor may become more likely to submit research on academic advising for publication. Also, knowledge of academic advising research resulted in a correlation with institutional expectation to participate in research activities, frequency of reading research on academic advising, and likelihood of submitting research on academic advising. Basically, as stated previously regarding institutional expectation to conduct research, the greater the
institutional expectation, the more knowledgeable an advisor becomes of research on academic advising.

The professional standards constructs resulted in a few moderate to large positive correlations. First, there is a large, positive correlation between respondents’ knowledge of assessment and both evaluation and both being familiar with departmental mission and knowledge of ethical standards variables. These results can be attributed to fact that many institutions of higher education have implemented the use of CAS standards for all departments of the college/university, of which these areas are an integral aspect. Also, professional standards constructs resulted in a few large positive correlation with professional development variables. There was a moderate positive correlation between respondents’ work being performed having a standard of practice and both membership in other professional organizations that supports their work as advisors and professional development received being related to academic advising.

Implications

The overall purpose of this study was to determine what professional characteristic construct (educational activities, research activities, and professional development activities) correlate with professional standards construct as it relates to the work-related activities of a selected group of academic advising practitioners. Research study findings have implications for both research and practice within the field of academic advising.
The results of this research study indicated that research activities and educational activities are extremely deficient among study practitioners. An implication for the field of academic advising relating its future and being recognized as profession is that research and educational activities among advising practitioners have to improve and increase. This may mean that special purposeful efforts should and need to be made at the practitioner level that would encourage and promote increased research and educational opportunities. More specifically, based on this research study results, academic advisors reported that they were not very interested in research activities or educational activities related to the field of academic advising. Based on this research finding implications suggest that the field of academic advising will continue to make small strides toward full professional recognition if all constituent's, especially current practitioners aren't interested in participating in research activities and pursuing further educational attainment relating to the field of academic advising.

Professional development activities and professional standards constructs results of this study indicate that academic advisors are receiving and participating in professional development activities related to the field of academic advising. These advisors are extremely knowledgeable of academic advising standards of practice and assessment and evaluation, which implies that academic advising as a field of study has characteristics of professional standards. Implications based on study results is that professional development activities are a strong asset within the field of advising and future efforts should be made to learn more about the professional development activities within the field of academic advising.
Recommendations

This study is different from other research studies on academic advising because it addressed current full-time academic advisors regarding their work-related activities. For the field of academic advising to reach full recognition as a profession, awareness of the field among advising practitioners must increase. Often advising practitioners are focused on the task-oriented aspects of their positions, such that they have very little to no awareness of the broader professional perspective. Although academic advising is operating as a profession is many aspects, it may lack full recognition because of the paucity of educational and research activities among advisors, as identified in this study.

Recommendations for research are that the content of professional development being received by academic advisor should be studied. A recommendations for practice is that the content of the professional development activities of academic advisors on and off campus should be evaluated for pertinence to the field. Additional information on the content of professional development and use of the information gained in practice should be studied. Also, further research should be conducted on funding sources for academic advisors to participate in professional development activities. Additionally more research should be conducted on the effects of the utilization of CAS standards on academic advising outcomes and student success.

As a result of this research study, a recommendation for practice is that academic advising practitioners should be encouraged to participate in research-related activities as a part of their work responsibilities. Doing so would not only improve efforts towards professionalization, but build a stronger research foundation for the field of academic advising. Another recommendation for practice is that this research study
confirmed that the field of academic advising minimally has a requirement of an undergraduate degree related to academic advising to gain entry into the field.
Expanding these requirements to include professional development activities related to academic advising, participation in research activities related to academic advising, and requiring an academic advising educational degree or certification to gain entry into the field or promotion within the field would improve efforts towards professionalization. Implementing the previously suggested expansions within the field now could eventually shift the field of academic advising towards full recognition as a profession in the future.

