THE FACULTY ADVISOR: A DEVELOPMENTAL APPROACH TO ADVISING STUDENT ORGANIZATIONS

by

RONALD MICHAEL LUNK

(Under the Direction of Laura Dean)

ABSTRACT

Faculty serve in a variety of capacities within the university. One of the roles commonly held by faculty members is to engage with students through advising. Likewise, since the founding of the higher education system in the United States, student organizations play an integral part in the student experience on college campuses. Although faculty play an integral role with student organizations, and student organizations comprise an important part of the higher education landscape, no advising theories surrounding student organization advising currently exist. Borrowing from academic advising literature and associated theories as a guide, two types of advising, prescriptive and developmental, may provide an initial starting point for better understanding student organization advising practices.

Developmental advising first appeared in 1972 by Crookston and was later elaborated on by O'Banion (1972). In 1982, Winston and Sandor developed an instrument to measure academic advising titled the Academic Advising Inventory (AAI), which determined, on a scale, whether the advisor's approach to advising presented as more prescriptive or developmental. This study used a modified Academic Advising Inventory, the Student Organization Advising Inventory, a 55-question survey including 14 demographic-type questions

that provided insight into advising preference, common advising activities, and relationships between the style of advising and the advisors' demographics.

The inventory was sent via Qualtrics email to 279 faculty advisors to student organizations at a large public university. Of those who received the survey, 74 (26.5%) advisors completed it. The study found that the participants preferred developmental advising techniques and that the most reported activities reported were *discussing organization business such as meeting/programming topics, getting to know each other*, *signing forms*, *identifying other campus offices that can provide assistance, discussing extracurricular activities*, *discussing college policies*, *discussing officer succession*, *talking about what you are doing besides taking classes*, and *discussing bylaws or constitution requirements*. The comparison between the advising style and each of the three demographic indicators did not yield a statistically significant relationship. There was no evidence of a relationship between the preferred advising style and sex, time at institution, or type of organization advised. Implications for practice include training, recruitment, and advising approach.

INDEX WORDS: Faculty, Advising, Student Organizations, Student Involvement, Quantitative, Teaching, Mentoring, Supervising, Academic Advising, Career Advising

THE FACULTY ADVISOR: A DEVELOPMENTAL APPROACH TO ADVISING STUDENT ORGANIZATIONS

by

RONALD MICHAEL LUNK

BA, University of West Georgia, 2001

MPA, University of West Georgia, 2004

A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2018

© 2018

Ronald Michael Lunk

All Rights Reserved

THE FACULTY ADVISOR: A DEVELOPMENTAL APPROACH TO ADVISING STUDENT ORGANIZATIONS

by

RONALD MICHAEL LUNK

Major Professor: Laura A. Dean
Committee: Diane L. Cooper
Georgianna L. Martin

Electronic Version Approved:

Suzanne Barbour
Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Georgia
December 2018

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I want to acknowledge the many educators along my journey who have laid a foundation for me to aspire to this point. To all the teachers at Cartersville City Schools (Cartersville, GA) who provided the basic knowledge, love of learning, and academic inquiry for they firmly guided me on the academic path. The professors and faculty at the University of West Georgia who taught me to question, think deeply, and explore the world around me. The faculty at the University of Georgia's Student Affairs Leadership Doctorate of Education program (SAL Ed.D.) for taking a chance on a guy who had been out of school for more than a decade, who struggled seeing himself as a student let alone a scholar, and who sometimes just did not "get it." I want especially to thank my committee members Laura Dean, Diane Cooper, and Georgianna Martin for their insights, patience, and encouragement through the entire writing process.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS iv

LIST OF TABLES viii

LIST OF FIGURES x

CHAPTER 1 1

- **Problem Statement** 4
- **Purpose of the Study** 5
- **Research Questions** 6
- **Assumptions and Delimitations of the Study** 7
- **Significance of the Study** 7
- **Chapter Summary** 8

CHAPTER 2 9

- **Student Organization History** 9
- **Student Development** 11
- **Student Organization Challenges** 16
- **Institutional Impact** 17
- **Advising** 20

Chapter Summary 28

CHAPTER 3 29

Research Design 30

Instrumentation 34

Location 35

Participants 36

Data Collection 37

Analysis of Data 39

Scoring 39

Conclusion 41

CHAPTER 4 43

Student Organization Advising Inventory 44

Conclusion 52

CHAPTER 5 53

Summary of Findings 54

Discussion 55

Conclusion 75

REFERENCES 77

APPENDICES **86**

Appendix A **866**

Appendix B **87**

Appendix C **88**

Appendix D **96**

Appendix E **106**

LIST OF TABLES

Page

Table 2.1: Differences in developmental and prescriptive academic advising.....25

Table 3.1: Time spent advising 33

Table 3.2: SOAI Part I scale scoring.....40

Table 3.3: Methodology rubric 42

Table 4.1: Prescriptive to developmental advising scale 45

Table 4.2: Advising activities 46

Table 4.3: Participants: Sex 47

Table 4.4: Participants: Race.....47

Table 4.5: Participants: Age.....47

Table 4.6: Participants: Faculty status 48

Table 4.7: Participants: Tenure track.....48

Table 4.8: Participants: Employment 48

Table 4.9: Participants: Years at institution 48

Table 4.10: Participants: Type of organization advised..... 49

Table 4.11: Advisor interactions..... 49

Table 4.12: Advisor participation..... 49

Table 4.13: Time spent advising 49

Table 4.14: Frequency of interaction 50

Table 4.15: Attendance at training **50**

Table 4.16: Learn something that would make you a better advisor (from training) **50**

Table 4.17: Reviewed online training videos **50**

Table 4.18: Learn something that would make you a better advisor (from videos) **50**

Table 4.19: Independent Sample t-test results of preferred advising by sex **51**

Table 4.20: Independent Sample t-test results of preferred advising by years at Institution **51**

Table 4.21: One-way ANOVA between advising preference and type of organization **52**

LIST OF FIGURES

Page

Figure 2.1: Concept of Academic Advising 21

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Faculty play many integral roles within the fabric of higher education. Common requirements for faculty include teaching, researching, and writing; however, they may also see other duties and expectations placed upon them (Croft, 2004; Dunkel, Schuh, & Chrystal-Green, 2014; Meyer & Kroth, 2010). Interaction with students outside of the classroom stands as one of the oldest responsibilities for faculty within the U.S. higher education system (Lyons, 2015; Nadler, 1997; Yarbrough, 2002). Inviting students into their homes, working on research projects, and advising students through various phases of the collegiate experience exemplify faculty-student co-curricular involvement (Bond & Sterrett, 2014; Meyer & Kroth, 2010; Nadler, 1997; Yarbrough, 2002). Faculty support of student organizations began with the earliest literary and debate organizations and continued through involvement with Greek-lettered organizations, advocacy organizations, and athletic groups, as well as special interest organizations, such as a chess club or an anime enthusiast organization, designed simply for community gathering.

Literature about membership in student organizations historically focuses on motivation, benefits, skill development, leadership, and overall student experience (Croft, 2004; Lyons, 2015; Mikulec & McKinney, 2014; Munoz, Miller, & Martin Poole, 2016); however, literature on the topic of faculty advising student organizations remains limited to motivation and how students benefit (Lyons, 2015). In searching the higher education and student affairs literature over the last twenty years, few publications regarding faculty and the co-curricular experience of students were found.

George Kuh (2008) wrote about high impact practices, which enhance student success and engagement. His list of ten practices include first-year experiences, learning communities, global learning, and service learning. Each of these practices typically involves faculty in outside-of-the-classroom activities, embedding them in the co-curricular areas of the institution. The integration of learning through the faculty-student or advisor-advisee relationship, according to Kuh, remains critical to student success. There is not, however, a mention of the impact on or experience of the faculty member.

According to Dunkel, Schuh, and Chrystal-Green (2015), the divide between inside the classroom and outside the classroom experiences limits faculty from fully serving the student organizations they advise. Faculty expectations remain on research, grant writing, teaching, and various service commitments, along with advising students academically and in student organizations (Krush & Winn, 2010). Faculty advisors for student organizations serve as mentors, guides, and administrators, and as a support system for those groups. Those who manage the student organization process typically require groups to have a full-time faculty or staff member serve as their advisor to remain good standing with the institution (CAS, 2015). Serving as a student organization advisor requires a range of skills and knowledge to fill this complex role; faculty may not receive adequate training on student development theories, students in crisis, and the administrative bureaucracy of the institution (De Sawal, 2007; Dunkel, Schuh & Chrystal-Green, 2015).

Most institutions in the United States rely on faculty to serve as academic advisors as they have from the earliest days of the higher education system. American institutions modeled themselves after the English example, with a focus to educate enrolled young men, both morally and intellectually (Gillispie, 2003). It was not until World War I that counseling and advising,

coupled with the advent of industrial psychology, placed vocation and aptitude as part of the academic consideration (Gallagher & Demos, 1983). In the 1960s and 1970s, emphasis on student development brought about changes in the way students received academic advisement (Gordon & Habley, 2000). Today, the student's development continues to play a large role in academic advising, with a greater integration with career advising (Huber & Miller, 2013). Academic advising by faculty may differ by institution, whether considered as a service-related job function or as part of the teaching responsibility (Sprague, 2008). Regardless of the method of advising, it often remains an important part of the faculty's role.

Bond and Sterrett (2014) wrote, "Student organizations serve an important role in the life of a university" (p. 26). One of the key strengths of student organizations is the connection to student retention (Nadler, 1997). Another strength found through participation in student organizations is the development of skills that are often unattainable within a classroom context. Additionally, students involved in student organizations receive an opportunity to engage in faculty-student learning outside of the classroom. Advisors play a crucial role in student organizations for a variety of reasons, including consistency from year to year, historical perspective, guidance, and adherence to institution policy (Dunkel, Schuh, & Chrystal-Green, 2014; Nadler, 1997)

Faculty serving as academic advisors fulfill a job duty expectation. Faculty who serve as student organization advisors take on extra duties not necessarily counted in the tenure and promotion process. In fact, some institutions claim that advising student organizations does not fall within the duties of a faculty member and may prove detrimental to their professional career. Institutional administrations often devalued the role of the faculty advisor for student

organizations leading to a shortage of willing faculty able to serve as an advisor to a club or organization.

Obtaining a clearer understanding of the faculty who serve as student organization advisors may assist in the recruitment and retention of advisors for student organizations. This application to practice may also inform decisions for training, supporting, and on-boarding new student organization advisors. Faculty who advise student organizations often also serve in some capacity as an academic advisor. Using the context of academic advising to help faculty see the similarities and connections will help them continue as more effective, willing advisors. Students would benefit by having more options in choosing their student organization advisor if there was a greater pool of able, trained, prepared faculty. The retention of student organization advisors plays a vital role in the sustainability of the group and the continuation of the organization's history on campus. As Tinto (1997) pointed out, the greater connection between faculty and students, the greater student learning and the likelihood of student persistence.

Problem Statement

The topic of student organization advising was particularly interesting to the researcher as he currently serves as the advisor for the Student Government Association and has advised over a dozen student organizations during his career as a Student Affairs professional. Throughout his career, he has had primary responsibility, or has supervised those with primary responsibility, for the guidance and management of registered student organizations. Advising student organizations is part of his lived experiences.

Student organizations have been part of the university landscape since the inception of higher education in the United States (Dunkel, Shuh, & Chrystal-Green, 2015; Whipple & Sullivan, 1998). Faculty have been an inextricable part of the student organization experience

offering mentorship, guidance, and support to the student members (Bond & Sterrett, 2014; Meyer & Kroth, 2010; Nadler, 1997). The role of faculty as an integral part of the student organization experience has often waned since the emergence of student affairs as a profession; however, faculty continue to serve as advisors for student organizations (Lyon, 2015). Student affairs staff typically handle systemic administrative student organization functions such as registering new organizations and managing existing organizations. Faculty serve as teachers, researchers, and administrators, and control the academic learning within the institution, while student affairs professionals manage the out-of-classroom experience. Serving in an advisor capacity for student organizations provides an outlet to continue the teaching role that faculty already hold.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to determine if faculty advisors currently use prescriptive or developmental advising techniques when advising student organizations. Using the existing developmental academic advising model as a guide, the study will determine the ways faculty utilize student development practices as they advise student organizations on a college or university campus. This study will also examine the faculty role as mentor, guide, administrator, and support system for the students within the organization.

Institutional efforts to increase student success are often reflected through on-going measurements of retention, progression, and graduation rates. Student organizations play a role in student success through retention; however, the importance of student organizations remains often ignored by school administrators. Student organizations retain students through the relationships students build with faculty advisors. This role of the faculty advisor plays a

significant role in student success as the relationship between faculty and students is important. Additionally, the way the faculty advise the students remains just as important.

No existing advising models for student organization advising currently exist; therefore, this study relied on existing advising models from academic advising and career advising to find models that may be applicable in student organization advising. Although more than a dozen models for academic advising exist, including seven families of advising models, as described on the NACADA Clearinghouse website (www.nacada.ksu.edu/Resources/Clearinghouse.aspx), this study will focus on Developmental Academic Advising. Developmental Academic Advising, first introduced by Burns Crookston (1972), provides an aspirational advising model where the advisor and advisee develop a mutual learning relationship and the functions evolve past the place of a prescriptive course selection. "Advising is viewed as a teaching function based on a negotiated agreement between the student and the teacher in which varying degrees of learning by both parties to the transaction are the product" (p. 9). Terry O'Banion (1972) operationalized Crookston's model to suggest a process of academic advising to include life goal exploration, vocational exploration, program choice, course choice, and course scheduling.

Academic advising can be prescriptive or developmental. The multitude of academic advising families fall under the auspice of developmental advising. Although there exist differences within the families, there are also overlapping ideas and tasks. Situating this study within the broader context of developmental advising, as described by Crookston and O'Banion, respectively, allows for a broader dialogue regarding how faculty advisors advise student organizations.

Research Questions

This quantitative study used survey methodology to explore the following questions:

1. Do faculty advisors identify as prescriptive or developmental in advising student organizations, as measured by the Student Organization Advising Inventory?
2. What advising activities do the respondents to the Student Organization Advising Inventory indicate they perform the most frequently in advising student organizations?
3. What is the relationship between the preferred advising approach and faculty characteristics such as sex, time at institution, and the type of organization advised as reported through responses of the Student Organization Advising Inventory?

Assumptions and Delimitations of the Study

Setting the study in one large, suburban, comprehensive institution in the southeastern United States may eliminate some of the variability possible in the faculty advising experience. A matter of access and convenience provided the rational for studying the selected institution, and since no current literature or current models exist, this will serve as an initial, exploratory study for this topic. Due to the significant range in types and sizes of organizations on the institution's campus, there should be a strong diversity of advisor feedback and input, for a single institution. Additionally, because of the merger of two separate institutions with two separate institutional cultures into the now one institution being studied, the single institution spreads across two campuses, less than ten miles apart; there may also be some variation in the advisor preparation and involvement based on the campus where the student organization is primarily housed.

Significance of the Study

Most institutions of higher education in the U.S. have student organizations, faculty, and faculty who advise student organizations, so this study provides for practitioner knowledge development. Additionally, it makes the case for student organization advising to be considered

among the forms of advising, along with academic and career advising. For the faculty who advise student organizations, I provided them an opportunity to share their experiences and ideas for further training. For the student affairs staff, responsible for managing student organizations and working with faculty advisors, the inquiry may provide insight into how faculty see their role as advisor and how student affairs professionals can best support them. This study offers support for the needs of the student organizations as part of the learning environment and serves as a catalyst for advancing advisor training and development. Gauging the experience of advisors as one of the ways faculty are part of the student experience, and looking at the broader advising umbrella, including academic advising and career advising, allows us to apply existing models to student organization advising, where no models exist. This holistic look at advising allows an application and possible adoption to an area that does not presently have models of good practice.

Chapter Summary

Advising in higher education comes in many forms, with three large focus areas of academic advising, career advising, and student organization advising. Faculty play an integral role within the university context in supporting the student advising process for each of these areas. Advising can be prescriptive or developmental in nature. Recently, there has been a shift back to the integration of faculty involvement in the student experience as part of student learning outside of the classroom. This emphasis on faculty integration provides sufficient reason to look at good practices related to advising strategies and the potential applicability of existing developmental advising models. The experiences of faculty who serve as advisors for student organizations can inform how training, communication, and preparation can contribute to the success of those who advise and the student groups with whom they work.

CHAPTER 2

Literature Review

This chapter will provide literature-based context for student organizations and advising in U.S. higher education. The chapter starts with a brief history of student organizations, the role of faculty, and the evolution of student groups including student development implications. It ends with the developmental theories associated with student organization involvement, student organization challenges and institutional impact. The chapter then moves from student organizations to advising definitions, faculty involvement, and various models or approaches to the advising function.

Student Organization History

Students have formed organizations and clubs since the beginning of higher education in the United States. The first known student club was founded at Yale as a debate club (Dunkel, Schuh, & Chrystal-Green, 2014; Meyer & Kroth, 2010; The flat hat club, 1917; Whipple & Sullivan, 1998). The men in the club gathered and discussed, debated, and philosophized on any topic of the day. Harvard and Princeton students soon after organized into similar debating clubs (Meyer & Kroth, 2010).

At some institutions, religious groups formed as ways to continue doctrinal teachings. At first, most of the religious groups formed were Catholic organizations, then Episcopal, Presbyterian, and Lutheran groups followed (Meyer & Kroth, 2010). These organizations helped continue young men's Christian formation process and connected students to their academic programs of study. Colleges where these religious groups formed most commonly declared

direct affiliation with the church, and the groups were therefore fully sanctioned and approved by the administration (Dunkel, Schuh, & Chrystal-Green, 2014; Meyer & Kroth, 2010; Whipple & Sullivan, 1998).

Literary clubs and underground societies found their start in the early nineteenth century (Dunkel, Schuh, & Chrystal-Green, 2014; Meyer & Kroth, 2010; Whipple & Sullivan, 1998). These groups would gather, when permissible, to discuss the greater writers and poets of the day. These clubs focused on academic pursuits and exchange of scholarly ideas (Meyer & Kroth, 2010). When colleges prohibited the formation of such groups, the students formed secret societies and met off campus or under the cloak of night, as written about in popular literature such as *Dead Poet's Society* (Kleinbaum, 1989). When the competition to join such literary groups grew to be difficult, Greek-lettered organizations began to form.

