

Advising At The Millennium: Advisor Roles and Responsibilities

Michael L. Lynch, Kansas State University

Karen Stucky, University of Texas, Arlington

This is the first in a series of articles in which we will present the results of the NACADA Academic Advising Survey 2000. In this article, we focus upon the reported roles and responsibilities of academic advisors and examine them according to institutional type, mission, and size. Similarities and differences in the roles and responsibilities of professional-staff academic advisors and faculty advisors are also examined.

The NACADA Academic Advising Survey 2000 was conducted electronically via the National Academic Advising Association Web site (www.nacada.ksu.edu). The survey was posted on April 18, 2000, and invitations to complete the survey were mailed to all NACADA members. Members were encouraged to ask nonmembers to also complete the survey. Notification of the survey was also posted on the Academic Advising Listserv (ACADV) on April 19, 2000.

Respondents completed the survey by logging on to the NACADA Web site and entering their responses

on-line. As noted, participation was not limited to NACADA members, but the survey's introduction stipulated that respondents should be employed at a higher education institution. Respondents were advised that the 89-question survey would require approximately 20 minutes to complete and that a server time limit of 90 minutes was allowed. If the respondents had not submitted their responses by the end of the 90-minute time limit, the server disconnected and the entered responses were lost. Potential respondents were further advised that the deadline for completing the survey was May 31, 2000.

A total of 2,695 surveys were completed and submitted by the May 31, 2000, deadline. However, the analyses that follow were frequently based upon fewer than the 2,695 because responses were missing or fell outside the response range for a given item. The actual number of responses used in each analysis is reported with the analysis. Table 1 presents a demographic profile of the 2,695 survey respondents on selected personal characteristics as well as educational background, advising experience, current title, position, appointment, and institutional type and size.

Table 1 Respondent profile for the NACADA Academic Advising Survey, $N = 2,695$

	<i>n</i>	%		<i>n</i>	%
NACADA Membership Status			Gender		
Yes	2,008	75	Female	2,051	76
No	605	22	Male	621	23
No Response	82	3	No Response	23	1
Ethnicity			Age		
African American	160	6	21–30	440	16
Asian American	99	4	31–40	656	24
Caucasian	2,171	81	41–50	793	29
Hispanic	20	1	51–60	566	21
Native American	49	2	61–70	66	2
Multiracial	12	<1	Over 70	4	<1
Other	135	5	No Response	170	6
No Response	49	2			
School/College/Department of Current Position			Number of Years in Advising		
Agriculture	30	1	< 1	14	1
Allied Health/Medicine	93	3	1–5	993	37
Architecture	11	< 1	6–10	656	24
Business	224	8	11–15	437	16
Education	121	4	> 15	480	18
			No Response	115	4

Table 1 Respondent profile for the NACADA Academic Advising Survey, $N = 2,695$ (continued)

	<i>n</i>	%		<i>n</i>	%
School/College/Department of Current Position			Highest Degree		
Engineering	75	3	Associate	23	1
Fine Arts	34	1	Bachelor's	501	19
General Arts/Science	293	11	Master's	1,675	62
Human Ecology	20	1	Doctorate	391	15
Humanities	67	2	Special certificate of advanced study	47	2
Law	2	< 1	Other	28	17
Social Science	95	4	No Response	30	17
Central Administration	342	13			
Undecided	156	6			
Central Advising Office	332	12			
Student Services	583	22			
Natural/Computational Science	122	5			
Other	26	1			
No Response	69	3			
Institutional Category			Size of Undergraduate Enrollment		
Public Research	1,067	40	<1,000	124	5
Private Research	144	5	1,000–2,499	361	13
Public Comprehensive			2,500–4,999	347	13
College/University	416	15	5,000–9,999	427	16
Private Comprehensive			10,000–19,999	703	26
College/University	148	5	≥20,000	642	24
Public Liberal Arts College	124	5	No Response	91	3
Private Liberal Arts College	189	7			
2-Year College	509	19			
Other	23	1			
No Response	75	3			
Current Title			Current Contract		
Professor/Instructor	161	6	Academic Year	308	4
Academic Department Chairperson	22	1	Full Year	2,297	85
Academic Advisor/Advising Specialist	1,209	45	No Response	90	3
Peer Advisor	4	<1			
Counselor/Psychologist	133	5	Current Appointment		
Advising Coordinator/Director	567	21	Full Time	2,409	89
Counseling Coordinator/Director	52	2	Three Quarters Time	79	3
Assistant/Associate Dean of Student Affairs	168	6	One Half Time	97	4
Assistant Associate Dean of Academic Affairs	167	6	One Quarter Time	18	1
Assistant/Associate College Dean	57	2	No Response	92	3
VP/Dean of Student Affairs	12	<1			
VP/Dean/Provost Academic Affairs	28	1			
Other	44	2			
No Response	71	3			