The only academic advising national association (NACADA), coupled with college/university administrators, academic advising administrators, and current academic advisors should collaborate to develop a strategic plan to implement a minimum requirements of an academic advising certification to become employed as an academic advisor. Developing a strategic plan as such, would take great amounts of efforts, but would set the stage for increased programs of study in academic advising within higher education, and thus increase interest in and pursuit of academic advising programs of study.

Results of this study were positive related to academic advisors’ professional development activities and professional standards construct. Research regarding the content of professional development received by academic advisors would be beneficial to the field. A question resulting from this positive response to professional development raised is, “Does the professional development received have a basis in research or is it merely more related to the function of academic advising?” As for professional standards, additional research should be conducted to explore whether or
not the increased implementation of CAS standards with regards to mission, student educational plans, having a standard or practice, and assessment and evaluation within higher education has had any effect on how academic advising as field of study functions.

Another recommendation to enhance the field of academic advising’s plight toward professionalism is to implement, utilize, and award continuing education units/credits (CEU’s). This study found that academic advisors are primarily receiving education and training via professional development activities offered at their institutions. With many reporting that they participate in professional development activities off campus. What if the professional development and training being received by advising practitioners were accompanied with CEU’s specifically for the field of academic advising and could actually be used for promotion or towards academic advising education credits? Based on this studies results, professional development activities were positively correlated with professional standards. Many academic advising practitioners reported that they regularly receive opportunities to participate in professional development activities on and off campus related to their position as the academic advisors’. Similarly, to their counseling counterparts and other professions the utilization CEU’s within their fields allows for practitioners to be educated and/or update on new practices, trends, or interventions within the field that affect their work related activities within the profession. It is recommended that the field of academic advising not only begin to award professional development credits and/or CEU’s specifically for advising practitioners, but implement a method/plan that would promote further education amongst practitioners. Potentially the CEU’s obtained by practitioners
in the field could possibly be used as an avenue to encourage advisor to seek academic advising certifications and graduate degrees. I believe that more advising practitioners would seek additional training, certificates, and degrees in academic advising if they had an incentive to do so. Implementing the rewarding of professional development credits and/or a CEU system within the field of advising could quite possibly increase desires, interest in, and participation in academic advising educational programs of study.

Finally, by limiting this study to only full-time academic advisors, it is recommended that future research be conducted that would include part-time personnel, on-call personnel, faculty, and other personnel who serve the role of an academic advisor. This would provide a comparison group on the measures of this study. Part-time or on-call academic advisors may be practitioners who are more likely and interested in pursuing academic advising education or certification to gain full-time entry into the field of advising.

Future Research

Future researchers may want to assess more in-depth why academic advisors’ have little or no interest in scholarly research activity or academic advising graduate or certificate education programs. How do they define scholarly activity? Could they be engage already in activities that could be deemed scholarly? This research explored the advisors’ general knowledge of research activities and educational activities. Conducting a more in-depth study of academic advisors perception of research-related
activities and lack of interest in academic advising educational programs may provide a
greater insight in to the work of academic advisors.

Also, future research may assess academic advising practitioners’ knowledge of
professionalization efforts and the professional standards necessary for a field of study
to be recognized as a profession. Academic advisors’ perceptions of their work as
professional is another recommendation for future study.

Based on the descriptive research analysis of this study, there appeared to be a
relationship between academic advisors, the college/university type, and a defined
promotion path within the position of academic advisors. Academic advisor
respondents’ overwhelmingly did not agree that the institutions that employed them had
a clear defined path for promotion. Further research regarding promotion within the
field of academic advising would increase awareness to this issue.