Student Organization Progression

Greek-lettered organizations grew out of literary organizations (Dunkel, Schuh, & Chrystal-Green, 2014; Murray, 1992; Whipple & Sullivan, 1998). Some of these societies became honorary organizations where others became social organizations (Dunkel, Schuh, & Chrystal-Green, 2014). The organizations moved away from literature and debate towards networking, social gatherings, and fraternal bonding. Along with the fraternal movement came the movement for fraternal organizations for women, later known as sororities (Dunkel, Schuh, & Chrystal-Green, 2014). The fraternal movement for women may have been one of the earliest women's movement activities, striving for equality.

Student-led activism began to surface in the twentieth century as the social climate began to change (Dunkel, Schuh, & Chrystal-Green, 2014). First, the movement toward student autonomy and independence was followed by the push for women's rights. By the 1960s the

Civil Rights movement was in full effect and activism was at an all-time high. Colleges and universities experienced legal integration and greater access to a wider variety of students through the admissions process. A decade later, the anti-Vietnam War movement took hold, coupled with militant activism such as the Black Panther Party (Rudy, 1996). By the end of the century, students organized around the AIDS epidemic and Lesbian, Gay, Bi, Trans, Queer (LGBTQ) rights (Rhoads, 1998; Rudy, 1996).

Throughout the years, student organizations served as an outlet for United States collegiate students. Advisement by the faculty provides a necessary support to these organizations. Along with the administrative work associated with advising comes the development of relationships between the student organization and the student membership. The rapport between student and advisor, in the context of student organizations, can also foster the student's development.

Student Development

Joining a student organization affords students greater opportunities that may not be realized by students who do not engage with a group (Bond & Sterrett, 2014; Dunkel, Schuh, & Chrystal-Green, 2014; Nadler, 1997). Students develop transferable skills that benefit them personally and professionally. Students who are part of an organization can try new things, explore their interests, and find a place to belong. By joining a student organization, students can interact with other students, work closely with faculty and staff advisors, develop leadership skills, and hone soft skills, while building confidence and self-esteem (Bond & Sterrett, 2014; Nadler, 1997).

Interactions with Students

When students interact with other students, they benefit from membership through their interactions with other students (Dunkel, Schuh, & Chrystal-Green, 2014). When students share different intersections of identity, they may find particular benefit to this interaction. Learning about cultures, ethnicities, geographic or regional differences, and various points of view is critical to the student's development (Bond & Sterrett, 2014; Dunkel, Schuh, & Chrystal-Green, 2014; Reaves, Hinson, & Marchant, 2010). Working with students from across the spectrum of background, identity, personality, and maturity provides great opportunity for the growth and development of the student (Dunkel, Schuh, & Chrystal-Green, 2014; Nadler, 1997; Reaves, Hinson, & Marchant, 2010).

Interactions with Faculty

Developing relationships with faculty who advise the organizations provides another way for students to experience personal development through their membership in a student organization (Astin, 1984; Astin & Cartter, 1996). Developing relationships with faculty and staff at the institution provides another layer of support and connection to the institution. Interacting with the faculty outside of the classroom is one of the greatest determinations whether a student will be retained at the institution (Astin, 1984; Tinto, 1987). These contacts afford opportunity for students to learn about research opportunities, graduate programs, and career options. The rapport between students and faculty in the context of student organizations serves as an important association for the student's development (Dunkel, Schuh, & Chrystal-Green, 2014).

Students Leadership and Self-Esteem

In addition to the relationships with other students and faculty, students practice their leadership skills in student organizations. Not all students can or aspire to serve as the president

of their club; however, leadership is not exclusively positional. The students organizing a fundraiser or planning a social gathering practice their leadership skills. It takes leadership to run a committee meeting or to recruit new members. At no other time in a person's life can they try so many different things and learn from their failures and successes than while in college (Bond & Sterrett, 2014; Reaves, Hinson, & Marchant, 2010). Stepping up and leading an initiative, a program, a group, or the entire student organization are all parts of the skill development process of what Stephen Covey (1989) referred to in *The 7 Habits of Highly Effective People* as Habit 7, "Sharpen the Saw" (p. 287).

Students participating in student organizations hone their skills, learn new ideas, make new connections, and gain self-esteem or confidence. Self-esteem comes from developing confidence in abilities, knowledge, practice, and relationships with people (Dunkel, Schuh, & Chrystal-Green, 2014; Reaves, Hinson, & Marchant, 2010). Feeling like there is a place for them and being part of a group satisfies the need to belong (Strayhorn, 2012). Not everyone who belongs to a group will experience a bolstered sense of self-esteem, as other issues may provide a greater influence on a student at a given moment; however, having a network or affiliation with a group where other students show appreciation and allow each other to practice their leadership skills is much more affirming than other scenarios (Nadler, 1997).

Just as students greatly personally by being part of student organizations, their connection with faculty who serve in advisory roles assists with their academic and educational growth. Advisors who are involved with the student organizations they advise and use developmental advising techniques with the students provide the greatest opportunity for connection between the faculty and student. The role advisors play within student organizations contributes greatly to the personal and professional advancement of the student.

Student Development Theories

The ways university administration works with students continues to change drastically over time. As generational shifts occur, the student profile and needs of the student continue change along with the expectations from the student and their families (Bergen-Cico & Viscomi, 2012). As students and their expectations have changed, so have theories about how best to support them. Two student development theories widely accepted and used in the context of student organizations are Student Involvement Theory and Student Engagement Theory (Astin, 1984; Kuh, 1995).

Student involvement theory. Student Involvement Theory (Astin, 1984) was developed to organize and make sense of other existing theories. The concept of student involvement, as described by Astin, is situated in student academic learning through student investment in interests and activities outside of themselves. He defined a highly involved student as one that "devotes considerable energy to studying, spends much time on campus, participates actively in student organizations, and interacts frequently with faculty and other students" (Astin, 1984, p. 292). Student Involvement Theory acknowledges the limitations of a student's time and energy as their attention is pulled in various directions. The relationship with faculty is a critical component of student happiness with an institution and may be one of the greatest factors in student persistence.

Although widely accepted, this theory is over thirty years old. The age of the theory raises a question of its relevance to today's student. Although Astin did revisit the Student Involvement Theory in 1993, it too is now dated. The challenge now is the lack of a more modern version or revision to the theory. Specifically, Student Involvement Theory has not been readdressed to include the various identity intersections that have gained recognition over the last

few decades. The theory lacks consideration for how the interaction or relationship between faculty and student is impacted by identity. Neither students nor faculty advisors are only a single dimension or label. Additionally, the involvement of a student is not simply a binary of involved versus not involved; a plethora of ways exist in which students show involvement.

Student engagement theory. Another, more contemporary offshoot of Astin's Student Involvement Theory is Student Engagement Theory (Kuh, 1995). The Student Engagement Theory was developed out of a need to explain a greater depth of understanding of student experience beyond student's simple involvement or participation in an activity. Engagement includes making meaning and feelings associated with student involved (Kuh, 1995). The three primary characteristics for the student are affect, cognition, and behavior (Kahu, 2013; Trowler, 2010), each impacted by structural influences, such as the student's history and the institution they attend, and psychological influences, such as relationships and student ability, identity, and drive. "Viewing student engagement as a psycho-social process, influenced by institutional and personal factors, and embedded within a wider social context, integrates the socio-cultural perspective with the psychological and behavioral views discussed" (Kahu, 2013, p. 767).

Student Engagement Theory has relevance to student organization involvement because of the student-centered acknowledgement of the influencing factors in learning outcomes. One of the challenges in applying this framework to student organizations is that it does not specifically address student membership or participation in student organizations or other extra-curricular pursuits. Extrapolating and synthesizing from Student Involvement Theory, there are factors influencing the student, directly and indirectly, that emphasize the role that student organizations and the interaction with faculty have on the student experience. Building on the work of Astin, Kuh, and Tinto, "Good relationships foster engagement, which in turn promotes

good relationships; and engagement leads to better grades, which in turn motivate students to be more engaged" (Kahu, 2013, p. 767).

Student Organization Challenges

Working with student organizations provides a challenge for many advisors. The student membership involved in an organization directly impacts the quality of the over-all student organization. (Dunkel, Schuh, & Chrystal-Green, 2014; Rosch & Coplin, 2007). Student leadership can make a significant difference between the success and failure of an organization (Mikulec & McKinney, 2014). For some students, joining and leading a student organization provides a way to experiment, learn, and try their hand at leading their peers, one of many transferable skills gained by those involved in the organization. Another challenge advisors and organizations face relates to the bureaucracy set out by the institution to manage and hold organizations accountable (Dunkel, Schuh, & Chrystal-Green, 2014).

Student organizations are comprised of students who come together over a common interest, belief, or goal (Ozaki & Johnston, 2008). Student membership turns over from year to year with student graduation, transfers, membership fatigue, and change in interests. Rarely will students join and maintain membership for their entire college career, unless in specific groups such as fraternities, sororities, and some professional or academic-related membership organizations. Advisors are one force that keeps organizations stable and moving forward (Meyer & Kroth, 2010; Nadler, 1997).

Consistency also poses a challenge for student organizations (Yarbrough, 2002). If the organization's mission and guiding documents, such as constitution or bylaws, are not specific or strong enough to keep the organization on track, the organization may falter. As students transition in and out of organizations, the group also evolves (Dunkel, Schuh, & Chrystal-Green,

2014). The lack of stability in an organization can be part of student and advisor attrition (Nadler, 1997). Providing the guidance and motivation to keep the student organization continuing from year to year takes sustainable leadership.

Leadership, especially sustainable, consistent leadership, is a challenge facing student organizations. Student organizations do not always do a good job preparing and implementing succession planning (Reaves, Hinson, & Marchant, 2010; Rosch & Coplin, 2007). Cultivating the next president, the next treasurer, or the next advisor are important considerations. Encouraging students who currently do not hold a leadership title is a requirement for student organization leadership. Leadership is less about the position one holds and more about what the person accomplishes (Dunkel, Schuh, & Chrystal-Green, 2014).

Student organizations are situated in the context of an institution of higher education. Colleges and universities have created a bureaucratic system to monitor, manage, and hold student organizations accountable (Dunkel, Schuh & Chrystal-Green, 2014; Meyer & Kroth, 2010). The number of policies, processes, procedures, and forms that are required for each group to navigate each year can be cumbersome and burdensome. In contrast, these systems are in place to assist and support those same student organizations. Many processes are in place to create consistency, develop leadership, and assist with student turnover (Craig & Warner, 1991).

Institutional Impact

Student organizations play an important role in the lives of students. Student members receive benefits including networking opportunities, skill attainment, and leadership development (Bond & Sterrett, 2014; Dunkel, Schuh & Chrystal-Green, 2014; Meyer & Kroth, 2010; Mikulec & McKinney, 2014; Ozaki & Johnston, 2008). Student organizations also impact the institution. Promoting school spirit, working recruitment activities such as Preview Days,

and assisting with various institutional initiatives such as Homecoming are some examples of how student organizations impact campus. Additionally, membership in student organizations promotes students' retention, progression, & graduation (Astin, 1996; Tinto, 1994). In the current climate of higher education, institutions are measured, assessed, and funded based on how well the institution retains, progresses, and graduates students (Dunkel, Schuh, & Chrystal-Green, 2014). Admittedly, countless factors contribute to a student continuing toward graduation; however, membership and involvement in a student organization sits among those contributing factors.

Universities provide student organizations various support mechanisms to aid in their success (Nadler, 1997). One of these mechanisms is university provided resources, and one of the greatest resources is the staffing provided to student organizations. In addition to the student organization advisor, at least one professional staff person in student affairs typically holds responsibility for managing student groups. Providing guidance to the overall student organization community for policies, processes, and training falls to professional staff member awarded this duty (Dunkel, Schuh, & Chrystal-Green, 2014; Reaves, Hinson, & Marchant, 2010). This staff person may also provide information to the student organizations regarding transition, event planning, fundraising, forms and waivers, constitution development, and budget processes.

Another resource universities often provide is financial support (Dunkel, Schuh, & Chrystal-Green, 2014; Nadler, 1997). Universities typically have a system in place that allows student organizations to access student activity fees, for those that fund student groups. Although not all organizations may have access, certain groups do, such as the student government or the campus programming board (Miles, 2011). In some cases, additional

organizations have access to student activity fees for conference registration and travel. Regardless of access to student activity fees, most campuses allow groups to fundraise, collect dues, and recruit sponsorships or donations (Dunkel, Schuh, & Chrystal-Green, 2014). Regulations around the ways that student organizations can use and request finances exist; however, the ability remains.

Space can be a contentious issue on campuses (Nadler, 1997). Reserving and accessing space for meetings, events, activities, recruitment/public relation events, and fundraisers may pose a challenge as space is limited. Although there are many limiting factors, an acknowledgement of how much the college values the student group is evident in the ability for student organizations to use campus space. Some university models have colleges allocating physical space to student organizations: sometimes cubicles, sometimes full offices, other times shared work space (Dunkel, Schuh, & Chrystal-Green, 2014). Considering the premium on space along with demand for space on campuses across the nation, dedicating space to students is notable.

As previously referenced, student organizations receive guidance from various areas on campus. The connection each organization has to the institution varies; however, direction and supervision can come from areas such as the facilities department, police or public safety, budget and finance areas, legal counsel, an academic department, the Dean of Students, Vice Presidents, and even the President's office (Dunkel, Schuh, & Chrystal-Green, 2014). The overall impact of the student organization experience on a university campus is generally recognized as universal and far reaching, impacting not only a variety of students but also many administrative offices and services.

Lastly, student organizations receive various types of training, focusing on topics such as leadership skill development, alcohol and other drug awareness programming, risk reduction, budgeting, and parliamentary procedure. The investment of educating students to ensure compliance with college, local, state, and federal regulation is tremendous.

Advising

To advise is simply to give advice, make suggestions, or refer. Students often look toward upper-class students, faculty, staff, and their parents for different types of advising. In the university context, advising comes from different places also: academic, career, and student organization (Dunkel, Schuh, & Chrystal-Green, 2014). Advising happens both formally and informally (Barbuto, Story, Fritz, & Schinstock, 2011; Kelley, 2008). Advisors use a variety of theories and strategies from many disciplines to create a holistic plan for the students they advise (CAS, 2015).

Currently no models exist for student organization advising; however, models have been developed for academic advising and career advising. The traditional academic advising system called for knowledge or advisor-centered prescriptive advising; however, starting in the 1970s, a shift made academic advising more developmental, holistic, and student-centered. (Barbuto, Story, Fritz, & Schinstock, 2011; Melander, 2005). Identification of advising characteristics of prescriptive or developmental nature may assist in framing the nature of advising model being used. Prescriptive advising provides an advisor led, lock step, formulaic advising approach where the advisor tells the student the requirements and needs of the program, with little input from the student. Developmental advising focuses on the student and their experiences, goals, interests, and learning outcomes (Barbuto, Story, Fritz, & Schinstock, 2011; Kelley, 2008; Melander, 2005). Both the Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education

(CAS) and National Academic Advising Association (NACADA) recognize more than a dozen type of advising approaches. The CAS Contextual Statement for Academic Advising Programs states, "Each approach encourages professional, faculty, and peer advisors to help students delineate their academic, career, and life goals as they help students craft the educational plans necessary to complete their postsecondary objectives" (CAS, 2015, p.37).

A developmental academic advising concept was developed in 2005, NACADA President Jo Anne Huber developed a task force chaired by past presidents Ruth Darling and Eric White to create the association's statement on academic advising (NACADA, n.d.). The concept created is represented by three interlinking triangles of curriculum, pedagogy, and learning outcomes.

Figure 2.1: Concept of Academic Advising

Although this concept was developed specifically for academic advising, the same concept can easily apply to student organization advising. Characteristics and expectations of advising remain the same across academic advising, career advising, and student organization advising as each of these types of advising involves learning-centered activities (Reynolds, 2010).

Student organization advisors are often referred to, generally, as faculty advisors because of the historic context of faculty serving in that role. Since the growth in interest of student organizations, faculty are not the only employees who serve as student organization advisors (Dunkel, Schuh, & Chrystal-Green, 2014). Full-time student affairs professionals at each institution hold responsibility for the overall health and management of the organizations. Student affairs professionals may have advising a student organization written in to their job description, especially for organizations such as student government or the programming board. "Regardless of what type of position you have as your 'day job,' the common thread between all advisors should be the educative role you must play for the organizations and the individual students in those organizations to succeed" (Dunkel, Schuh, & Chrystal-Green, 2014, p. 121).

Faculty Advising

"Advising is a critical component of higher education" (Kennemer & Hurt, 2013, p. 1). The majority of institutions in the United States depend on faculty members to serve as advisors, both academic and for student organizations (Sprague, 2008). Little doubt remains that advising students will continue as a key responsibility of an institution's faculty (Yarbrough, 2002). CAS standards for Campus Activities Programs (2015), indicate that "Every student organization must have an advisor" (p.7). Providing guidance on career plans, academic progress, and course selection are all aspects of academic advising (McCalla-Wriggins, 2009). "Academic advisors must develop the tools and skills necessary to address the many issues that influence student success and do so with respect to the increasing diversity on college and university campuses" (CAS, 2015, p. 38). Responsibilities of student organizations advisors can include attending meetings, meeting with officers (as a group or individually), overseeing budgets, serving as an

advocate, serving as a liaison between the institution and students, assisting in problem solving, and overseeing the selection of new officers (CAS, 2015, p. 7).

Some institutions consider advising as a service-related activity while others consider advising as a teaching responsibility (Sprague, 2008). "Some instructors feel they are hired to teach their subject; institutional efforts to get them involved in other programs are viewed as impositions and sometimes as even encroachments on academic freedom" (O'Banion, 1994, p. 14). The lack of reward for advising may influence the quality and attitudes of the faculty advising (Titley & Titley, 1982). Tenure track faculty are devoted to their teaching, scholarship, and service, along with other responsibilities, besides advising (Frost, 2000; Kennemer & Hurt, 2013).