Five aspects of advisor role and responsibility were examined:

- Primary model of advising delivery
- Average length of advising meetings
- Areas of advising responsibility
- Special populations advised
- Advisor service on institutional workgroups and committees

In examining the five areas of role and responsibility, we made comparisons among respondents based upon the respondent's type of institution (public university or college, private university or college, 2-year college), the mission of the respondent's institution (research university, comprehensive college or university, liberal arts college, 2-year college), and the size of the respondent's institution (undergraduate enrollment <1,000; 1,000–2,499; 2,500–4,999; 5,000–9,999; 10,000–19,999; and ≥ 20,000). We also made comparisons between full-time professional staff advisors and faculty advisors. In addition to the five areas of advisor role and responsibility, we compared professional-staff advisors and faculty advisors on number of advisees assigned and the proportion of their appointments devoted to advising and other insti-

tutional responsibilities.

We used chi-square analyses to analyze the comparisons. In those instances where the chi-square was significant at the 0.05 level, we conducted further analyses using the standardized residual method to identify the major contributors to the significant chi-square comparison.

Analysis by Type of Institution

In Table 2 we summarize the advisors' primary model of advising delivery by type of institution. No significant differences were found among respondents at the various types of institutions studied. Regardless of institution type, the primary avenue for delivery of academic advising is individual contact. Nearly 90% of all academic advising is delivered in this manner, and respondents ranked group advising and course-based advising a distant second and third respectively.

The average length of the advising meeting is presented in Table 3. The dominant length was 15–30 minutes for the advising meeting. Slightly over one half of the respondents reported meeting in this time frame. By adding those respondents who indicated advising meetings of less than 15 minutes, we found that approximately 75% of all advising

Table 2 Primary advising model by type of institution

Primary Model of Advising Delivery	Type of Institution							
	Public University/ College (n = 1,377)		Private University/ College (n = 418)		2-Year College (n = 452)		Total (N = 2,247)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Individual contact	1,220	89	362	87	394	87	1,976	88
Group advising	100	7	31	7	34	8	165	7
Course-based advising	57	4	25	6	24	5	106	5

Note. $\chi^2(4, N = 2,247) = 2.944, p > 0.05$

Table 3 Average length of advising meeting by type of institution

Average Length of Advising Meeting (minutes)	Type of Institution							
	Public University/ College (n = 1,550)		Private University/ College (n = 462)		2-Year College (n = 485)		Total (N = 2,497)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
<15	398	26	109	24	111	23	618	25
15–30	870	56	232	51	260	54	1,362	55
31–45	231	15	99	21	90	19	420	17
>45	51	3	22	5	24	5	97	4

Note. $\chi^2(6, N = 2,497) = 17.674, p = 0.0071$

Table 4 Areas of advising responsibility by type of institution

Area of Advising Responsibility	Type of Institution							
	Public University/College (<i>n</i> = 1,607)		Private University/College (<i>n</i> = 481)		2-Year College (<i>n</i> = 509)		Total (<i>N</i> = 2,597)	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Advising publications	749	47	235	49	208	41	1,192	46
Advising research	513	32	155	32	155	30	823	32
Career/life planning*	989	62	244	51	331	65	1,564	60
Mentoring*	725	45	240	50	174	34	1,139	44
New student orientation*	1,325	82	376	78	371	73	2,072	80
Personal counseling	644	40	201	42	239	47	1,084	42
Course selection/registration	1,505	94	451	94	477	94	2,433	94

Note. * Indicates significant chi-square value and one or more significant standardized residuals among the categories.