Future research with academic advising and professionalization efforts should
address more in depth the academic advisors’ perceived promotion path and
institutional promotion paths for advisors. Additional research should also be conducted
to determine why academic advisors are not interested in research activities or graduate
level education or certification in advising. Lastly, additional research is recommended
to find out what academic advisors’ educational backgrounds are and what academic
disciplines are represented amongst practitioners.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the field of academic advising has many components of
professionalization. The results of this study confirmed that the field of academic
advising has minimal qualifications to gain entry into the field and has not established a
defined path for promotion for practitioners within the field. Research activities within
the field of academic advising primarily due the increased efforts of NACADA, yet the
level of research continues to need improvement at the practitioner level. Based on this
study’s results, current academic advising practitioners have minimal interest in
participating in research-related activities. Educational Activities results of this study
were alarming as well showing that programs of education and certification for
academic advising continue to be lacking and interest in these types of programs are
seemingly limited as well. Professional development activities and professional
standards constructs resulted in positive outcomes. Academic advising practitioners
are indeed participating in professional development activities related to academic
advising and believe that these activities to enhance their work. Professional standards
results were also positive, in that CAS appears to be setting standards that academic
advisors are aware of within their work. It may take more time, but through increased
efforts among all academic advising constituents (institutions that employ academic
advisors, academic advising administrators, and academic advising practitioners), the
field of academic advising can be more fully recognized as a profession.

Based on the results of this study, generally academic advising study participants
believe that they are operating as professionals within their positions; however the lack
of formal ‘academic advising’ educational courses and programs of study may be the
number one cause for academic advising remaining a field of study and not a
recognized academic discipline. Compared to other recognized professions as
discussed previously in the review of the literature, academic advising practitioners
within the field are merely functioning as professionals without formal recognition. In other recognized professional disciplines, one must seek education or training to gain entry into the field, whereas academic advising primarily requires a general Bachelor’s degree and years of experience within the field of higher education to gain entry into the advising field. Academic advising as a field of study is comprised of higher education professionals who promote teaching and learning, which sets them apart from other recognized professional disciplines. However, academic advising as a prospective profession has inadequate educational programs of study available for practitioners within the field; coupled with the fact that the results of this study found that interest in pursuing programs of study in academic advising to be limited.

The day-to-day operation and work-related activities of current academic advising practitioners allow for them to function as professionals and make professional decisions within their position and in their work-related activities with students. Because academic advisors function as professionals within their roles, many are unaware of the fact that the field of academic advising is not yet a recognized academic discipline. This is primarily due to the fact that practitioners’ work-related activities mirror that of other recognized professional positions. Advisors use critical thinking and analytical reasoning skills within their positions on a day-to-day basis. They may also be the first persons with whom students come in contact on college campuses, nationwide. Advisors are responsible for not only knowing and understanding institutional policies that affect student, but also serves as professional representatives of the institutions that employ them. Advisors are the primary means of communication between students and institutions; thus, they are key stakeholders in student success and completion.
Advisors' various responsibilities at the institutions that employ them warrants formal professional recognition.
APPENDIX A

E-MAIL TO ACADEMIC ADVISING ADMINISTRATORS
Dear Dr. / Mr. / Mrs. (Last name):

I hope this email finds you well. My name is Kiesha Shelton and I am a doctoral candidate at the University of North Texas in Denton, TX. I am working on my dissertation focused on the professionalization of academic advising. I am contacting you because I am hopeful that you might be able to help me identify full-time academic advisors employed at your college /university. Please note that academic advisors will be asked to participate on a voluntary basis and will be able to opt out of participation in this study without any repercussions. For my study, I am looking for participants:

1. Who are designated as a full-time academic advisors on your college/university campus and
2. Whose primary responsibility is to advise students academically on a full-time basis?

If any academic advisors at your college/university meet the aforementioned criteria, please provide me with their names and e-mail addresses. Participants will be asked to respond to a 20-minute survey with 34 questions. Below I have included a web link to access the survey.

WEBLINK HERE

Thank you for your consideration of my request. I would appreciate any and all assistance you can provide. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have questions about my study.