Advising Models

Academic advising plays an important role in the development of a student as it relates to their coursework, progression, and eventual graduation (CAS, 2015). The literature on academic advising divides into two types of advising; prescriptive and developmental. A third category of full range, or learning-centered advising (Barbuto, Story, Fritz, & Schinstock, 2011), emerged after the turn of the century/millennium as an integration of leadership theory into advising practice. Since it was first introduced, it has yet to catch on beyond being considered another developmental advising approach. Prescriptive advising refers to a style where the advisor directs the student with little to no input from the student. Developmental advising refers to a style where the advisor and student develop a relationship and share responsibility for choices and programs.

In 1972, Burns Crookston wrote, "The emergence of the student development philosophy in recent years necessitates a critical reexamination of this traditional helping function as well as

the assumptions which undergird it" (p. 5). There are two hallmarks of the developmental theory framework. One, that higher education is viewed as a way to achieve a life plan, instead of exclusively for professional preparation. Secondly, the faculty advisor and student mutually contribute to each other's learning. Students are no longer told what path to take to graduate; now there is a negotiated opportunity for the student to choose their own adventure, within the confines of the course catalog. Crookston's definition remains useful; however, it is too large and ambitious (Hendey, 1999). Terry O'Banion (1972) added function to the developmental advising concept by explaining the "five dimensions of academic advising: explorations of life goals, exploration of vocational goals, program of choice, course choice, and scheduling courses" (p. 11). O'Banion's approach assigns decision-making to the student and dictates development in advising (Hendey, 1999).

The term *developmental academic advising* did not gain popularity until 1984 when Winston, Miller, Ender, and Grites published their book, *Developmental Academic Advising* (Winston, et al, 2013). The editors saw the "growing emphasis on educating the whole student, especially in light of the growing and increasingly diverse college student population" (Winston, et al, 2013, p. 6). Winston and Sandor (1984) continued the work of defining developmental academic advising by creating the Academic Advising Inventory to ask students what type of relationship they wish to have with their academic advisors. Asking students these questions regarding advising relationships is important, given the importance of academic advising in assisting retention and student development, especially knowing that there is no one way to successfully advise students (Winston & Sandor, 1984).

Table 2.1
Differences in Developmental and Prescriptive Academic Advising

	Prescriptive Advising	**Developmental Advising**
ABILITIES	Focus on limitation of students	Focus on potentialities of students
MOTIVATION	Students are lazy	Students are active and striving
REWARDS	Grades, credits	Achievement, mastery, feeling of fulfillment
MATURITY	Students are immature, irresponsible, and must be supervised closely.	Students are growing, maturing, and capable of self-direction.
INITIATIVE	Advisor fulfills duty by signing forms and giving advice; the remainder is up to student.	Either student or advisor may take initiative—who does what is a matter of shared decision making.
CONTROL	By advisor	Not a major issue
RESPONSIBILITY	Advisor has primary responsibility for outcomes.	Clearly negotiated as to who does what (not the same with every student)
RELATIONSHIPS	Advisor demands respect based on status and position. Relationship is formal and guarded.	Relationship is based on the nature of the tasks, situation, and high trust. Position and status is de-emphasized.

Note. Based on Crookston, 1972. (Winston & Sandor, 2002, p. 8)

The NACADA Clearinghouse for Academic Advising Resources (n.d.) identifies six families of developmental advising: appreciative advising, intrusive or proactive advising, strengths-based advising, coaching, Socratic advising, and hermeneutic and narrative advising. Many of these approaches include individual, one-on-one advising and emphasize the importance of faculty advising students, especially in upper-level courses (Bailey, 2010).

Having a centralized advising structure with full-time professional advisors for first-year and undeclared majors is another common model across institutions.

The use of existing academic advising models can inform the delivery and approach to student organization advising. Appreciative advising incorporates asking questions to help students realize their strengths and abilities (Bloom, 2002). Intrusive advising is action-oriented and involves the advisor encouraging the student to seek assistance early (Earl, n.d.). Strength-based advising relies on students to work from their strengths, interests, and natural abilities to create their own self-authored experience (Kincanon, 2009). Coaching is a process where the relationship built between the student and advisor comes first followed by an assessment, feedback, planning, implementation, evaluation, and follow-up cycle (McClellan & Moser, 2011). Socratic advising provides an interactive process where students are active participants in the process of discovering their own answers (McIntyre, 2011). Narrative advising is a process using storytelling as the primary communication delivery (Hagan, 2007). Career advising models integrate academic advising with career planning and choice (Burton Nelson, 2006). Each of these advising approaches emphasizes the ongoing relationship between advisors and students. In appreciative advising, intrusive advising, coaching, Socratic advising, and career advising, the advisor plays a significant role in asking questions and helping the student discover their path. However, in strengths based advising the advisor serves as a support role as the students find their own path. Lastly, in narrative advising the advisor takes a greater role in making connections for the student from the advisor's lived experiences.

Likewise, Kelley (2008) described Fink's Taxonomy of Significant Learning as a model for developmental academic advising. Fink's taxonomy expands on Bloom's taxonomy (1956) and outlines six categories for significant learning: foundational knowledge, application,

integration, human dimension, caring, and learning how to learn (Fink, as cited in Kelley, 2008). This model, and Kelley's connection to developmental advising, recognizes that advisees are learners and advisors are teachers. "Advising is educating" (Melander, 2005, p. 27).

Barbuto, Story, Fritz, and Schinstock (2011) advanced full range advising, which borrows from the leadership field of leader-follower, or in this case advisor-student. This was an attempt to shift the academic advising paradigm and create a new model. The full range leadership model recognized three types of behaviors: laissez-faire, transactional, and transformational. Laissez-faire advising is non-transactional, inaccessible, non-responsive, dissatisfying to students, and passive. Transactional advising is inconsistent, either micro managing or passive, and sporadic in reward systems. Transformational advising is individualized, inspirational, relationship driven, and where the advisor serves as a role model to the group. Advisors operate out of each of these behaviors from time to time; however, every advisor finds one of the behaviors a more natural default position. "It is only through open-ended dialog, reflection, and discussion that the educational experience is personalized and integrated and as a result, becomes more meaningful and transformative" (Wilcox, 2016, p. 2). Keeping with the principles of full range advising, the principles remain that advising must be done developmentally, not prescriptively (Slonneger Hancock, 2004).

> Whether practicing the intentionality of proactive (*formerly intrusive*) advising (Varney) or appreciative advising (Bloom, Hutson, & He) advising, employing the rigors of advising as coaching (McClellan), or shifting the emphasis from students' deficiencies to their strengths (Schreiner), the advisor of today integrates the common thread of the developmental approach to assist students in achieving

their goals and maximizing their opportunities for success. (McCalla-Wriggins, 2009, p. 12)

Chapter Summary

Many convincing arguments emerge for why looking at career and academic advising approaches as a model for student organization advising makes sense. The relationship between the student and faculty advisor is similar as are the outcomes and objectives in common. Considering advising as a proverbial three-legged stool with academic advising, career advising, and student organization each being a leg, then the congruence becomes more apparent. The strongest argument is that supporting students as they make meaning of their curricular and co-curricular experiences is important (McCalla-Wriggins, 2009). Grounding student organization advising in student involvement and student engagement theories provides a framework where the student and faculty relationship is acknowledged and encouraged. The need for students' involvement in their own learning and development brings these theories together.

CHAPTER 3

Methodology

This chapter describes the research design, methodology, instrumentation, and data analysis used for this exploratory study of advising methods used by faculty members who advise student organizations. According to Creswell (2014), the use of a non-experimental quantitative research design provides a numeric description of trends, attitudes, or opinions of a population by studying a sample of that population. Faculty who serve as student organization advisors were surveyed using a modified version of the Academic Advising Inventory, which is a nationally normed instrument developed by Roger Winston and Janet Sandor (1984, 2002). This study provided a descriptive exploration of the advising style and activities of the faculty who serve as student organization advisors. No advising models for student organization advising currently exist; therefore, this study is situated in existing academic and career advising approaches.

This study explored the following quantitative research questions:

1. Do faculty advisors identify as prescriptive or developmental in advising student organizations, as measured by the Student Organization Advising Inventory?
2. What advising activities do the respondents to the Student Organization Advising Inventory indicate they perform the most frequently in advising student organizations?
3. What is the relationship between the preferred advising approach and faculty characteristics such as sex, time at institution, and the type of organization advised as reported through responses of the Student Organization Advising Inventory?

The researcher surveyed faculty who advise student organizations at a large comprehensive, teaching university in the southeast United States. The survey was distributed to faculty advisors via an email link to the survey in Qualtrics. Once data were collected, the researcher analyzed the faculty's responses regarding their advising methods and activities as advisors.

Research Design

The use of survey data to gain understanding of the advisor relationship for faculty who serve as advisors to student organizations is advantageous as it provides a timely, economical, and straightforward way to collect the data. Using the questionnaire as an unobtrusive tool across a large population allowed for a greater cross-section of data for an exploratory study. Adapting an existing survey tool for this study provided an established framework as a starting place for the current research Academic Advising Inventory

The Academic Advising Inventory was created to operationalize, define, and measure developmental advising. Building on the work of O'Banion (1972) and Crookston (1972), this inventory operationally defined developmental advising by asking students if they preferred developmental or prescriptive advising. The instrument was developed based on Crookston's article, "Developmental View of Academic Advising as Teaching" (1972). Developed by Winston and Sandor (1984), the Academic Advising Inventory filled a "need that exists for a systematic, theoretically-grounded instrument that measures developmental advising" (p. 6).

When Winston and Sandor created the AAI, they wrote 62 items, formatted in pairs to represent both developmental and prescriptive relationships. "Eight experts in the field of academic advising were asked to participate in the next stage of construction by independently classifying items written by the authors" (Winston & Sandor, 1984, p. 8). The experts were

given the statements unpaired and asked to categorize the items. The final instrument, in 1984, had 22 paired statements with an internal validity of 0.81 as determined by a Cronbach Alpha. Subsequent edits brought the number of statements to 14, increasing the Cronbach to 0.93, comprising the Developmental-Prescriptive Advising Scale (DPAS) (Winston & Sandor, 2002). The DPAS contains 14 items with two statements to be assessed. Items are evaluated on an 8-point scale with the low score indicating prescriptive advising and a high score indicating developmental advising. NACADA retains and holds the copyright of this nationally normed instrument (Freitag, 2004). In 2004, David Freitag developed a freeware application version of the Academic Advising Inventory.

The revised Academic Advising Inventory (Winston & Sandor, 2002) was divided into five parts with a total of 72 items including the paired statements. The inventory was designed to collect data about the advising approach of the advisor, either developmental or prescriptive (Winston & Sandor, 2002). Starting with the revised version of the Academic Advising Inventory (AAI) (Winston & Sandor, 2002), the researcher in the current study modified the instrument and called it the Student Organization Advising Inventory (SOAI), available in Appendix C. The instructions given to the participants as they responded to the survey were to think about the organization they advise, the way they were introduced to the advising responsibility, and the ways they interact with the students in the organization.

AAI/SOAI Part I: Advising Styles. Part I of the AAI consists of 14 pairs regarding the current academic advising situation under assessment. An example of Part I pairings is "My advisor plans my schedule for me" on the left to the right side "My advisor and I plan my schedule together." Part I of the revised SOAI concerns how the participants approach advising student organizations. Even if they have advised more than one student organization or have been in more than one type of student organization advising situation this year, the participants in this study were asked to think about the primary group for which they serve as the faculty advisor and respond to the statements to the best of their ability. Part I of the SOAI also uses 14 items, as did the AAI, adapted to be more applicable to student organization advising. Examples of the paired statements in the modified version include "I plan the student organization's activities" on the left side to the right side "The students and I plan the student organization activities together." Participants had to make two decisions about each pair to respond: (1) decide which one of the two statements most accurately described the student organization advising provided this year, and then (2) decide how accurate or true that statement is (from very true to slightly true).

AAI/SOAI Part II: Time spent advising. Part II of the AAI contains 30 statements about the activities that take place during academic advising. An example of the type of statements found in Part II is "Signing registration forms." Part II of the revised SOAI focuses on the activities that take place involving the advisor and student organization members and includes 25 statements such as "Signing forms." Part II asked the participants to respond to the activities that often take place during their student organization advising experiences. Using the code below, faculty responded to each item: "How frequently, this academic year, have you and members of the student organization you advise spent time…"

Table 3.1
Time Spent Advising

Answer	Number of times advised
A	None (0 times)
B	1 time
C	2 times
D	3 times
E	4 times
F	5 or more times

AAI Part III: Satisfaction. Part III of the AAI entails five statements concerning the academic advising that occurred this year, such as "Advising is available when I needed it." Part III asked the participants to consider the advising they have participated in at this college this year and respond to the statements on a 4-point scale from Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree. The questions in this section do not translate from the academic advising inventory to the student organization advising. In the AAI, the student respondents would report how satisfied they were with the advising they received. Since the SOAI captured self-reported advisor data, the responses were not expected to yield different results from previous sections, and therefore this section was eliminated.

AAI Part IV/SOAI Part III: Demographics. Part IV of the AAI comprises seven general questions, including demographic questions such as "What is your academic class standing?" The demographic information in Part III of the revised SOAI was adapted to update terminology, especially related to personal identities. An additional change to this section included changing the terminology from language used to describe students to language describing faculty, such as "What is your faculty status?" Lastly, two questions were added pertaining directly to in-person and video training options offered as advisor training at the

beginning of the academic year to determine if advisors participated and how they perceived their own learning through those opportunities.

AAI Part V: Ideal Advising. Part V of the AAI is made up of the same 14 statements as in Part I but pertains to the respondent's perception of the ideal academic advisor, rather than to their experience with their actual advisor. For the purposes of this study, Part V was omitted. In the 2002 revision by Winston & Sandor, just as in the online tool created by Frietag (2004), Part V was made optional. The Student Organizations Advising Inventory would not have gained anything of significance related to this study's research questions by repeating the same questions found in Part I, so it was not included.

Instrumentation

Using the same basic statements of the original AAI, rewritten to be more specific for student organization advising, the revised instrument addressed similar constructs as found in the original (Appendix C). The items were stated from the perspective of the advisor and not from the student point of view. To refine the revised instrument and test the face validity of the items, the reworded questions were given to three former faculty advisors to student organizations and two student affairs staff members who have primary responsibility for student organizations. The researcher asked the five faculty and staff to consider each question and how they would respond to each item. Each person was given one week to complete and return the instrument with comments, suggestions, and feedback. Two of the three former faculty advisors to student organizations and the two student affairs professionals provided replied to the request. The feedback received resulted in the addition of clarifying statements and minor word choice modifications, but no substantive changes were suggested or made. Adapting the Academic Advising Inventory (Winston & Sandor, 2002), yet ensuring that the spirit of the instrument

remained where the exact wording was changed, kept the intent intact. The internal validity for the adapted instrument had a Chronbach Alpha of .936. Appendix E provides a side-by-side comparison of the original statements (Appendix C) and the adapted statements (Appendix D).

Location

The location for this study was a large comprehensive public post-secondary institution in the southeast United States. The institution is one of the four comprehensive universities in the state. The institution enrolls approximately 35,000 students over two campuses, four instructional sites, and various online offerings and grants undergraduate, masters, and doctoral degrees through 13 colleges (University website, 2017). At the time of this study, there were over 300 organizations registered with the university, with 279 unique advisors, not including the residence hall organizations, 31 fraternities and sororities, or 41 club sports.

The Department of Student Activities is a part of the Office of the Dean of Students in the Division of Student Affairs. Student Activities holds responsibility primarily for student programming, student media, and student organizations. Students who wish to register their organizations with the Department of Student Activities require a designated, identified advisor, a minimum of seven student members, and a written constitution. Once a registered organization, the group then can reserve space on campus and in some cases request money from the student activity fee allocation committee. The Department of Student Activities facilitates trainings, processes the expenditure of any student activities fee allocations, and reserves space for student groups on campus.

There are, however, student organizations not registered with the Department of Student Activities. Club sports, residential organizations, and social fraternities and sororities are not included, as they are not considered registered student organizations, and so are not listed with

the other student organizations, making advisor information less accessible. These groups are also, generally, not advised by faculty. Managed by the Department of Sports and Recreation, club sports have off-campus coaches/advisors that do not work as university employees; these groups obtain funding through the student recreation fee. Residential organizations are managed by the Department of Housing & Residence Life, advised by residence life professional staff, and funded from a social fee paid by residential students. Fraternities and sororities are managed by the Department of Fraternity & Sorority Life, advised by (inter)nationally appointed alumni advisors who are not necessarily university employees, and are financially independent of the university.

Of the student organizations registered with the Department of Student Activities, 279 have designated advisors holding faculty appointments, which constituted 87% of the registered organizations being advised by a member of the faculty (University website, 2017). These organizations are categorized into a dozen groups: academic and professional, applied academic competition teams, community service, cultural-based and international, faith based and spiritual, honor societies, military, performance and fine arts, political, publications and media, social action, and special interest (University website, 2017).

Participants

Advisors for student organizations typically volunteer to serve in these advisory roles. Many times, a student organization searching for an advisor will identify a short list of faculty or staff whom they wish to consider as their advisor. In a few cases, advisors may have advising duties written in to their position description as it is part of their assignment. In all cases, the advisor and student organization president must agree to continue the advisory relationship. The researcher recruited the faculty who serve as student organization advisors at the institution to

serve as the participants for this study (recruitment email included in Appendix A). The survey was sent to all 279 unique student organization advisors listed publicly on the online student organization management tool. The researcher sent the survey to all advisors as not to miss anyone who identifies as faculty even if that is not their primary position, such as the dean of students who has a faculty appointment in the college of business and university college but has primary responsibility as an administrative staff member. In the survey, logic questions were built in to identify the student organization advisors whose primary role at the institution was as faculty. For this questionnaire, faculty was defined as those individuals having primary teaching appointments at the institution. The faculty participants were provided information regarding informed consent and had to acknowledge the informed consent agreement by clicking their acceptance of the terms, before moving forward with the survey, found in Appendix B.