Table 5 Special populations advised by type of institution

Special Population	Type of Institution							
	Public University/College (<i>n</i> = 1,607)		Private University/College (<i>n</i> = 481)		2-Year College (<i>n</i> = 509)		Total (<i>N</i> = 2,597)	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Student athletes*	465	29	110	23	103	20	678	26
Specific department/ curricular advising*	926	58	224	47	231	45	1,381	53
Disabled student advising*	334	21	116	24	154	30	604	23
First-year student advising*	1,111	69	339	70	403	79	1,853	71
Graduate/professional school advising*	243	15	88	18	19	4	350	13
International/study abroad advising*	255	16	75	16	31	6	361	14
International student advising	464	29	132	27	123	24	719	28
Graduate/professional school preparation*	457	28	89	19	46	9	592	23
Reentry/adult student advising*	859	53	215	45	370	73	1,444	56
Transfer student advising*	1,206	75	318	66	416	82	1,940	75
Undeclared student advising*	951	59	305	63	382	75	1,638	63
Underprepared student advising*	701	44	184	38	347	68	1,232	47
Underrepresented student advising*	446	28	84	17	157	31	687	26
Probation, dismissal, reinstatement advising	1,019	63	288	60	298	59	1,605	62

Note. * Indicates significant chi-square value and one or more significant standardized residuals among the categories.

meetings are 30 minutes or less. The chi-square analysis comparing length of advising meeting time across types of institutions showed significance: $\chi^2(6, N = 2,947) = 17.674, p = 0.0071$. Further analyses using the standardized residual indicated that overrepresentation of private universities or colleges in the 31–45 category was the only major contributor to significance.

Respondents were requested to indicate whether they were involved in seven areas of advising-related responsibilities on their campuses. Table 4 summarizes their overall responses and those as categorized by type of institution. As indicated, a high of 94% was involved in course selection and registration, while only 32% were involved in advising research. We did not find any significant difference in either the course-selection or research areas of responsibility with regard to institution type. Of the five remaining areas of responsibility, we found significant chi-square values with regard to institution type. However, we found that only three of the five analyzed by the standardized residual method showed major differences by institution type. Private institutions proved to be less involved in career and life planning than were the other institutions: $\chi^2(2, N = 2,597) = 27.182, p < 0.0001$. Advisors from private colleges and universities indicated greater involvement in mentoring, while those from 2-year colleges reported less than expected mentoring levels: $\chi^2(2, N = 2,597) = 27.497, p < 0.0001$. Advisors from public colleges and universities reported greater than expected levels of involvement with new student orientation, while those from 2-year colleges reported less than expected levels: $\chi^2(2, N = 2,597) = 22.875, p < 0.0001$.

Respondents indicated whether they advised 1 or more of 14 special populations of students. Their responses to each of the questions regarding special populations are presented in Table 5. As in Table 4, responses are given for the total respondents and broken down by type of institution.

We found no differences among advisors of the three types of institutions on 2 of the 14 special populations: advising international students and probation, dismissal, reinstatement advising. For 12 of the 14 special populations, advisor responses yielded chi-square values that exceeded the critical value.