Respectfully,

Kiesha R. Shelton
Doctoral Candidate, Higher Education Program
University of North Texas
APPENDIX B

E-MAIL TO ACADEMIC ADVISING PROFESSIONALS
Dear Dr. / Mr. / Mrs. (Last name):

I hope this letter finds you well. My name is Kiesha Shelton and I am a doctoral candidate at the University of North Texas in Denton, TX. I am working on my dissertation focused on the professionalization of academic advising. Dr. /Mr. /Mrs. (Academic Advising Administrator) provided your contact information. He/ She identified you as a full-time academic advisor employed at the college/university. You will be asked to complete a survey on a purely voluntary basis. I am looking for participants:

1. Who are designated as a full-time academic advisors on your college/university campus and
2. Whose primary responsibility is to academically advise student academically on a full-time basis.

If you meet these criteria, in about a week I will send you a Web survey via your college/university assigned electronic mail address, requesting that you take about 20 minutes to respond to a 20-minute survey of 34 questions. Below I have provided a link to access the survey.

WEBLINK HERE

Thank you for completing the survey before DATE.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have questions about my study.

Respectfully,

Kiesha R. Shelton

Doctoral Candidate, Higher Education Program

University of North Texas
APPENDIX C

NON-RESPONDENT REMINDER E-MAIL
Dear Dr. / Mr. / Mrs. (Last name):

   My name is Kiesha Shelton and I am a doctoral candidate at the University of North Texas in Denton, TX. I am working on my dissertation focused on the professionalization of academic advising.

   A few weeks ago, I sent you a survey to complete because you were identified as a full-time academic advisor at your college /university. The submission deadline of May 31, 2013 is fast approaching. If you have not done so already, please take about 20 minutes to respond to this short survey of 34 questions. Below I have provided a Web link to access the survey.

WEBLINK HERE

Please contact me if you have questions about my study. I will be happy to answer them.

Respectfully,

Kiesha R. Shelton

Doctoral Candidate, Higher Education Department

University of North Texas
APPENDIX D

SURVEY QUESTIONS
Demographics

1. Please Identify your gender:
   1- Female
   2- Male
2. Which of the following best describes your ethnicity?
   1- Caucasian American
   2- African American
   3- Hispanic/ Latino American
   4- Asian/Pacific Islander
   5- Other
3. Please enter your age: _____
4. Which of the following best describes the college/university of which you are employed?
   1- 4 Year College / University
   2- 2 Year College
5. My position is Academic Advisor at my college/university.
   1- Yes
   2- No
6. I have other duties and responsibilities outside of academic advising.
   1- Strongly Disagree
   2- Disagree
   3- Neutral
   4- Agree
   5- Strongly Agree
7. Which of the following best describes your years of work experience in higher education, including academic advising?
   1- 0-5 years
   2- 6-10 years
   3- 11-15 years
   4- 16-20 years
   5- More than 20
8. Which of the following best describes your years of work experience as an academic advisor?
   1- 0-5 years
   2- 6-10 years
   3- 11-15 years
   4- 16-20 years
   5- More than 20

Educational Activities

9. Which of the following best describes the highest level of education you have completed?
   1- No College Degree
   2- Associate’s Degree
   3- Bachelor’s Degree
   4- Master’s Degree
   5- Doctoral Degree
10. Which of the following best describes the minimum degree qualifications for an academic advising position at your institution?

1- No College Degree
2- Associate’s Degree
3- Bachelor’s Degree
4- Master’s Degree
5- Doctoral Degree

11. The degrees I hold are related to the field of Academic Advising.

1- Strongly Disagree
2- Disagree
3- Neutral
4- Agree
5- Strongly Agree

12. The degrees I hold helped me be more prepared in my position as an academic advisor.

1- Strongly Disagree
2- Disagree
3- Neutral
4- Agree
5- Strongly Agree

13. There is a defined career path for promotion as an academic advisor at my institution.

1- Strongly Disagree
2- Disagree
3- Neutral
4- Agree
5- Strongly Agree

14. Rate your familiarity with Academic Advising Graduate Programs

1- No Knowledge
2- Minimal Knowledge
3- Somewhat Knowledgeable
4- Knowledgeable
5- Exceptional Knowledge