Collecting data related to tenure status, if they were a part-time or full-time faculty member, the type of organization they advised, and how long they had served at the institution allowed comparisons to be drawn among the advisor responses.

Data Collection

Initially, the researcher reviewed the institution's online student organization database management system to identify the organizations recognized on campus. After receiving approval from IRB at the University of Georgia and the study institution, the researcher sent out an invitation to the advisors at the study institution to complete a survey,

Ideally, the timing of this study would have taken place in the fall semester after the re-registration process closed in September; however, the data were collected during the Spring Semester, the three weeks prior to Spring Break. The survey was not administered during the identified ideal timeframe, as the instrument had not been identified, modified, or validated. The

researcher obtained Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval in February, pushing the survey collection to March. The timing allowed for organizations to have updated the reporting of their faculty advisors and was after any formalized training program for new advisors. In previous years, new student organization advisors, including advisors new to advising student organizations as well as advisors to newly registered student organizations, would attend the student organization leadership training day and complete an online set of videos covering topics such as room reservations, student activity fee budget allocation processes, and helping students through transition into leadership positions. In 2016, the student organization leadership training day was opened to all advisors, not reserved exclusively to those working with new student organizations; however, in the last two years there has been a decrease in the number of advisors attending this training day.

Data Collection Methods

The questionnaire was sent to all student organization advisors using the contact information available to the public from the institutions' online student organization database management system. The survey remained open for three weeks. There were three reminder emails sent to the student organization advisors who had not responded to the survey to encourage participation. An additional set of emails were sent to student organization presidents to inform them of the survey that was sent to their advisors and asked them to encourage their advisor to complete the instrument. At the conclusion of the survey, participants were offered a choice of a $5 gift card to either Starbucks or Amazon. Individually identified responses to that question were separated from responses to the survey to protect anonymity.

Analysis of Data

After data were collected, the researcher scored and recoded responses according to the rubric provided in the scoring section below. Once scored, the data were uploaded in to SPSS for examination. The results of the Student Organization Advising Inventory Part I were analyzed using descriptive statistics. Part II includes sums and means to show five most frequently reported activities performed in advising student organizations. Part III includes results of statistics used to explore the relationships between the advisor's preferred advising method and demographics.

Scoring

Part I: Advising Styles. For SOAI Part I, the statements were randomly placed on the left and right side of each pair to prevent the participant from creating a response set (Winston & Sandor, 2002). Therefore, the first step in scoring was to recode the items.

Table 3.2
SOAI Part I Scale Scoring

	1 =	**2 =**	**3 =**	**4 =**	**5 =**	**6 =**	**7 =**	**8 =**
Question 1	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Question 2	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Question 3	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Question 4	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Question 5	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Question 6	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Question 7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Question 8	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Question 9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Question 10	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Question 11	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Question 12	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Question 13	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Question 14	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8

The greater the score, the more developmental the advising preference would be for the entire scale, once recoded. Once the items were summed, a score of 14 to 56 points indicated prescriptive advising where a score of 57 to 112 indicated developmental advising.

Knowing how the participants responded to the survey in terms of prescriptive/developmental approaches created a classification and set the context for the remainder of the instrument. These results were used to answer Research Question 1, Do faculty advisors identify as prescriptive or developmental in advising student organizations, as measured by the Student Organization Advising Inventory?

Part II: Time Spent Advising. The data collected in Part II provided information regarding the activities that take place during student organization advising. In reporting the results, some precautions were taken regarding assumptions being made. First, these items elicited faculty-reported responses and, therefore, represented only the advisor perspective of the advising situation. Because the advisor was asked to recall their student organization advising activities, there was the potential that some activities were under-reported and others over-reported. Second, some items were applicable to all advisors; other items were applicable to only select groups of advisors, and additional items may not have been applicable to anyone. As a result, some statement scores were expected to be higher than others, depending on the population surveyed. Scoring of Part II was accomplished by taking the responses, which ranged from 0 to 5, and summing the totals for each statement (Winston & Sandor, 2002). For the 26 questions in SOAI Part II, the researcher reported the activities most reported within the responses on a Likert-type scale. The results provided data for Research Question 2, What advising activities do the respondents to the Student Organization Advising Inventory to indicate they perform the most frequently in advising student organizations?

Part III: Demographics. SOAI Part III collects demographic information, which was totaled and reported as percentage of participants. T-tests and ANOVA were completed between the advising preference and various identities to determine if there was a relationship and if those relationships were significant. These numbers correspond to Research Question III, regarding the relationship between the preferred advising approach and faculty characteristics such as sex, time at institution, and the type of organization advised, as reported through responses of the Student Organization Advising Inventory. The responses provided a greater understanding of how the participants who serve as advisors to student organization identified.

Table 3.3
Methodology Rubric

Questionnaire Section	Section Content	Statistics	Research Question Number	Research Question Description
Part I	Advising behavior	descriptive statistics	1	Advising preference
Part II	Advising activities	mean, standard deviation	2	Time spent advising
Part III	Demographic information	T-test, ANOVA	3	Relationship between advising method and sex, time at institution, and type of organization

Conclusion

This chapter described the research methods, methodology, and instrumentation used for this study. In this chapter, the location and site of the study was described, participants were defined, procedures were discussed, collection of data was described, and how the data was

analyzed was explained. By using a modified version of the Academic Advising Inventory (Winston & Sandor, 1984), the Student Organization Advising Inventory, this study provided information regarding the advising of student organizations.

CHAPTER 4

Results

Faculty have played an integral part of the student organization experience from the inception of higher education in the United States (Croft, 2004; Dunkel, Schuh, & Chrystal-Green, 2014; Meyer & Kroth, 2010). The relationship between student organization members and their organization's faculty advisors plays an important role in the student experience. There have been studies conducted on the student experience and benefits of membership in student organizations (Croft, 2004; Lyons, 2015; Mikulec & McKinney, 2014; Munoz, Miller, & Martin Poole, 2016); however, the profession has conducted very little research from the perspective of the faculty advisor. This research study borrows primarily from academic advising literature to draw comparisons for advising practices to inform student organization advising. The research was conducted by modifying the Academic Advising Inventory (AAI) developed by Winston and Sandor (1984, 2002), to create the Student Organization Advising Inventory (SOAI).

This chapter contains the findings from the analysis of data gathered using the instrument outlined in Chapter 3. The chapter begins with details of the Student Organization Advisor Inventory (SOAI) and the responses received from the participants. This chapter reports data gathered by the inventory first by section and then by research question. For each of the three parts of the SOAI, the question, response rate, and responses are detailed. Following the response data of participants completing the SOAI, this chapter also discusses responses regarding the research questions. The chapter closes with conclusions and a final summarization.

Student Organization Advising Inventory

The Student Organization Advising Inventory (Appendix D) was comprised of three sections and 54 questions and sent via Qualtrics email to 279 faculty advisors to student organizations. Of those who received the survey, 116 advisors (42% of faculty advisors to student organizations) opened the email containing the survey. Of those who opened the email containing the survey, 96 (34% of the advisors surveyed) completed the first question consenting to participate in the survey. Ninety-five participants consented to participate in the survey and one participant did not consent to participate in the survey. Part I of the SOAI had 74 participants complete the 14 questions, which was 27% of the advisors surveyed. Part II had 72 participants complete the 26 questions, which was 26% of the advisors surveyed. Part III had 74 participants complete the 14 questions, which was 27% of the advisors surveyed. The return rate for the survey was 26.5%.

RQ 1: Advising Styles

Research Question 1 asked if faculty advisors identify as prescriptive or developmental in advising student organizations. This question corresponds to the data collected in SOAI Part I. The participant chose which statement they identified with more and then ranked how strongly they identified with the statement by choosing, on a scale, from very true to slightly true. The responses (N=74) were coded by assigning a point value corresponding to the scale value selected, from 1 to 8 (questions 1, 3, 5, 9, and 13 were reverse coded, as necessitated by the phrasing of the question). Once the values were coded, each participant's responses were tallied to give a total score that fell along the scale from prescriptive advising techniques to developmental advising techniques. A score of 14 to 56 points indicated prescriptive advising (N=9, 12%), and a score of 57 to 112 indicated developmental advising (N=65, 88%). A large

majority of respondents, therefore, identified with the developmental approach to advising (M = 65.38, SD = 8.75).

14	35	56	57	84	112
Most prescriptive		Prescriptive	Developmental		Most developmental

Figure 4.1: Prescriptive to Developmental Advising Scale

RQ 2: Time Spent Advising

Research Question 2 focused on the most frequently reported advising activities. This question reflects the measure in Part II of the SOAI. SOAI Part II was designed to identify the organization advising related behaviors in which advisors report engaging most frequently. It contained 26 statements of activities that student organization advisors may engage in with the student organization leaders they advise. The respondents (N=71) chose how often those activities took place within the semester, from none to five or more times. The totals for each statement were summed and rank ordered based on the totaled score, as was done in the original Academic Advising Inventory (Appendix C). The most reported activities were *discussing organization business such as meeting/programming topics* (N=71, 100%)*, getting to know each other* (N=71, 100%), *signing forms* (N=69, 97%), *identifying other campus offices that can provide assistance* (N=67, 94%), *discussing extracurricular activities* (N=67, 94%), *discussing college policies* (N=66, 93%), *discussing officer succession* (N=65, 92%), *talking about what you are doing besides taking classes* (N=65, 92%), and *discussing bylaws or constitution requirements* (N=63, 89%). Likewise, the least reported activities were *evaluating academic progress* (N=34, 48%), *discussing probation and dismissal policies related to good standing for student organizations* (N=33, 46%), and *discussing financial aid* (N = 25, 35%).

Table 4. 2
Advising Activities

Rank	Item	Respondents	%
1	Discussing organization business such as meeting/programming topics	71	100
1	Getting to know each other	71	100
3	Signing forms	69	97
4	Identifying other campus offices that can provide assistance	67	94
4	Discussing extracurricular activities	67	94
6	Discussing college policies	66	93
7	Discussing officer succession	65	92
7	Talking about what you are doing besides taking classes	65	92
9	Discussing bylaws or constitution requirements	63	89
10	Discussing job placement opportunities	61	86
11	Discussing personal values	58	82
11	Discussing personal concerns or problems	58	82
13	Discussing internship or cooperative education opportunities	55	77
14	Talking about or setting personal goals	54	76
14	Discussing time management	54	76
14	Discussing career alternatives	54	76
17	Discussing the purposes of a college education	51	72
18	Discussing important social or political issues	50	70
19	Discussing possible majors/academic concentrations	47	66
20	Talking about experiences in different classes	43	61
21	Discussing study abroad or other special academic programs	42	59
22	Discussing study skills or study tips	41	58
23	Discussing course selection	39	55
24	Evaluating academic progress	34	48
25	Discussing probation and dismissal policies related to good standing for student organizations	33	46
26	Discussing financial aid	25	35
	Total Respondents	71	100

RQ 3: Relationship between Advising Preference and Demographics

Research Question 3 asked if there was a relationship between the advising preference and demographic information of sex, time at institution, and type of organization advised. This question uses the scale score from SOAI Part I along with responses from SOAI Part III,

demographics. SOAI Part III was designed to collect descriptive data on the respondents; it included 14 demographic questions. The respondents (N=74) chose how they identified. T-tests were conducted to determine if there was a relationship between the advising scale and sex or advising scale and time at the institution. An ANOVA was conducted to determine if there was a relationship between advising scale and the type of institution advised.

SOAI participant demographic responses

Table 4.3
Participant: Sex

	N	**%**
Female	39	54
Male	33	46
Non-Binary	0	0
No Response	0	0
Total	72	100

Table 4.4
Participant: Race

	N	**%**
White	55	76
African American / Black	7	10
Asian American / Pacific Islander	6	8
Bi and Multi-Racial	2	3
Hispanic American/ Latino/a	1	1
No Response	1	1
Total	72	99

Table 4.5
Participant: Age

	N	**%**
18-24	1	1
25-34	15	21
35-44	12	17
45-54	19	27
55-64	20	28
65-74	4	6
Total	71	100

Table 4.6
Participant: Faculty Status

	N	%
Primary role as faculty	44	60
Primary role not as faculty	29	39
No response	1	1
Total	74	100

Table 4.7
Participant: Tenure Track

	N	%
Tenure Track	27	63
Non-Tenure Track	16	37
Professor Emeritus	0	0
Total	43	100

Table 4.8
Participant: Employment

	N	%
Full-time faculty	41	95
Part-time faculty	2	5
Total	43	100

Table 4.9
Participant: Years at Institution

	N	%
Less than 5 years	23	35
5 – 10 years	24	36
11-15 years	11	17
16-20 years	6	9
21 – 25 years	2	3
More than 25 years	0	0
Total	66	100

Table 4.10
Participant: Type of organization advised

	N	%
Directly linked to academic department	13	18
Indirectly linked to academic department	20	27
Non-academic organization	37	51
Other	3	4
Total	73	100

Table 4.11
Advisor interactions

	N	%
Met with officers in small groups	21	29
Met with officers of the student organization individually	19	26
Met with members in small groups	12	17
Met with members in large groups	12	17
Met with officers in large groups	3	4
Did not meet with officers	2	3
Met with members of the student organization individually	1	1
Met with officers virtually	1	1
Met with members virtually	1	1
Met with members of organizations they do not advise	0	0
Met with officers of organizations they do not advise	0	0
Did not meet with members of the organization they advise	0	0
Total	72	99

Table 4.12
Advisor participation

	N	%
Attend planned events and activities	62	85
Meet with students in their office	62	85
Attend student organization meetings	55	75
Served as a liaison between the student organization and the institution	52	71
Informal or impromptu interactions on campus	48	66
Attend service projects/volunteer activities	32	44
Served as a liaison between the student organization and a National organization	23	32
Total	72	100

Table 4.13
Time spent advising

	N	%
Less than 15 minutes	5	7
15-30 minutes	16	21
31-45 minutes	15	21
46-60 minutes	16	21
More than an hour	21	29
Total	73	99

Table 4.14
Frequency of interaction

	N	%
Weekly or more than once a week	23	32
Several times a month	14	19
Monthly	18	25
Several times a semester	10	14
Once a semester	7	10
Did not meet with organization	0	0
Total	72	100

Table 4.15
Attendance at training

	N	%
Attended	18	24
Did not attend	50	68
Do not remember	6	8
Total	74	100

Table 4.16
Learn something that would make you a better advisor

	N	%
Yes	10	56
Maybe	6	33
No	2	11
Total	18	100

Table 4.17
Reviewed online training videos

	N	%
Reviewed	31	42
Did not review	29	39
Do not remember	14	19
Total	74	100

Table 4.18
Learn something that would make you a better advisor

	N	%
Yes	15	48
Maybe	7	23
No	9	29
Total	31	100

An independent sample T-test was conducted to compare advising preference (prescriptive or developmental) and identified sex of the advisor. There was no significant difference in the score for female (M = 64.87, SD = 8.939) and male (M = 66.42, SD = 8.934); t (-.743) = 70, p = .465.

Table 4.19

Independent sample t-test results of advising preference by sex

Group	N	Mean	SD	SE	*t*	*p*
Female	39	64.87	8.939	1.431	-0.734	0.465
Male	33	66.42	8.934	1.555		

An independent sample T-test was conducted to compare advising preference (prescriptive or developmental) and number of years an advisor had been at the institution. There was no significant difference in the score for 10 or less years (M = 64.74, SD = 8.303) and 11 or more years (M = 67.96, SD = 9.961); t (-1.422) = 68, p = .597.

Table 4.20

Independent sample t-test results of advising preference by years at institution

Group	N	Mean	SD	SE	*t*	*p*
10 years or less	47	64.74	8.303	2.258	-1.422	0.597
11 years of more	23	67.96	9.961	2.404		

A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was calculated to compare the effect of advising preference on the type of organization advised (N = 72, M = 3.42, SD = .835). There was not significant effect of advising preference on the type of organization advised at the $p<.05$ level for the three conditions [F (2, 66) = .451, p = .639].

Table 4.21

One-way ANOVA between advising preference and type of organization advised

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	*p*
Between groups	72.504	2	36.252	.451	0.639
Within groups	5301.235	66	80.322		

Conclusion

The Student Organization Advising Inventory (Appendix C), modified from the Academic Advising Inventory (Winston & Sandor, 1984, 2002), collected data on faculty advisors for student organizations. Participants reflected a cross-section of faculty advisors by race, sex, years at institution, and the type of organization advised, representing 26.5% of those surveyed. There were no significant findings related to the relationship of preferred style and demographic characteristics. Results reflected a participant preference for a more developmental advising style and described advising activities in which advisors engaged most frequently; these will be discussed further in the next chapter.

CHAPTER 5

Discussion and Implications

Student organizations play an important role in the co-curricular component of higher education in the United States. Faculty who serve as advisors to student organizations are critical to the overall success and sustainability of those groups. Through a modified instrument, originally designed for academic advising, faculty advisors to student organizations at a large public institution participated in the survey providing data about how advisors engage in their work, with the intent of informing practice surrounding training, on-boarding, recruiting, and motivating advisors. The results of the study provided three important pieces of information: faculty advisors preferred using developmental advising techniques in advising student organizations, faculty advisors for student organizations primarily participate in relationship building activities in advising student organizations, and there were no correlations between the preferred advising technique and sex, seniority, or type of organization advised.

The researcher utilized the Winston and Sandor (1984, 2002) Academic Advising Inventory and modified it to capture information regarding student organization advising. The modified survey, the Student Organization Advising Inventory (SOAI), was structured in three parts, as opposed to the five of the original AAI. Part I, Advising Style, asked faculty advisors to student organizations how they approached advising student organizations through 14-paired questions with an eight-point scale of slightly true to very true for each of the statements. Part II, Time Spent Advising, asked faculty advisors to student organizations to indicate how often they participated in a list of 26 common advising activities, from zero to five or more times during the

academic year. Part III, Demographics, asked faculty advisors for student organizations demographic information questions including items pertaining to advisor training.

With an understanding and overview of the study conducted, including information regarding the inventory used, the remainder of this chapter will focus on the instrument, findings, and the future of assessment for student organization advisement. This chapter will specifically discuss a summary of the findings and a discussion of the instrument. Additionally, this chapter will discuss limitations of the study as well as the implications for practice. Recommendations for future research will conclude the chapter.