Advisors from public institutions reported a higher than expected level of advising student athletes, while advisors representing 2-year colleges reported a lower than expected level: $\chi^2(2, N = 2,597) = 18.376, p < 0.0001$. Advisors from pub-

lic universities and colleges reported significantly higher than expected involvement in departmental curricular advising while advisors at both private colleges and universities and 2-year colleges indicated less than expected involvement: $\chi^2(2, N = 2,597) = 33.609, p < 0.0001$. Advisors from 2-year colleges were more likely than expected to be involved in the advising of students with disabilities while those at public colleges and universities were less likely to be advising students with disabilities: $\chi^2(2, N = 2,597) = 19.673, p < 0.0001$. Advisors from 2-year colleges also reported greater than expected involvement in the advising of first-year students, $\chi^2(2, N = 2,597) = 19.282, p < 0.0001$, and undeclared students, $\chi^2(2, N = 2,597) = 41.832, p < 0.0001$, while their counterparts at public and private colleges and universities responded at expected levels.

Respondents at private colleges and universities reported greater than expected involvement in graduate and professional school advising and those at 2-year colleges reported less than expected involvement: $\chi^2(2, N = 2,597) = 54.748, p < 0.0001$. Advisors employed at public institutions were more likely than others to be involved in advising related to study abroad $\chi^2(2, N = 2,597) = 32.290, p < 0.0001$, and those working at 2-year colleges were less likely than expected to be involved than other advisors with students wanting to study outside the United States. Advisors from public institutions were significantly more involved in graduate and professional school preparation advising while advisors from both private institutions and 2-year colleges were less likely to be advising graduate or professional students: $\chi^2(2, N = 2,597) = 88.853, p < 0.0001$.

Private-institution advisors were less likely than expected to be involved in the advising of transfer students, $\chi^2(2, N = 2,597) = 32.179, p < 0.0001$, and underrepresented students, $\chi^2(2, N = 2,597) = 26.422, p < 0.0001$, than their counterparts at other institutions. Advisors from public colleges and universities and 2-year colleges reported expected levels with regard to transfer and underrepresented students. Advisors working at 2-year colleges were significantly more likely to be involved in advising reentry and adult students, $\chi^2(2, N = 2,597) = 86.387, p < 0.0001$, and underprepared students, $\chi^2(2, N = 2,597) = 113.424, p < 0.0001$, than were advisors from other institutions. Advisors from both private and public institutions reported lower than expected involvement with underprepared students.

Respondents from the three types of institutions were compared to determine whether advisors

Table 6 Advisor service on institutional workgroups and committees by type of institution

Institutional Workgroups/ Committees	Type of Institution							
	Public University/ College (n = 1,607)		Private University/ College (n = 481)		2-Year College (n = 509)		Total (N = 2,597)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Academic policy/ procedural exceptions	691	43	230	48	251	49	1,172	45
Admissions	598	37	190	40	203	40	991	38
Advising council/committee*	886	55	184	38	254	50	1,324	51
Curriculum*	662	41	205	43	249	49	1,116	43
Financial aid/scholarship*	400	25	102	21	210	41	712	27
First-year programs*	775	48	217	45	202	40	1,194	46
Judicial committees*	315	20	119	25	98	19	532	20
Orientation committees	923	57	261	54	314	62	1,498	58
Retention committees*	885	55	280	58	333	65	1,498	58
Student life policy/procedures*	422	26	142	30	180	35	744	29
Probation/dismissal/ reinstatement	709	44	248	52	226	44	1,183	46
Administrative technology	586	36	184	38	195	38	965	37

Note. * Indicates significant chi-square value and one or more significant standardized residuals among the categories.