15. I am interested in pursuing a graduate degree in Academic Advising.

1- Strongly Disagree
2- Disagree
3- Neutral
4- Agree
5- Strongly Agree

16. I am interested in pursuing a graduate certification in Academic Advising.

1- Strongly Disagree
2- Disagree
3- Neutral
4- Agree
5- Strongly Agree
Professional Development Activities

17. I am currently a member of a professional organization that supports my work as an academic advisor.
   1- Strongly Disagree
   2- Disagree
   3- Neutral
   4- Agree
   5- Strongly Agree

18. I am currently a member of the National Association of Academic Advisors (NACADA).
   1- Yes
   2- No
   3- Not Sure

19. How often do you participate in professional development activities related to academic advising on your campus?
   1- Never
   2- Infrequently (1-2x/year)
   3- Sometimes (3-4x/year)
   4- Frequently
   5- Very Frequently

20. How often do you participate in professional development activities related to academic advising off campus?
   1- Never
   2- Infrequently (1-2x/year)
   3- Sometimes (3-4x/year)
   4- Frequently
   5- Very Frequently

21. Funding for off campus professional development activity is provided by my institution.
   1- Strongly Disagree
   2- Disagree
   3- Neutral
   4- Agree
   5- Strongly Agree

22. Overall, how would you rate the degree to which your professional development is related to academic advising?
   1- Almost Never Related
   2- Usually Not Related
   3- Occasionally Related
   4- Usually Related
   5- Almost Always Related
Research Activities

23. There is an expectation that I participate in scholarly research activities as a part of my academic advisor job responsibilities.
   1- Strongly Disagree
   2- Disagree
   3- Neutral
   4- Agree
   5- Strongly Agree

24. How often do you read scholarly research articles related to the field of academic advising?
   1- Never
   2- Infrequently (1 -2x /year)
   3- Sometimes (3-4x / year)
   4- Frequently
   5- Very Frequently

25. How many research articles have you submitted for publication in scholarly journals?
   1- 0 articles
   2- 1-3 articles
   3- 4-5 articles
   4- 6-8 articles
   5- 9 or more articles

26. How likely would you be to submit research articles for publication?
   1- Very Likely
   2- Likely
   3- Somewhat Likely
   4- Unlikely
   5- Not at all Likely

27. How knowledgeable are you with the existing body of published research on academic advising?
   1- No Knowledge
   2- Minimal Knowledge
   3- Somewhat Knowledgeable
   4- Knowledgeable
   5- Exceptional Knowledge.

Professional Standards

28. The work I perform has standards of practice.
   1- Almost Never True
   2- Usually Not True
   3- Occasionally True
   4- Usually True
   5- Almost Always True
29. I am familiar with the mission statement of my Academic Advising office.
   1- Strongly Disagree
   2- Disagree
   3- Neutral
   4- Agree
   5- Strongly Agree

30. How does your work relate to assisting students in developing a meaningful educational plan?
   1- Almost Never Related
   2- Usually Not Related
   3- Occasionally Related
   4- Usually Related
   5- Almost Always Related

31. How would you rate the effectiveness of educational plans you develop with students?
   1- Almost Never Effective
   2- Usually Not Effective
   3- Occasionally Effective
   4- Usually Effective
   5- Almost Always Effective

32. How would you rate your knowledge of your institution’s policies affecting students?
   1- No Knowledge
   2- Minimal Knowledge
   3- Somewhat Knowledgeable
   4- Knowledgeable
   5- Exceptional Knowledge.

33. How would you rate your knowledge of academic advising ethical standards?
   1- No Knowledge
   2- Minimal Knowledge
   3- Somewhat Knowledgeable
   4- Knowledgeable
   5- Exceptional Knowledge.

34. How would you rate your knowledge of academic advising assessment and evaluation plans?
   1- No Knowledge
   2- Minimal Knowledge
   3- Somewhat Knowledgeable
   4- Knowledgeable
   5- Exceptional Knowledge
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