Summary of Findings

The Student Organization Advisor Inventory (SOAI) was used to answer the established research questions for this study. Research Question 1, which asked if faculty advisors identify as prescriptive or developmental in advising student organizations, was answered by responses to Part I of the SOAI. Twelve percent of the participants scored as taking a more prescriptive approach to advising while 88% of the participants scored as being more developmental. Therefore, the preference for the respondents indicated that overall their preference was toward developmental advising. This means that the faculty advisors to student organizations are creating relationships with the students they are working with and are inquiring about the students in a holistic way. They are working with students on the business of the student organization as well as considering the student's academic life, personal life, work life, and how each aspect influences the other aspects of the student. From a practitioner viewpoint, having developmental faculty advisors is ideal as it helps with the student feeling engaged and connected to the institution, linking back to Student Involvement Theory (Astin, 1984, 1993).

Likewise, having faculty advisors engaged with students outside of the classroom provides the faculty connection to the institution and additional teaching opportunities.

Research Question 2 was answered by data collected in Part II of the SOAI which asked advisors which advising activities were performed most frequently in their advising roles. The most frequently reported activities included *discussing organization business such as meeting/programming topics, getting to know each other*, *signing forms*, *identifying other campus offices that can provide assistance*, *discussing extracurricular activities*, *discussing college policies*, *discussing officer succession*, *talking about what you are doing besides taking classes*, and *discussing bylaws or constitution requirements*. This means that the respondents to the instrument are engaging with students in ways that advance the organization they are involved with as well as taking interest in other facets of the student's life. They are building relationships with the students and creating connection points that may lead to the retention of both the student and faculty member.

Research Question 3 asked if there was a relationship of the preferred advising approach and faculty characteristics such as sex, time at institution, and the type of organization advised. There was no statistical significance between the advising method and these demographic characteristics. As a practitioner, the researcher had expected to find differences, based on many years of interactions, conversations, and work with student organizations. The lack of significant results leads to additional questions, which will be discussed later.

Discussion

Advising continues as a major role of faculty in their job, as it has been historically in the United States. Little doubt exists that advising students will continue as a key responsibility of an institution's faculty (Yarbrough, 2002). Although this role is critical, there remains a lack of

literature surrounding the topic. There is a need to recognize the important role and function of student organization faculty advisors and how they advise, interact, and support student groups. Advisors use a variety of theories and strategies from many disciplines to create a holistic plan for the students they advise (CAS, 2015). Literature is void of models for student organization advising; however, models have been developed for academic advising and career advising. The results from this study are the first using a modified instrument from the academic advising area and applying it to student organization advising. Knowing how faculty advise student organizations creates opportunities for those who manage student organization processes and trainings to better support the advisors and provide the necessary resources and information.

Just as there is a void of models for student organization advising, there is a void in the literature regarding how faculty advise student groups or advising method preferences. The lack of literature and lack of models does not provide for direction or guidance on student organization good practice. Making the linkage between existing academic advising techniques and student organization advising is the closest literature available. The adaptation and implementation of the Student Organization Advising Inventory provides the first glimpse into these, creating something specific to student organization advising.

Student Organization Advising Inventory

The instrument used for this study was the Student Organization Advising Inventory (SOAI). The inventory was adapted from the Academic Advising Inventory (AAI) (Winston & Sandor, 1984, 2002) which was developed to capture student preferences for academic advising delivery. The AAI originally had five parts, where two sections (Part I and Part V) asked the same questions (asking respondents first for actual and later for ideal descriptors). The inventory was lengthy and a bit cumbersome. Modifying the instrument to use the three parts that were

most germane to student organization advising and would provide the needed information reduced the redundancy of questions and shortened the time investment for participants.

Reworking the elements of an instrument designed originally for student participants and academic advising for the purposes of faculty advisor participants and student organization advising proved beneficial. Revising the wording of various questions for faculty advisors in a student organization context proved a bit challenging, at first. Thinking through what the spirit of the survey was and how to utilize it for a similar, but different, purpose was necessary. Vetting the instrument with former faculty advisors to student organizations and student activities staff who primarily manage the student organizations proved an important step to ensure the wording and flow of questions worked for the intended audience.

The structure of the survey provided a challenge, particularly of Part I: Advising Styles. The paired statement format may have confused participants, and the scale of very true to slightly true for each statement makes the instrument difficult to read. Although we cannot ascertain for certain, the format of Part I may have contributed to the lower response rate. It is presumed that once the respondents consented to participate in the study, they reviewed Part I and opted not to continue. Of the 279 faculty advisors invited to participate in the survey, 116 advisors (42% of faculty advisors to student organizations) opened the email containing the survey. Of those who opened the email containing the survey, 96 (83% of the advisors who opened the email, but just 34% of those invited) completed the first question indicating consent to participate in the survey, and even fewer continued to complete the inventory. Part I of the SOAI had 74 participants complete the 14 questions, which was 27% of the advisors surveyed. Respondents who finished Part I generally finished the entire inventory. Although the instrument, at least Part I, may have been perceived as difficult to maneuver and interpret, the

data generated was useful. Part II: Time Spent Advising was designed in Qualtrics as radio bullet responses for each of the statements, allowing for a quicker response. The various demographic questions in Part III varied in format depending on what information was being captured.

Since the SOAI was modified, the researcher sent the instrument to three former faculty advisors to student organizations and two student affairs professionals who have primary responsibility for managing student organizations. Two faculty and both student affairs professionals returned the survey with comments and suggestions to clarify statements and simplify some language. No structural or substantive changes were suggested or made. The researcher made the minor changes that were suggested. The Cronbach alpha suggests reliability of a measurement and refers to the extent of consistency. The internal validity of the SOAI was calculated at .936, maintaining the AAI's Cronbach alpha of .93.

Advising Style

Research question 1 asks about the advising preference of faculty who advise student organizations. This question was answered by analyzing the responses from the Student Organization Advising Inventory (SOAI), Part I: Advising Styles. The literature on academic advising generally reflects a divide into two types of advising, prescriptive and developmental (Barbuto, Story, Fritz, & Schinstock, 2011). Prescriptive advising refers to a style where the advisor directs the student with little to no input from the student. Developmental advising refers to a style where the advisor and student develop a relationship and share responsibility for choices and programs. With a goal to answer research question 1, questions were framed to best determine if faculty preferred prescriptive or developmental advising techniques.

The survey responses, with 12% of the participants scoring on the prescriptive side of the scale and 88% of the participants scoring on the developmental side of the scale, indicate the preference of most of the group was toward developmental advising. The leading organization in academic advising training and development, NACADA, recognizes developmental advisement as good practice (Barbuto, Story, Fritz, & Schinstock, 2011; Kelley, 2008; Melander, 2005). Moreover, developmental advising is the students' preferred academic advisement style, as indicated by the findings of the Academic Advising Inventory (Winston & Sandor, 1984, 2002). Based on the preference for academic advising, it might also suggest that students would prefer similar types of advising in student organization advising. If the logic that "advising is advising" regardless of kind (academic, career, or student organization) is true, then the preference in advising method would hold true across each area.

Advising Activities

Research question 2 asks about the most frequently reported activities completed by advisors with their student organizations. This question was answered by analyzing the responses from the Student Organization Advising Inventory (SOAI), Part II: Time Spent Advising. The most frequently reported activities included *discussing organization business such as meeting/programming topics, getting to know each other*, *signing forms*, *identifying other campus offices that can provide assistance*, *discussing extracurricular activities*, *discussing college policies*, *discussing officer succession*, *talking about what you are doing besides taking classes*, and *discussing bylaws or constitution requirements*. These activities correspond to the nature of the advising role. The responses support the literature indicating that students develop through membership in a student organization by developing relationships with faculty who advise the organization (Astin, 1984; Astin & Cartter, 1996). Developing relationships with

faculty and staff at the institution provides another layer of support and connection to the institution. Additionally, building on the work of Astin, Kuh, and Tinto, "Good relationships foster engagement, which in turn promotes good relationships; and engagement leads to better grades, which in turn motivate students to be more engaged" (Kahu, 2013, p. 767).

Likewise, the least frequently reported activities included *evaluating academic progress*, *discussing probation and dismissal policies related to good standing for student organizations*, and *discussing financial aid.* Similarly, it is not surprising that the least reported activities are these activities that are least closely associated with student organization activities. These activities do not work to support the organization, meaning the student organization advisor may not consider these aspects or topics in their conversations with the students. These activities were still considered potential activities of a student organization advisor because the development of the student remains important regardless of the realm of advising.

Relationship between Advising Style & Demographics

There was no statistically significant relationship between the preferred advising style and various demographic identities such as sex, time at institution, and type of organization advised. This lack of relationship could be a factor of the small sample size or it could be attributed to the group of participants that responded to the survey. It may also indicate that there truly is no difference in the advisor style associated with their demographic characteristics. There is potential that with developmental advising being developed in 1972 the current cohort of advisors had developmental advising experiences of their own or formed their own developmental advising style over the years. The oldest advisors who participated in the survey would have been around 19 when Crookston and O'Banion first introduced developmental advising, which would have taken some time to be widely adopted as an advising method.

However, although the concept of developmental advising was first articulated by Crookston and O'Banion, it is likely that some advisors have always taken this approach to working with students.

Demographics

The Student Organization Advising Inventory (SOAI) Part III: Demographics provided a good bit of data about how the participants identify. The number of responses limit the broad implications of what the demographics of the total population may indicate; however, the results remain usable. The participants in the SOAI identified largely as serving in primarily a tenure-track, full-time, faculty role, having served at the institution for 10 or fewer years, and not attending the Student Leader Training Day Advisor Session. The respondents identified predominately as White, while age and sex did not have a majority identity as the responses were divided fairly evenly across categories. The responses indicated that the advisors met weekly with the leaders of the organization they advised individually and in small groups.

It is worth pointing out that while this study identified advisors classified as faculty through the institution's human resources system, a flaw was discovered in that process. As indicated in Table 4.5, 44 (60%) of respondents identified as faculty being their primary job function. The institution designated staff with a graduate degree who can teach a subject as faculty status by indicating the employee is a part-time assistant professor in the field of their graduate degree. This distorted the number of advisors who received the instrument because they were identified as holding faculty status, when they in fact were hired primarily as a staff member. Additionally, this group includes, but is not limited to, librarians and academic advisors who report through the Division of Academic Affairs and the Provost's office but serve in an academic support staff position rather than in a faculty role. Likewise, some student affairs

professionals were also included in the group as they were listed as faculty, many of whom have taught the First Year Experience course when needed. Therefore, the responses may be skewed more developmental and student-centered because of the non-faculty employees who participated in the survey as their classified by human resources as having faculty status.

Reviewing the institution's Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) data for sex and race, as of November 2017, the group who participated in the SOAI is reasonably representative of the full faculty at this institution. The comparisons are based on the IPEDS data, and they are although not categorized exactly the same as listed in the instrument, the numbers remain similar. As listed in tables 5.1 and 5.2, respectively, the percentages represented by the SOAI participants are within a few percentage points of the IPEDS report.

Sex

Although the question is about participant's sex, the question, for consistency, uses terms of gender (female/male) rather than sex (woman/man) as the original instrument and IPEDS data used gender terms. The nearly equal representation of respondents who identified as female (N = 39) or male (N = 33) is similar to the institution's IPEDS data reported sex breakdown (see Table 5.1 below). A challenge is that the only available data online for the institution addressed tenured faculty, which is not fully representative of the population that responded to the survey. The comparison, although not exact, shows the relative balance within the faculty by sex, indicating that the respondents who participated closely reflected the overall tenured faculty at the institution.

Table 5.1
Institution's IPEDS Data compared with SOAI Data by Gender

IPEDS	N	%	SOAI	N	%
Male	577	50	Male	33	46
Female	574	50	Female	39	54

Total	1,151	100	Total	72	100

(National Center for Education Statistics, 2017)

Race

Using the institution's IPEDS data (Table 5.2) the respondent's race identities for tenured faculty fell in line with the faculty demographics of the university. This would indicate that an appropriate sample of faculty advisors, based on race of tenured faculty, participated in the survey.

Table 5.2
Institution's IPED Data compared with SOAI Data for Tenure Status by Race & Ethnicity

IPED	Tenured - N	%	SOAI - N	%
American Indian/Alaskan Native	0	0	0	0
Asian	53	11	6	8
Black	53	10	7	10
Hispanic	11	3	1	1
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	0	0	0	0
Multi-racial	6	1	2	3
White	423	71	55	76
International	7	4	0	0
Unknown	<5	0	1	1
Total	558	100	72	99

Age & Time at Institution

The ages of the respondents are distributed fairly evenly across the age groups with respondents primarily indicating ten or fewer years (N = 47) at the institution. The number of years at the institution would indicate that many of the faculty respondents have not been at the institution very long, regardless of their age. Logically, it might be expected that the older respondents would report more years at the institution; however, that is not the case with these participants. There were few (N = 1) identifying 24 or younger, which could be predicted as the typical age of graduates with an earned graduate degree is 24 or older. There were also few (N=4) identifying 65 or older, which could be predicted as people typically retire by age 65. The

responses between 25 and 64 years of age were approximately 20% for each of the age groups (25 to 34, 35 to 44, 45 to 54, and 55 to 64). This is surprising when considering the later question regarding years at the institution. The majority of respondents (77%) indicated they had been at the university for 10 or fewer years. The fact that so many of the participants report being newer to the institution might suggest there is a lack of institutional knowledge, history, and process that is important to advising. The data would indicate that the majority of respondents are newer at the institution, regardless of age, which may be a result of the low response rates. Another consideration would be that serving as an advisor for student organizations is something assigned or expected for newer faculty, regardless of age or experience. This might also suggest that the faculty come to the institution with different experiences, trainings, and expectations about advising students. Depending on where the faculty members served previously, they may have been exposed to more intentional implementation of advising practices and pedagogy regarding student organizations. Likewise, it might be that other institutions use integrative advising methods for various types of advisors.

Limitations

There are a few limitations to this study, specifically, scope, response rate, and the instrument. The major limitation is the administration of the survey at only one large, comprehensive, metropolitan, southern, public university campus. This limited perspective would not necessarily allow for application across a national landscape of higher education in the United States, or perhaps even across similar institutions. An additional limitation consists of the relatively small number of participants from those eligible to participate at the institution. Roughly 26% of the faculty advisors to student organizations who received the email solicitation to participate completed the survey. Emailing the advisor's list reminders three times, offering a

gift card incentive, and asking student leaders to encourage participation did not yield a larger return. This small rate of return decreased the participant pool and limits the broader variation of responses. Although those who responded varied, there is no way to draw conclusive results or apply them broadly as the number of responses was insufficient for statistical power for the planned analyses. Yet another limitation includes the potential for self-selection in the decision to participate by the respondents of the SOAI. Those who participated may identify as more student-centered, developmental advisors, and the remaining 74% might identify as more prescriptive in their preferred approach, but this cannot be determined from the data. Due to the limited number of participants, there was not enough statistical power to run the tests as planned, further limiting inferences.

An interesting limitation for this study was identifying advisors classified as faculty through the institution's human resources system. As indicated in Table 4.5, 44 (60%) of respondents identified as faculty being their primary job function. The institution designated staff with a graduate degree who can teach a subject as faculty status by indicating the employee is a part-time assistant professor in the field of their graduate degree. This distorted the number of advisors who received the instrument because they were identified as holding faculty status, when they in fact were hired primarily as a staff member. This group includes, but is not limited to, librarians and academic advisors who are in the Division of Academic Affairs and report through the Provost's office but serve in an academic support staff position rather than in a faculty role. Additionally, some student affairs professionals were also included in the group as they were listed as faculty, many of whom have taught the First Year Experience course when needed. Therefore, the responses may be skewed more developmental and student-centered because of the non-faculty employees who received the survey as classified by human resources.

Possibly the largest limitation was the instrument itself. The use of an existing survey created a number of opportunities and a certain level of usefulness; however, adapting an instrument meant to measure student perception and satisfaction in academic advising for faculty advising student organizations was not ideal. Since this was the first exploratory study looking at the practical application of student organization advising by faculty members, the adaption worked enough to provide initial data. The structure of the instrument, specifically Part I, was challenging and could be confusing in comparing the two statements and then choosing the degree of agreement on an eight-point scale. Another limitation related to the survey is that the instrument manual for the Academic Advising Inventory (Winston & Sandor, 1984, 2002) did not provide guidance in handling missing data, specifically in Part I for the advising scale. In the collection for this study, eight records each had one missing response, which the researcher coded as zero. This coding depressed the eight scores; however, the depression did not change the distribution of scores. To verify this, the researcher replaced each of the zeros with the highest number available and there was no change in the scale score distribution.

Implications for Practice

The practice of advising student organizations includes complexities with the annual change of student leadership and the recognition that student organizations are only as good as the student membership involved in the organization (Dunkel, Schuh, Chrystal-Green, 2014; Rosch & Coplin, 2007). The survey results indicate that the participants of the study prefer a developmental approach to advising, engage in student-centered activities in advising, spend time with the organizations they advise on a regular basis, and participate in regular meetings, events, and service projects hosted by the organization. Time spent developing advising relationships with student organization leaders through developmental advising approaches helps

develop those students to be better leaders and move the organizations along toward achieving their goals. There was an expectation that the study would indicate relationships between advising preference and advisor identities through the responses in the demographics section; however, no statistically significant relationships emerged. There is no indication that the sex, age, time at institution, tenure status, or other demographic identity of the advisor has any relationship to how they approach the advising role. From a practical perspective, the focus should be on the skills needed to advise and ensuring there are enough advisors for the student groups that need advisors. Another practical implication is that this is the first time student organization advising has been compared to academic advising methodology. The relationship between the student and faculty advisor is similar in student organization advising as academic advising and even career advising, given that they have outcomes and objectives in common. Considering advising as a proverbial three-legged stool with academic advising, career advising, and student organization advising each being a leg, then the congruence becomes more apparent. Supporting students as they make meaning of their curricular and co-curricular experiences become an important factor in advising methods (McCalla-Wriggins, 2009). Grounding student organization advising in student involvement and student engagement theories provides a framework where the student and faculty relationship is acknowledged and encouraged. The need for students' involvement in their own learning and development brings these theories together. This section will discuss three implications for practice: training, recruitment, and advising approach.

Training

The responses to the questions in Part III: Demographics of the Student Organization Advising Inventory (SOAI) indicated that attendance at the in-person advisor training session

was much lower than the online training modules. Twenty-four percent of respondents (N = 18) indicated they participated in the Student Leader Training Day Advisor Session. The Advisor Session during the Student Leader Training Day included topics on funding, fundraising, policy changes at the departmental and university level, and updates to the Registered Student Organization Manual. Meanwhile, 42% of the participants (N = 31) indicated they reviewed the online training videos as part of the registration process. The online training videos included information on how to reserve space on-campus and how to request/access student activity fees.

The low response rate to the training offered might suggest that the training was not well advertised or promoted to the student organization advisors. It may also suggest that the training is not viewed as relevant to the advisors. In either case, the implication is clear that if the professionals who manage student organizations continue to offer training to student organization advisors, finding ways to deliver advising topics and strategies in a variety of ways on multiple platforms might encourage involvement. There may be a need, from time to time, to distribute updated information, new policies, revisions to the policy manual, or any other topics deemed necessary. The number of policies, processes, procedures, and forms that are required for each group to navigate each year can be cumbersome and burdensome (Craig & Warner, 1991).

The administrative minutia is a reality of university life and important in upholding laws, policies, and guidelines; however, the participant's responses indicate that their preference is working with the students. Developing relationships, being a resource, and spending time with the organization members is more interesting than learning about needed paperwork. If the training provided has been more administratively driven and less in line with developmental advising strategies, then it reasons that the advisors are not interested in the training being

provided. Creating a series of advisor trainings that are focused on developing leaders, working with students, understanding the new student profile, or innovative programming and outreach may be more intriguing and may yield a greater return in advisor attendance. Providing a feedback tool such as a survey may be beneficial in gauging what topics and information advisors are looking to receive from Student Activities staff.

The response rate for online training as part of the registration process was nearly twice as high as the in-person training, which may indicate it is a preferred format. Staff wanting to ensure faculty participation may need to conduct further investigation into preferred training platforms and varied advising topics for faculty. Relevance of information, length of presentation, and timing of training sessions are all other considerations to make in creating additional training opportunities.

Recruiting

The responses to the questions in Part III: Demographics of the Student Organization Advising Inventory (SOAI) regarding years at the institution indicated that 77% of the respondents have been at the institution for 10 years or less. Likewise, the responses for regarding age range was distributed relatively evenly across age categories, which paired with the years at the institution creates some questions regarding newer faculty serving as advisors. With so many advisors, regardless of age, identifying as being at the institution 10 or fewer years, it might imply a lack of knowledge regarding policy, process, and institutional history. In some cases, it might be that the advisors with the least years at the institution would minimally lack context for why or how a policy or process was implemented. It would also reason that recruiting advisors with a longer institutional history or breadth of experience with the institution to serve as advisors might provide more stability for the student organizations they advise,

especially since advisors are the one force that keeps organizations stable and moving forward (Meyer & Kroth, 2010; Nadler, 1997). It would be helpful to have more information about the length of time the advisor has been at the institution and the length of time the advisor has worked with the student organization. Providing the guidance and motivation to keep the student organization continuing from year to year takes sustained leadership.

Student organizations find that they may need to find a new advisor for a variety of reasons including personality conflicts, time constraints, and attrition at the university. Student leaders might rely on the student affairs professionals who work primarily with student organizations for advice and help in identifying an advisor candidate. Considering the type of organization and the history of the group, the student affairs professional might suggest a faculty member who has been at the institution and is familiar with the bureaucracy. This would help the student organization find their success.

Advising approach

Possibly the greatest implication from this study is that student organization advising uses developmental methods, similar to academic advising, providing a direct first linkage to current advising models. The faculty advisors who participated in the inventory overwhelmingly scored as endorsing developmental advising activities, as opposed to the prescriptive activities. Knowing that the preferred advising style is developmental, for these faculty advisors, can inform the method and content of advisor training, determining the support given, and resources provided. The anecdotal narrative says that some advisors agree to serve, but their service largely involves signing forms. That might well be the case for some advisors, regardless of faculty status; however, the results of this study run contrary to that narrative.

There has not previously been literature regarding advising student organizations, how faculty advise student groups, or advising method preferences. This inventory provides the first glimpse into these areas. Understanding the time faculty advisors spend advising student organizations, their preference for using developmental advising methods, and the most commonly identified advising activities is critical to the way student organization advising should be approached. Additional information regarding the types of interactions that occur between advisors and the student organizations and the ways advisors participate with the organizations they advise provide a sense of the day-to-day connections that occur.

Faculty advisors to student organizations indicated they typically advise the student leaders individually or in small groups as opposed to large group or individual member meetings. Additionally, advisors to student organizations participate in planned activities and meetings as well as meet with members in their offices. The advisors report meeting with the student organization from once a month to several times a month, not necessarily on a weekly basis. The final take-away is that faculty advisors are involved and invested in the student organizations they advise, but this study did not establish any relationship between the advising style and demographic identities, perhaps based on the low responses to this initial inventory.

Recommendations for Research

The Student Organization Advising Inventory distribution and associated results were, as far as could be determined by a review of published literature, the first application or data collection to consider the advising techniques of faculty advisors to student organizations. This was also the first time student organization advising was considered in the context of academic advising, which is the first linkage to current advising models. As such, there are many recommendations for future research. The recommendations include conducting qualitative

methodological research, recruiting a larger sample from a multi-institutional perspective, and using this same inventory from the student perspective to consider the responses from student leadership of the student organizations.

Qualitative study

The first recommendation includes the completion of a qualitative study that captures the words and thoughts of the faculty advisors to student organizations. The numbers provide some interesting information and begin to tell a story; however, pairing the quantitative with the qualitative would round out the information. Asking faculty advisors to student organizations the open-ended questions of "Why" may yield deeper application, specifically to recruiting and training student organization advisors. Through qualitative research one could find out more about why faculty advise student organizations and discover the overall experience of faculty who serve as a student organization advisor. This could be useful in connecting the student experience with the faculty experience and determining if there are similarities and differences. The faculty experience in serving as an advisor to a student organization could also provide clarity on additional recruiting and training opportunities. Considering the faculty advisor experience might provide information on what they enjoy about advising student organizations, the challenges in advising student organizations, and the support that needs to be provided to improve the advising experience.

Expand Scope

Another recommendation consists of recruiting a larger pool of respondents for a quantitative study similar to this one. Recruiting a larger pool of respondents may provide clarity on how characteristics such as sex, seniority, and the type of organization advised are associated with advising approaches. Administering the inventory to a larger number of advisors

across a variety of institution types, geographically distinct areas, and sizes would provide a more meaningful response. Making this inventory available to different institutions and seeing how the data scales, compares, and eventually becomes a nationally normed tool for student organization advising would make a significant impact in the field of student organization advising.

A larger study would bring attention to the function of student organization advising and the many similarities that exist between student organization advising, academic advising, and career advising. Being able to generalize the activities, time spent, and preferred advising methods used in advising student organizations through the linkage to literature and advising theory would provide legitimacy by helping faculty see that what is needed to be a good student organization advisor is similar to the skill set they already have for academic advising.

Student Perspective

The development of the Student Organization Advising Inventory created the opportunity to capture important and timely information about the advisors surveyed. The recommendation would be to use this same inventory modified back to the student perspective, as the original Academic Advising Inventory was framed to capture student preferences, to see if the student leaders of the student organizations being advised support the responses of the faculty advisors claiming the use of developmental advising methods. Asking the student leaders to provide the feedback on advising for the faculty would provide either corroboration or contradictory findings. If the findings were contradictory, understanding where the gap exists between reality and perception would be insightful.

Survey Design

As mentioned as a limitation, the survey being adapted from a student perspective on academic advising for faculty advising of student organizations created some challenges. Developing an instrument that was built and designed specifically to gather data on faculty advisors to student organizations may yield additional insights into the advising practices. Consulting survey research literature and good practice surrounding the creation of an instrument as a tool identifying advising practices and demographic questions that may be more likely to yield relationships.

Comparing Faculty and Staff Advisors

This survey was intended to collect information about faculty advisors to student organizations. Another recommendation for future research would be to conduct a similar study specifically targeting staff advisors to student organizations in order to compare and contrast the advising of staff members and faculty. Is there a difference? Which group advises closer to the student expectations and needs for their student organization? What can practitioners learn about student organization advising, regardless of the classification of employee?

Advisor Experience

This survey examined how faculty advisors advise student organizations. This survey does not consider the advisor's experience. There are questions in the SOAI Part III that reference if the advisor felt learning occurred during the training sessions, both in-person and via the online modules, but the survey does not take into account the advisor's experience of serving as an advisor. Are the advisors fulfilled by advising student organizations? Do they enjoy it? What level of satisfaction do they experience? What are the positives of serving as a student organization advisor? What are the negatives of serving as a student organization advisor? What is the relationship with the students like? What is the relationship with the student affairs

staff like? These questions could be addressed through further qualitative and quantitative research studies.

Conclusion

The administration of the Student Organization Advising Inventory (SOAI) laid the groundwork for more attention on the work of faculty advisors to student organizations and student organization advising in general. The fact that there is a lack of research or publications about student organization advising, in spite of a general acknowledgement that student organizations are important, is puzzling. The advisors serving in these roles deserve more support, resources, direction, and information. The students serving in student organization leadership roles deserve well-trained, well-equipped, and developmental advisors. This first use of this instrument resulted in new information about the population of advisors surveyed that was not previously seen.

The inventory results document that the preferred advising method for faculty advisors to student organizations is developmental advising. The inventory further provides information on the advising activities, interactions, and ways in which advisors most frequently participate with the organizations they advise, providing a sense of the day-to-day connections that occur. Additionally, the responses demonstrate a lack of participation in advisor training, whether in person or via online videos, pointing to a need for developing various alternative methods to share updates as well as a way to identify training topics more germane to the advisor roles.

Taking the information collected from the Student Organization Advising Inventory and situating it in the context of academic advising allows great similarities to be drawn between the two functions. Some of the similarities include meeting with students individually or in small groups, using developmental advising methods, getting to know more about the students being

advised by developing relationships, and having a thorough knowledge of the institution's various policies impacting the students. Connecting the literature, theories, and results of the inventory begin to provide the basis for an advising model that has never been provided for student organization advising. The development of an advising model would then allow for more advisors and institutions to work toward good practice in advising student groups. The improvement of student groups leads to the enhancement of the student experience which in turn increases the students' development. The greater the development of the student leader and the student organization, the greater possibility of continuity for the student organization allowing for more opportunities for student engagement. Similarly, a positive student experience may be a contributing factor for retention, progression, graduation, and alumni affinity to the institution, all because of the relationships forged through good student organization advising.

REFERENCES

Astin, A. W. (1984). Student involvement: A developmental theory for higher education. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, *25*(4), 297-308.

Astin, A. W. (1996). Involvement in learning revisited: Lessons we have learned. *Journal of College Student Development, 40*(5), 587-598.

Astin, A. W. (1999). Student involvement: A developmental theory for higher education. *Journal of College Student Development, 40*(5), 518-529.

Bailey, S. J. (2010). *Theories of advising.* Providence, RI: Rhode Island School of Design Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED509799)

Barbuto, J. E., Story, J. S., Fritz, S. M., & Schinstock, J. L. (2011). Full range advising: Transforming the advisor-advisee experience. *Journal of College Student Development, 52*(6), 656-670.

Bergen-Cico, D., & Viscomi, J. (2012). Exploring the association between campus co-curricular involvement and academic achievement. *Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory & Practice, 14*(3), 329-343. doi:10.2190/CS.14.3.c

Bloom, J. L. (2002, August 29). Incorporating appreciative inquiry into academic advising. *The Mentor.* Retrieved from https://dus.psu.edu/mentor/old/articles/020829jb.htm.

Bloom, J. L., Hutson, B. L., & He, D. Y. (2008). *The appreciative advising revolution*. Champaign, IL: Stipes Publishing.

Bond, N., & Sterrett, W. L. (2014). Guiding preservice teachers to lead student organizations in education: The faculty advisor's perspective. *Journal of Organizational Learning and Leadership, 12*(1), 26-42.

Burton Nelson, D. (2006). Career advisors: A new breed. *NACADA Clearinghouse of Academic Advising Resources*. Retrieved from http://www.nacada.ksu.edu/Resources/Clearinghouse/View-Articles/Career-advisors.aspx

Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education. (2015). *CAS professional standards for higher education*. Washington, DC: Author.

Covey, S. (1989). *The seven habits of highly successful people*. New York, NY: Fireside/Simon & Schuster.

Craig, D. H., & Warner, T. R. (1991). Working together: The "forgotten majority" of student organizations and campus activities. *Campus Activities Programming*, *23*(9), 42-46.

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *A concise introduction to mixed methods research*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publications.

Croft, L. B. S. (2004). *A study of motivation of university faculty to serve as student organization advisors* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (305207955).

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

DeSawal, D. M. (2006). How advisors learn to advise: A study. *Campus Activities Programming, 39*(5), 30-36.

Dunkel, N. W., Schuh, J. H., & Chrystal-Green, N. (2014). *Advising student groups and organizations* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Earl, W. R. (1987) Intrusive advising for freshman. *Academic Advising News, 9*(3). Retrieved from

http://www.nacada.ksu.edu/Resources/Clearinghouse/View-Articles/Intrusive-Advising-for-Freshmen.aspx

Freitag, D. (2004). Academic Advising Inventory. *NACADA Clearinghouse of Academic Advising Resources.* Retrieved from http://www.nacada.ksu.edu/Resources/Clearinghouse/View-Articles/Academic-Advising-Inventory.aspx

Frost, S. H. (2000). Historical and philosophical foundations for academic advising. In V. N. Gordon & W. R. Habley (Eds.), *Academic advising: A comprehensive handbook* (pp.3-17). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Gallagher, P. J., & Demos, G. D. (Eds.). (1983). *Handbook of counselling in higher education*. Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger.

Gillispie, B. (2003). History of academic advising. *NACADA Clearinghouse of Academic Advising Resources.* Retrieved from http://www.nacada.ksu.edu/Resources/Clearinghouse/View-Articles/History-of-academic-advising.aspx

Gordon, V. N., & Habley, W.R. (Eds.), (2000). *Academic advising: A comprehensive handbook* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Grites, T. J. (2013). Developmental academic advising: A 40-year context. *NACADA Journal*, *33*(1), 5-15.

Hagen, P. L. (2007, September). Narrative theory and academic advising. *Academic Advising Today*, *36*(2). Retrieved from http://www.nacada.ksu.edu/Resources/Academic-Advising-Today/View-Articles/Narrative-Theory-and-Academic-Advising.aspx

Hendy, W. G. (1999). Developmental advising: A practical view. *The Mentor*. Retrieved from https://dus.psu.edu/mentor/old/articles/990115wh.htm

Huber, J., & Miller, M. A. (2013). Implications for advisor job responsibilities at 2- and 4-year institutions. *NACADA Clearinghouse of Academic Advising Resources*. Retrieved from https://www.nacada.ksu.edu/Resources/Clearinghouse/View-Articles/Advisor-Job-Responsibilities-a3045.aspx

Kahu, E. R. (2013) Framing student engagement in higher education. *Studies in Higher Education, 38*(5), 758-773.

Kelley, B. (2008). Significant learning, significant advising. *NACADA Journal*, *28*(1), 19-28.

Kennemer, C. & Hurt, B. (2013). Faculty advising. *NACADA Clearinghouse of Academic Advising Resources*. Retrieved from http://www.nacada.ksu.edu/Resources/Clearinghouse/View-Articles/Faculty-advising.aspx

Kincanon , K. (2009). Translating the transformative: Applying transformational and self-authorship pedagogy to advising undecided/exploring students. NACADA Clearinghouse of Academic Advising Resources Retrieved from http://www.nacada.ksu.edu/tabid/3318/articleType/ArticleView/articleId/647/article.aspx

Kleinbaum, N. H. (1989). Dead poet's society: A novel. Stuttgart, Germany: Ernst Klett Sprachen.

Krush, J.M. & Winn, S. (2010, December). Professional advisors and faculty advisors: A shared goal of student success. Academic Advising Today, 33(4). Retrieved from http://www.nacada.ksu.edu/Resources/Academic-Advising-Today/View-

Articles/Professional-Advisors-and-Faculty-Advisors-A-Shared-Goal-of-Student-Success.aspx

Kuh, G. D. (1995). The other curriculum: Out-of-class experiences associated with student learning and personal development. The Journal of Higher Education, 66(2), 123-155.

Kuh, G. D. (2008). Excerpt from high-impact educational practices: What they are, who has access to them, and why they matter. AAC&U, (34) Washington, D.C.

Lyons, S. A. (2015). A study of exemplary co-curricular advising by college and university faculty (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global (1779253378).

McCalla-Wriggins, B. (2009). Integrating career and academic advising: Mastering the challenge. NACADA Clearinghouse of Academic Advising Resources. Retrieved from http://www.nacada.ksu.edu/Resources/Clearinghouse/View-Articles/Integrating-career-and-academic-advising.aspx.

McClellan J., & Moser C. (2011). A practical approach to advising as coaching. NACADA Clearinghouse of Academic Advising Resources. Retrieved from http://www.nacada.ksu.edu/Resources/Clearinghouse/View-Articles/Advising-as-coaching.aspx

McIntyre, C. M. (2011, June). Peripatetic advising: How Socrates, advising, and running shoes influence student success. Academic Advising Today, 34(2). Retrieved from https://www.nacada.ksu.edu/Resources/Academic-Advising-Today/View-Articles/Peripatetic-Advising-How-Socrates-Advising-and-Running-Shoes-Influence-Student-Success.aspx

Melander, E. R. (2005). Advising as educating: A framework for organizing advising systems. *NACADA Journal*, *25*(2), 84-91.

Meyer, R. A., & Kroth, M. (2010). Student organization advisor motives to volunteer at four-year institutions of higher education. *Journal of Student Affairs Research & Practice, 47*(4), 400-420. doi:10.2202/1949-6605.6023

Mikulec, E., & McKinney, K. (2014). Perceived learning outcomes from participation in one type of registered student organization: Equestrian sport clubs. *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, 14*(3), 93-109.

Miles, J. M. (2011). Reflections of student government association leaders: Implications for advisors. *College Student Journal, 45*(2), 324-332.

Munoz, L., Miller, R. J., & Poole, S. M. (2016). Who are you going after? A practical typology to generate engagement in professional student organizations. *Marketing Education Review*, *26*(2), 105-118.

Murray, T. E. (1992). The nicknames of American Greek-lettered organizations. *Names, 40*(3), 173-194.

Nadler, M. K. (1997). The value of student organizations and the role of faculty advisers. *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator, 52*(1), 16-25.

National Center for Education Statistics. (2017). *IPEDS: Integrated postsecondary education data system: Data feedback report.* Washington, D.C. Retrieved from http://ir.kennesaw.edu/publications/ipeds-data-feedback-pdfs/2017.pdf

O'Banion, T. (1972). An academic advising model. *Community College Journal*, *42*(6), 62-69.

Ozaki, C.C., & Johnston, M.P. (2008, Fall). The space in between: Issues for multiracial student organizations and advising. In K. A. Renn & P. Shang (Eds.), *Biracial and Multiracial*

Students. (New Directions for Student Services. no. 123, pp. 53-61). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Reaves, D. W., Hinson, A., & Marchant, M. A. (2010). Benefits and costs of faculty participation in extra- and co-curricular activities. *NACTA Journal, 54*(1), 54-60.

Reynolds, M. M. (2010). An advisor's half dozen: Principles for incorporating learning theory into our advising practices. *NACADA Clearinghouse of Academic Advising Resources.* Retrieved from http://www.nacada.ksu.edu/Resources/Clearinghouse/View-Articles/Learning-theory-in-academic-advising.aspx

Rhoads, R. A. (1998). Student protest and multicultural reform: Making sense of campus unrest in the 1990s. *Journal of Higher Education, 69,* 621-645.

Rosch, D. M., & Coplin, W. D. (2007). Student organizations: Realizing the potential. *Campus Activities Programming*, *40*(1), 50-53.

Rudy, W. (1996). *The campus and a nation in crisis: From the American revolution to Vietnam*. Cranbury, NJ: Associated University Press.

Schreiner, L., & Anderson, E. (2005). Strengths-based advising: A new lens for higher education. *NACADA Journal*, *25*, 20-29.

Slonneger Hancock, N. (2004). Developmental academic advising and learner-centered education. *The Mentor*. Retrieved from https://dus.psu.edu/mentor/old/articles/040407nh.htm

Sprague, R. (2008, March). Doing it all: Adding advising into faculty workloads. *Academic Advising Today*, *31*(1). Retrieved from https://www.nacada.ksu.edu/Resources/Academic-Advising-Today/View-Articles/Doing-It-All-Adding-Advising-into-Faculty-Workloads.aspx.

Strayhorn, T. L. (2012). *College students' sense of belonging: A key to educational success for all students*. New York, NY: Routledge.

The Flat Hat Club. (1917). *The William and Mary Quarterly, 25*(3), 161-164.

Titley, R. W., & Titley, B. S. (1982). Academic advising: The neglected dimension in designs for undergraduate education. *Teaching in Psychology, 9*, 45-49.

Tinto, V. (1993). Building community. *Liberal Education*, *79*(4), 16-21.

Tinto, V. (1997). Classrooms as communities: Exploring the educational character of student persistence. *The Journal of Higher Education, 68*(6), 599-623. doi:10.2307/2959965

Trowler, V. (2010). Student engagement literature review. *The Higher Education Academy*, *11*, 1-15.

Varney, J. (2014). Proactive advising. In J. Drake, P. Folsom, & M. A. Miller (Eds.), *Academic advising approaches: Strategies that teach student to make the most of college.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Whipple, E. G., & Sullivan, E. G. (1998), Greek letter organizations: Communities of learners? In E.G. Whipple (Ed.), *Critical issues for student athletes: Going behind the invisible wall.* (New Directions for Student Services, no. 81, pp. 87–94). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Wilcox, E. (2016). An end to checklist thinking: Learning-centered advising in practice. *NACADA Clearinghouse of Academic Advising Resources.* Retrieved from http://nacada.ksu.edu/tabid/3318/articleType/ArticleView/articleId/6101/article.aspx

Winston, R. B., Jr., Ender, S. C., Miller, T. K., & Grites, T. J. (1984). *Developmental academic advising: Addressing students' educational, career, and personal needs*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Winston, R. B., Jr., & Sandor, J. A. (1984). Developmental academic advising: What do students want? *NACADA Journal*, *4*(1), 5-13.

Winston, R. B., Jr., & Sandor, J. A. (2002). Evaluating academic advising: Manual for the Academic Advising Inventory. *NACADA Clearinghouse of Academic Advising Resources.* Retrieved from www.nacada.ksu.edu/Portals/0/Clearinghouse/links/documents/AAI-Manual-02.pdf

Yarbrough, D. (2002). The engagement model for effective academic advising with undergraduate college students and student organizations. *Journal of Humanistic Counseling, Education & Development, 41*(1), 61-68.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Recruitment Email

Dear Student Organization Advisor:

Advising a student organization can be very rewarding and equally as challenging. I am interested in learning about the experience of faculty members who serve as a student organization advisor. Please take 15 minutes to provide your thoughts by answering the questions on the attached survey. The results will help provide information about how to serve our organizations better. At the conclusion of the survey, you will have an opportunity to indicate if you would like a $5 gift card to Starbucks or Amazon.

I am doctoral student at the University of Georgia. I invite you to participate in research I am conducting about advising student organizations. If you are interested in participating in this online study, please follow the link below to the survey, IRB approval STUDY00005622.

Thank you for considering the study. Please let me know if you have questions.

Link to the study: XXXXX

Sincerely,

Ron Lunk,
Doctoral Candidate
Student Affairs Leadership

Appendix B

UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA
CONSENT FORM
THE FACULTY ADVISOR: A DEVELOPMENTAL APPROACH TO ADVISING STUDENT ORGANIZATIONS

I am a graduate student under the direction of Professor Laura A. Dean, Ph.D. in the Department of Counseling and Human Development at The University of Georgia. I invite you to participate in a research study entitled The Faculty Advisor: A Developmental Approach to Advising Student Organizations that is being conducted as part of a dissertation for the completion of a doctorate in education. The purpose of this study is to explore the experiences of the faculty who advise student organizations on a college or university campus.

Your participation will involve participating in a survey and should only take approximately 20 minutes to complete. Your involvement in the study is voluntary, and you may choose not to participate or to stop at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. If you decide to stop or withdraw from the study, the information/data collected from or about you up to the point of your withdrawal will be kept as part of the study and may continue to be analyzed. At the conclusion of the survey, you will have an opportunity to indicate if you would like a $5 gift card to Starbucks or Amazon.

Your confidentiality will be maintained to the degree permitted by the technology used. Specifically, no guarantees can be made regarding the interception of data sent via the Internet by any third parties.

The findings from this project may provide information on how faculty benefit from advising student organizations and provide information on the faculty experience. There are no known risks or discomforts associated with this research.

If you have any questions about this research project, please feel free to contact me, Ron Lunk, at (770) 595-9294 or rlunk@uga.edu, or Laura Dean at (706) 542-1812 or ladean@uga.edu. Questions or concerns about your rights as a research participant should be directed to the Institutional Review Board (IRB) Chairperson at 706.542.3199 or irb@uga.edu.

By completing and submitting this questionnaire via Qualtrics, you are agreeing to participate in the above described research project.

Thank you for your consideration! Please print this letter for your records.

Sincerely,

Ron Lunk
Doctoral Candidate
Student Affairs Leadership

Appendix C

ACADEMIC ADVISING INVENTORY

Roger B. Winston Jr. and Janet A. Sandor

PART I

Part I of this Inventory concerns how you and your advisor approach academic advising. Even if you have had more than one advisor or have been in more than one type of advising situation this year, please respond to the statements in terms of your **current situation.**

There are 14 parts of statements in Part I. You must make two decisions about each pair in orer to respond: (1) decide which one of the two statements most accurately describes the academic advising you received this year, and then (2) decide how accurate or true that statement is (from *very true* to *slightly true*).

Mark your answers to all questions in the *Inventory* on the separate optical scan answer sheet provided. Use a number 2 pencil. If you need to change an answer, erase it completely and then mark the desired response.

EXAMPLE

80. My advisor plans my schedule.	**OR**	My advisor and I plan my schedule together.
A----------B----------C----------D		**E----------F----------G----------H**
very slightly true true		slightly true / very true

RESPONSE ON ANSWER SHEET:

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
80	0	1	2	3	4	●	6	7	8	9

EXPLANATION: *In this example, the student has chosen the statement on the right as more descriptive of his or her academic advising this year, and determined that the statement is toward the slightly true end (response F).*

---

1. My advisor is interested in helping me learn how to find out about courses and programs for myself.	**OR**	My advisor tells me what I need to know about academic courses and programs.
A----------B----------C----------D		**E----------F----------G----------H**
very true / slightly true		slightly true / very true
2. My advisor tells me what would be the best schedule for me.	**OR**	My advisor suggests important considerations in planning a schedule and then gives me responsibility for the final decision. .
A----------B----------C----------D		**E----------F----------G----------H**
very true / slightly true		slightly true / very true
3. My advisor and I talk about vocational opportunities in conjunction with advising.	**OR**	My advisor and I do not talk about vocational opportunities in conjunction with advising.

4. My advisor shows an interest in my outside-of-class activities and sometimes suggests activities.

A----------**B**----------**C**----------**D**
very true — slightly true

OR

My advisor does not know what I do outside of class.

E----------**F**----------**G**----------**H**
slightly true — very true

5. My advisor assists me in identifying realistic academic goals based on what I know about myself, as well as about my test scores and grades.

A----------**B**----------**C**----------**D**
very true — slightly true

OR

My advisor identifies realistic academic goals for me based on my test scores and grades.

E----------**F**----------**G**----------**H**
slightly true — very true

6. My advisor registers me for my classes.

A----------**B**----------**C**----------**D**
very true — slightly true

OR

My advisor teaches me how to register myself for classes.

E----------**F**----------**G**----------**H**
slightly true — very true

7. When I'm faced with difficult decisions my advisor tells me my alternatives and which one is the best choice.

A----------**B**----------**C**----------**D**
very true — slightly true

OR

When I'm faced with difficult decisions, my advisor assists me in identifying alternatives and in considering the consequences of choosing each alternative.

E----------**F**----------**G**----------**H**
slightly true — very true

8. My advisor does not know who to contact about other-than-academic problems.

A----------**B**----------**C**----------**D**
very true — slightly true

OR

My advisor knows who to contact about other-than-academic problems.

E----------**F**----------**G**----------**H**
slightly true — very true

9. My advisor gives me tips on managing my time better or on studying more effectively when I seem to need them.

A----------**B**----------**C**----------**D**
very true — slightly true

OR

My advisor does not spend time giving me tips on managing my time better or on studying my effectively.

E----------**F**----------**G**----------**H**
slightly true — very true

10. My advisor tells me what I must do in order to be advised.

OR

My advisor and I discuss our expectations of advising and of each other.

A----------**B**----------**C**----------**D** very true — slightly true		**E**----------**F**----------**G**----------**H** slightly true — very true	
11. My advisor suggests what I should major in. **A**----------**B**----------**C**----------**D** very true — slightly true	**OR**	My advisor suggests steps I can take tohelp me decide on a major. **E**----------**F**----------**G**----------**H** slightly true — very true	
12. My advisor uses test scores and grades to let him or her know what courses are most appropriate for me to take. **A**----------**B**----------**C**----------**D** very true — slightly true	**OR**	My advisor and I use information, such as test scores, grades, interests, and abilities, to determine what courses are most appropriate for me to take. **E**----------**F**----------**G**----------**H** slightly true — very true	
13. My advisor talks with me about my other-than-academic interests and plans. **A**----------**B**----------**C**----------**D** very true — slightly true	**OR**	My advisor does not talk with me about interests and plans other than academic ones. **E**----------**F**----------**G**----------**H** slightly true — very true	
14. My advisor keeps me informed of my academic progress by examining my files and grades *only*. **A**----------**B**----------**C**----------**D** very true — slightly true	**OR**	My advisor keeps me informed of my academic progress by examining my files and grades and by talking to me about my classes. **E**----------**F**----------**G**----------**H** slightly true — very true	

PART II

Directions-Consider the following activities that often take place during academic advising. During **this academic year,** how many times have you been involved in each activity? Use the code below to respond to questions 15-44 on the separate answer sheet.

A=None (0 times)	**C=2 times**	**E=4 times**
B=1 time	**D=3 times**	**F=5 or more times**

How frequently have you and your advisor spent time…

15. Discussing college policies
16. Signing registration forms
17. Dropping and/or adding course(s)
18. Discussing personal values
19. Discussing possible majors/academic concentrations
20. Discussing important social or political issues
21. Discussing content of courses
22. Selecting courses for the next term
23. Planning a class schedule for the next term
24. Discussing transfer credit and policies
25. Discussing advanced placement or exempting courses
26. Discussing career alternatives
27. Discussing probation and dismissal policies
28. Discussing financial aid
31. Discussing degree or major/academic concentration requirements
32. Discussing personal concerns or problems
33. Discussing studies abroad or other special academic programs
34. Discussing internship or cooperative education opportunities
35. Talking about or setting personal goals
36. Evaluating academic progress
37. Getting to know each other
38. Discussing extracurricular activities
39. Discussing job placement opportunities
40. Discussing the purposes of a college education
41. Declaring or changing a major/academic concentration
42. Discussing time management
43. Talking about experiences in different classes
44. Talking about what you are doing besides taking classes

PART III

Considering the academic advising you have participated in at this college this year, respond to the following five statements on the answer sheet using the code below.

A=Strongly Disagree **C=Agree**
B=Disagree **D=Strongly Agree**

45. I am satisfied in general with the academic advising I have received.
46. I have received accurate information about courses, programs, and requirements through academic advising.
47. Sufficient prior notice has been provided about deadlines related to institutional policies and procedures.
48. Advising has been available when I needed it.
49. Sufficient time has been available during advising sessions.

PART IV

Please respond to the following questions. Continue marking your responses on the same answer sheet.

50. What is your sex?
    (a) male
    (b) female

51. What is your cultural/racial background?
    (a) African American/Black
    (b) Hispanic American/Latino/a
    (c) Asian American or Pacific Islander
    (d) Native American
    (e) White/Caucasian
    (f) Biracial/multiracial
    (g) Other
    (h) Decline to respond

52. What was your age at your last birthday?
    (a) 18 or younger
    (b) 19
    (c) 20
    (d) 21
    (e) 22
    (f) 23
    (g) 24
    (h) 25-30
    (i) 31 or older

53. What is your academic class standing?
    (a) Freshman (first year)
    (b) Sophomore (second year)
    (c) Junior (third year)
    (d) Senior (fourth or more years)
    (e) Irregular/Transient/Special Student
    (f) Other than any of the above

54. Which of the following **best describes** the majority of the academic advising you have received this academic year?
    Select only one.
    (a) Advised individually by assigned advisor at an advising center
    (b) Advised individually by any available advisor at an advising center
    (c) Advised individually, **not** through an advising center
    (d) Advised with a group of students
    (e) Advised by a peer (student) advisor
    (f) Advised in conjunction with a course in which I was enrolled

55. Approximately how much time was generally spent in each advising session?
    (a) Less than 15 minutes (c) 31-45 minutes (e) More than 1 hour
    (b) 15-30 minutes (d) 46-60 minutes

56. How many academic advising sessions have you had this academic year in your **current** situation?
    (a) None (c) Two (e) Four (g) Six (i) Eight
    (b) One (d) Three (f) Five (h) seven (j) Nine or more

57. How many academic advising sessions **in total** have you had this year?
    (a) None (c) Two (e) Four (g) Six (i) Eight
    (b) One (d) Three (f) Five (h) seven (j) Nine or more

PART V

Part V of the *Inventory* concerns how you view the **IDEAL** academic advisor. You are to choose the one statement for each pair that best describes, in your opinion the *ideal* academic advisor (that is, what you would want an advisor to be like). Then determine how important that statement is to you for an ideal advisor. This is *not* and evaluation of your present or past advisors at this college.

Record your answers on the same answer sheet used for Parts I through IV.

---

59. My advisor is interested in helping me learn how to find out about courses and programs for myself.
    A----------**B**----------**C**----------**D**
    very true — slightly true

OR My advisor tells me what I need to know about academic courses and programs.
    E----------**F**----------**G**----------**H**
    slightly true — very true

60. My advisor tells me what would be the best schedule for me.
    A----------**B**----------**C**----------**D**
    very true — slightly true

OR My advisor suggests important considerations in planning a schedule and then gives me responsibility for the final decision. .
    E----------**F**----------**G**----------**H**
    slightly true — very true

61. My advisor and I talk about vocational opportunities in conjunction with advising.
    A----------**B**----------**C**----------**D**
    very true — slightly true

OR My advisor and I do not talk about vocational opportunities in conjunction with advising.
    E----------**F**----------**G**----------**H**
    slightly true — very true

62. My advisor shows an interest in my outside-of-class activities and sometimes suggests activities.
A----------B----------C----------D
very true — slightly true

OR

My advisor does not know what I do outside of class.
E----------F----------G----------H
slightly true — very true

63. My advisor assists me in identifying realistic academic goals based on what I know about myself, as well as about my test scores and grades.
A----------B----------C----------D
very true — slightly true

OR

My advisor identifies realistic academic goals for me based on my test scores and grades.
E----------F----------G----------H
slightly true — very true

64. My advisor registers me for my classes.
A----------B----------C----------D
very true — slightly true

OR

My advisor teaches me how to register myself for classes.
E----------F----------G----------H
slightly true — very true

65. When I'm faced with difficult decisions my advisor tells me my alternatives and which one is the best choice.
A----------B----------C----------D
very true — slightly true

OR

When I'm faced with difficult decisions, my advisor assists me in identifying alternatives and in considering the consequences of choosing each alternative.
E----------F----------G----------H
slightly true — very true

66. My advisor does not know who to contact about other-than-academic problems.
A----------B----------C----------D
very true — slightly true

OR

My advisor knows who to contact about other-than-academic problems.
E----------F----------G----------H
slightly true — very true

67. My advisor gives me tips on managing my time better or on studying more effectively when I seem to need them.
A----------B----------C----------D
very true — slightly true

OR

My advisor does not spend time giving me tips on managing my time better or on studying my effectively.
E----------F----------G----------H
slightly true — very true

68. My advisor tells me what I must do in order to be advised.
A----------B----------C----------D

OR

My advisor and I discuss our expectations of advising and of each other.
E----------F----------G----------H

very true	slightly true		slightly true	very true

69. My advisor suggests what I should major in.
A----------**B**----------**C**----------**D**
very true — slightly true

OR

My advisor suggests steps I can take tohelp me decide on a major.
E----------**F**----------**G**----------**H**
slightly true — very true

70. My advisor uses test scores and grades to let him or her know what courses are most appropriate for me to take.
A----------**B**----------**C**----------**D**
very true — slightly true

OR

My advisor and I use information, such as test scores, grades, interests, and abilities, to determine what courses are most appropriate for me to take.
E----------**F**----------**G**----------**H**
slightly true — very true

71. My advisor talks with me about my other-than-academic interests and plans.
A----------**B**----------**C**----------**D**
very true — slightly true

OR

My advisor does not talk with me about interests and plans other than academic ones.
E----------**F**----------**G**----------**H**
slightly true — very true

72. My advisor keeps me informed of my academic progress by examining my files and grades *only*.
A----------**B**----------**C**----------**D**
very true — slightly true

OR

My advisor keeps me informed of my academic progress by examining my files and grades and by talking to me about my classes.
E----------**F**----------**G**----------**H**
slightly true — very true

Appendix D

STUDENT ORGANIZATION ADVISING INVENTORY

The purpose of the Student Organization Advising Inventory is to determine the advising approaches used by student organization advisors.

Part I: Advising Styles

Part I of this inventory concerns how you approach advising student organizations. Even if you have advised more than one student organization or have been in more than one type of advising situation this year, please think about the main group for which you serve as the faculty advisor and respond to the statements to the best of your ability.

There are 14 pairs of statements in Part I. You must make two decisions about each pair in order to respond: (1) decide which one of the two statements most accurately describes the student organization advising you are providing this year, and then (2) decide how accurate or true that statement is (from *very true* to *slightly true*).

EXAMPLE

I plan the student organization's activities.	**OR**	The students and I plan the student organization activities together.
1 2 3 4 very true slightly true		5 6 7 8 slightly true very true

EXPLANATION: In this example, if you chose letter F, you chose the statement on the right as more descriptive of your student organization advising this year, and determined that the statement is toward the "slightly true" end.

1.	I assist in helping members of the student organization I advise learn how to find resources. 1 2 3 4	**OR**	I think it is my job to tell members of the student organization I advise what they need to know. 5 6 7 8
2.	I tell members of the student organization I advise the best way to run their organization. 1 2 3 4	**OR**	I suggest important considerations to members of the student organization I advise, then give them responsibility for the final decision. 5 6 7 8
3.	As a part of advising a student organization, I talk about career opportunities with students. 1 2 3 4	**OR**	I do not talk about career opportunities with students in conjunction with advising. 5 6 7 8

4.	I show interest in the academic activities of the members of the student organization I. 1 2 3 4	**OR**	I do not know what the members of the student organization I advise do academically. 5 6 7 8
5.	I assist the members of the student organizations I advise in identifying realistic goals for the organization based on what they know about them. 1 2 3 4	**OR**	I identify realistic goals for the student organization I advise. 5 6 7 8
6.	I re-register the student organization I advise each year with the Department of Student Activities. 1 2 3 4	**OR**	I oversee the student leaders of the student organization I advise as they re-register each year with the Department of Student Activities. 5 6 7 8
7.	When members of the student organization I advise face difficult decisions, I tell them their alternatives and which one is the best choice. 1 2 3 4	**OR**	When members of the student organization I advise face difficult decisions, I assist them in identifying alternatives and considering the consequences of choosing each alternative. 5 6 7 8
8.	I do not know who to refer members of the student organization I advise to contact about their problems. 1 2 3 4	**OR**	I know who to refer members of the student organization I advise to contact about their problems. 5 6 7 8
9.	I give members of the student organization I advise tips on managing time better or on studying more effectively when they seem to need help. 1 2 3 4	**OR**	I do not spend time giving members of the student organization I advise tips on managing their time better or on studying more effectively. 5 6 7 8
10.	I tell the members of the student organization I advise what to expect through our advising relationship. 1 2 3 4	**OR**	I discuss with the members of the student organization I advise our mutual expectations through our advising relationship. 5 6 7 8
11.	I suggest what the members of the student organization I advise should major in. 1 2 3 4	**OR**	I suggest steps the members of the student organization I advise can take to help them decide on a major. 5 6 7 8

12.	I use student organization information, group interests, and abilities to let me know how to advise their organization. 1 2 3 4	**OR**	I use organization information, group interests, and abilities to determine how to advise their organization. 5 6 7 8
13.	I talk with the members of the student organization I advise about non-organization related interests and plans. 1 2 3 4	**OR**	I do not talk with members of the student organization I advise about non-organization related interests and plans. 5 6 7 8
14.	I keep members of the student organization informed of policies and processes that effect the organization. 1 2 3 4	**OR**	I do not keep members of the student organization I advise informed of policies and processes that effect the organization. 5 6 7 8

PART II: Time spent advising

Directions: Consider the following activities that often take place during student organization advising. During the academic year, how many times have you been involved in each activity? Use the code below to respond to questions 15-40.

A = None (0 times)	C = 2 times	E = 4 times
B = 1 time	D = 3 times	F = 5 or more times

How frequently have you and members of the student organization you advise spent time…

15. Discussing college policies
16. Signing forms
17. Discussing course selection
18. Discussing personal values
19. Discussing possible majors/academic concentrations
20. Discussing important social or political issues
21. Discussing organization business such as meeting/programming topics
22. Discussing career alternatives
23. Discussing probation and dismissal policies related to good standing for student organizations
24. Discussing financial aid
25. Identifying other campus offices that can provide assistance
26. Discussing study skills or study tips
27. Discussing bylaws or constitution requirements
28. Discussing personal concerns or problems
29. Discussing study abroad or other special academic programs

30. Discussing internship or cooperative education opportunities
31. Talking about or setting personal goals
32. Evaluating academic progress
33. Getting to know each other
34. Discussing extracurricular activities
35. Discussing job placement opportunities
36. Discussing the purposes of a college education
37. Discussing officer succession
38. Discussing time management
39. Talking about experiences in different classes
40. Talking about what you are doing besides taking classes

PART IV: Demographics

Please respond to the following questions.

41. What is your sex?

    A) Male

    B) Female

    C) Non-binary

    D) No response

42. What is your cultural/racial background?

    A) African American/Black

    B) Hispanic American/Latino/a

    C) Asian American or Pacific Islander

    D) Native American

    E) White/Caucasian

    F) Biracial/multiracial

    G) Other: _____

    H) No response

43. What was your age at your last birthday?

    A) Under 25

    B) 26 – 35

    C) 36 – 45

    D) 46 – 55

    E) 56 – 65

    F) 66 or older

44. Is your primary role at the institution faculty?

    A) Yes

    B) No

    C) No response

45. What is your faculty status?

    A) Tenure track faculty

    B) Non-tenure track faculty

    C) Professor Emeritus

46. Are you part time or full time?

    A) Part time

    B) Full time

47. How long have you been at KSU?

    A) 4 years or less

    B) 5 to 8 years

    C) 9 to 12 years

    D) 13 to 16 years

    E) 17 to 20 years

    F) more than 20 years

48. What type of student organization do you advise?

    A) Directly focused academic organization (including academic honor societies)

    B) Indirect academic organization (including pre-professional groups)

    C) Non-academic organization

    D) Other

49. Which of the following best describes the majority of the student organization advising you have provided this academic year? (*Select only one*)

A) Met with officers of the student organization I advise individually

B) Met with members of student organization I advise individually

C) Met with officers of the student organization I advise in small groups

D) Met with members of student organization I advise in small groups

E) Met with officers of the student organization I advise in a large group

F) Met with members of student organization I advise in a large group

G) Met with officers of the student organization I advise virtually

H) Met with members of the student organization I advise virtually

I) Met with officers of a student organization who are not members of the student organization I advise

J) Met with member of a student organization who are not members of the student organization I advise

K) I did not meet with officers of the student organization I advise

L) I did not meet with members of the student organization I advise

50. I interact with the student organization I advise in the following way(s). (*Please mark all that apply)*

A) attending student organization meetings

B) attending planned events and activities

C) attending service projects/volunteer activities

D) meeting with students in my office

E) serving as a liaison between the student organization and the institution

F) serving as a liaison between the student organization and a national organization

G) informal or impromptu interactions on campus

51. Approximately how much time was generally spent in each interaction advising student organizations?

A) less than 15 minutes

B) 15 – 30 minutes

C) 31-45 minutes

D) 46 – 60 minutes

E) more than 1 hour

52. How many times have you and the student organization you advise interacted so far this academic year?

A) weekly or more than once a week

B) several times a month

C) monthly

D) several times a semester

E) once a semester

F) never

53. I participated in the Student Leader Training Day Advisor session.

A. If yes: I learned something that will help me be a better advisor.

1. If yes: One thing I learned that will help be a better advisor was _____.

54. I reviewed the various training videos available online as part of the annual registration process.

A. If yes: I learned something that will help me be a better advisor.

1. If yes: One thing I learned that will help be a better advisor was _____.

Appendix E

Inventory Question Comparison PART 1

AAI	1	My advisor is interested in helping me learn how to find out about courses and programs for myself.	OR	My advisor tells me what I need to know about academic courses and programs.
SOAI	1	I am interested in helping members of the student organization I advise learn how to find resources.	OR	I think it is my job to tell members of the student organization I advise what they need to know.
AAI	2	My advisor tells me what would be the best schedule for me.	OR	My advisor suggests important considerations in planning a schedule and then gives me responsibility for the final decision.
SOAI	2	I tell members of the student organization I advise the best way to run their organization.	OR	I suggest important considerations to members of the student organization I advise, then give them responsibility for the final decision.
AAI	3	My advisor and I talk about vocational opportunities in conjunction with advising.	OR	My advisor and I do not talk about vocational opportunities in conjunction with advising.
SOAI	3	Members of the student organization I advise and I talk about career opportunities in conjunction with advising.	OR	Members of the student organization that I advise and I do not talk about career opportunities in conjunction with advising.
AAI	4	My advisor shows an interest in my outside-of-class activities and sometimes suggests activities.	OR	My advisor does not know what I do outside of class.
SOAI	4	I show interest in the academic activities of the members of the student organization I advise and sometimes suggest courses.	OR	I do not know what the members of the student organization I advise do academically.
AAI	5	My advisor assists me in identifying realistic academic goals based on what I know about myself, as well as about my test scores and grades.	OR	My advisor identifies realistic academic goals for me based on my test scores and grades.
SOAI	5	I assist the members of the student organizations I advise in identifying realistic goals based on what they know about themselves.	OR	I identify realistic goals for the members of the student organization I advise.
AAI	6	My advisor registers me for my classes.	OR	My advisor teaches me how to register myself for classes.
SOAI	6	re-register the student organization I advise each year with the Department of Student Activities.	OR	I teach the student leaders of the student organization I advise how to re-register each year with the Department of Student Activities
AAI	7	When I'm faced with difficult decisions my advisor tells me my alternatives and which one is the best choice.	OR	When I'm faced with difficult decisions, my advisor assists me in identifying alternatives and in considering the consequences of choosing each alternative.
SOAI	7	When members of the student organization I advise face difficult decisions, I tell them their alternatives and which one is the best choice	OR	When members of the student organization I advise face difficult decisions, I assist them in identifying alternatives and consider the consequences of choosing each alternative.
AAI	8	My advisor does not know who to contact about other-than-academic problems.	OR	My advisor knows who to contact about other-than-academic problems.

SOAI	8	I do not know who to refer members of the student organization I advise to contact about problems	OR	I know who to refer members of the student organization I advise to contact about problems.
AAI	9	My advisor gives me tips on managing my time better or on studying more effectively when I seem to need them.	OR	My advisor does not spend time giving me tips on managing my time better or on studying my effectively.
SOAI	9	I give members of the student organization I advise tips on managing time better or on studying more effectively when they seem to need help.	OR	I do not spend time giving members of the student organization I advise tips on managing their time better or on studying more effectively
AAI	10	My advisor tells me what I must do in order to be advised.	OR	My advisor and I discuss our expectations of advising and of each other.
SOAI	10	I tell the members of the student organization I advise what to expect through our advising relationship.	OR	I discuss with the members of the student organization I advise our mutual expectations through our advising relationship.
AAI	11	My advisor suggests what I should major in.	OR	My advisor suggests steps I can take tohelp me decide on a major.
SOAI	11	I suggest what the members of the student organization I advise should major in.	OR	I suggest steps the members of the student organization I advise can take to help them decide on a major
AAI	12	My advisor uses test scores and grades to let him or her know what courses are most appropriate for me to take.	OR	My advisor and I use information, such as test scores, grades, interests, and abilities, to determine what courses are most appropriate for me to take.
SOAI	12	I use student organization data to let me know how to manage their organization.	OR	I use organization information, group interests, and abilities to determine how to manage their organization
AAI	13	My advisor talks with me about my other-than-academic interests and plans.	OR	My advisor does not talk with me about interests and plans other than academic ones.
SOAI	13	I talk with the members of the student organization I advise about non-academic interests and plans.	OR	I do not talk with members of the student organization I advise about non-academic interests and plans.
AAI	14	My advisor keeps me informed of my academic progress by examining my files and grades *only.*	OR	My advisor keeps me informed of my academic progress by examining my files and grades and by talking to me about my classes.
SOAI	14	I keep members of the student organization informed of policies and processes that effect the organization.	OR	I do not keep members of the student organization I advise informed of policies and processes that effect the organization.

Inventory Question Comparison PART 2				
	Student Organization Advising Inventory			**Student Organization Advising Inventory**
15	Discussing college policies		15	Discussing college policies
16	Signing registration forms		16	Signing forms
17	Dropping and/or adding course(s)			No comparable
18	Discussing personal values		18	Discussing personal values
19	Discussing possible majors/academic concentrations		19	Discussing possible majors/academic concentrations
20	Discussing important social or political issues		20	Discussing important social or political issues
21	Discussing content of courses			No comparable
22	Selecting courses for the next term			No comparable
23	Planning a class schedule for the next term			No comparable
24	Discussing transfer credit and policies			No comparable
25	Discussing advanced placement or exempting courses			No comparable
26	Discussing career alternatives		22	Discussing career alternatives
27	Discussing probation and dismissal policies		23	Discussing probation and dismissal policies
28	Discussing financial aid		24	Discussing financial aid
29	Identifying other campus offices that can provide assistance		25	Identifying other campus offices that can provide assistance
30	Discussing study skills or study tips		26	Discussing study skills or study tips
31	Discussing degree or major/academic concentration requirements			No comparable
32	Discussing personal concerns or problems		28	Discussing personal concerns or problems
33	Discussing studies abroad or other special academic programs		29	Discussing study abroad or other special academic programs
34	Discussing internship or cooperative education opportunities		30	Discussing internship or cooperative education opportunities
35	Talking about or setting personal goals		31	Talking about or setting personal goals
36	Evaluating academic progress		32	Evaluating academic progress
37	Getting to know each other		33	Getting to know each other
38	Discussing extracurricular activities		34	Discussing extracurricular activities
39	Discussing job placement opportunities		35	Discussing job placement opportunities
40	Discussing the purposes of a college education		37	Discussing the purposes of a college education
41	Declaring or changing a major/academic concentration			No comparable
42	Discussing time management		38	Discussing time management
43	Talking about experiences in different classes		39	Talking about experiences in different classes
44	Talking about what you are doing besides taking classes		40	Talking about what you are doing besides taking classes
	No comparable		17	Discussing course selection
	No comparable		21	Discussing meeting/programming topics
	No comparable		37	Discussing officer succession

Inventory Question Comparison PART 3

	AAI Statement			SOAI Statement
45	I am satisfied in general with the academic advising I have received.	Compares with:	41	I am satisfied in general with the student organization advising I have provided.
46	I have received accurate information about courses, programs, and requirements through academic advising.		42	I have provided accurate information about programs, policies, and requirements through student organization advising.
47	Sufficient prior notice has been provided about deadlines related to institutional policies and procedures.		43	Sufficient prior notice has been provided about institutional policies and procedures.
48	Advising has been available when I needed it.		44	I have provided student organization advising when it is needed.
49	Sufficient time has been available during advising sessions.		45	I have provided sufficient advising for the student organization I advise..
			46	I participated in the Student Leader Training Day Advisor session. A. If yes: I learned something that will help me be a better advisor. 1. If yes: One thing I learned that will help be a better advisor was _____.
			47	I reviewed the various training videos available online as part of the annual registration process. A. If yes: I learned something that will help me be a better advisor. 1. If yes: One thing I learned that will help be a better advisor was _____.

Inventory Question Comparison PART 4

AAI		SOAI	
50	What is your sex?	48	What is your sex?
51	What is your cultural/racial background?	49	What is your cultural/racial background?
52	What was your age at your last birthday?	50	What was your age at your last birthday?
53	What is your academic class standing?	52	What is your faculty status?
54	Which of the following best describes the majority of the academic advising you have received this academic year?	53	Which of the following best describes the majority of the student organization advising you have provided this academic year?
55	Approximately how much time was generally spent in each advising session?	55	Approximately how much time was generally spent in each meeting advising student organizations?
56	How many academic advising sessions have you had this academic year in your current situation?	56	How many times have you and the student organization you advise meet so far this academic year?
57	How many academic advising sessions in total have you had this year?		
		51	Is your primary role at the institution faculty?
		54	I interact with the student organization I advise in the following way(s). (*Please mark all that apply)*