Table 7 Primary advising model by institutional mission

Primary Model of Advising Delivery	Institutional Mission									
	Research University (n = 1,022)		Comprehensive College/University (n = 489)		Liberal Arts College (n = 284)		2-Year College (n = 452)		Total (N = 2,247)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	N	%
Individual contact	898	88	433	89	251	88	394	87	1,976	88
Group advising	75	7	41	8	15	5	34	8	165	7
Course-based advising	49	5	15	3	18	6	24	5	106	5

Note. $\chi^2 (6, N = 2,247) = 7.195, p > 0.05$

Table 8 Average length of advising meeting by institutional mission

Average Length of Advising Meeting (minutes)	Institutional Mission									
	Research University (n = 1,159)		Comprehensive College/University (n = 546)		Liberal Arts College (n = 307)		2-Year College (n = 485)		Total (N = 2,497)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	N	%
< 15	323	28	123	23	61	20	111	23	618	25
15–30	635	55	311	57	156	51	260	54	1,362	55
31–45	166	14	93	17	71	23	90	19	420	17
> 45	35	3	19	3	19	6	24	5	97	4

Note. $\chi^2 (9, N = 2,497) = 31.250, p = 0.0003$

at their institutions served on any of 12 common institutional workgroups or committees. See Table 6. With a critical chi-square value of 5.991, $df = 2$, $\alpha = 0.05$, the results revealed no differences with respect to service on admissions committees, orientation committees, and committees and workgroups dealing with administrative technology. We found significant chi-square values for service on committees and workgroups dealing with academic policy and procedural exceptions and groups addressing issues of probation, dismissal, and reinstatement. However, no significant standardized residuals were indicated.

We found that advisors at 2-year colleges were serving more often than those at public and private institutions on the following committees or workgroups: curriculum, $\chi^2(2, N = 2,597) = 9.443, p = 0.0089$; retention, $\chi^2(2, N = 2,597) = 17.035, p = 0.0002$; and student life policies and procedures, $\chi^2(2, N = 2,597) = 15.892, p = 0.0004$.

Respondents from 2-year institutions reported less than expected involvement on first-year program committees, $\chi^2(2, N = 2,597) = 11.529, p = 0.0031$, and greater than expected involvement on financial aid scholarship committees, $\chi^2(2, N = 2,597) = 63.474, p < 0.0001$. Advisors from private institutions reported less than expected involvement on the financial aid and scholarship workgroups, but these same advisors experienced greater than expected involvement on judicial groups, $\chi^2(2, N = 2,597) = 6.590, p = 0.0351$, and lower than expected service levels on advising councils and committees, $\chi^2(2, N = 2,597) = 42.505, p < 0.0001$. Respondents from public colleges and universities reported higher than expected involvement on advising councils and committees.

Analysis by Institutional Mission

Advisor roles and responsibilities were also examined for differences by institutional mission. For purposes of these comparisons, we classified the respondents' institutions into the categories of research university, comprehensive college or university, liberal arts college, or 2-year college. We then made comparisons on each of the five aspects of advising using chi-square analysis and standardized residuals where appropriate.

Table 7 summarizes the advisors' primary delivery model by institutional mission. The primary delivery model was the individual advising contact: Nearly 90% of the respondents utilized individual contact. We found no significant differences among institutions of differing missions.

With respect to the average length of advising meetings (Table 8), we found significant differences among institutions of differing missions: $\chi^2(9, N = 2,497) = 31.250, p = 0.0003$. The standardized residuals indicated that research universities had a greater number of advisors reporting contacts of less than 15 minutes and relatively few in the 31–45 minute range. Advisors from liberal arts colleges reported greater than expected percentages in the 31–45 and greater-than-45 minute categories. The time category distributions were as expected for respondents from both the comprehensive colleges and universities and the 2-year colleges.

Table 9 indicates the extent to which the respondents reported they were involved in seven common areas of advising responsibility. No significant differences on course selection and registration, career and life planning, and advising research were found

Table 9 Areas of advising responsibility by institutional mission

Area of Advising Responsibility	Institutional Mission									
	Research University (<i>n</i> = 1,211)		Comprehensive College/University (<i>n</i> = 564)		Liberal Arts College (<i>n</i> = 313)		2-Year College (<i>n</i> = 509)		Total (<i>N</i> = 2,597)	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%
Advising publications	591	49	257	46	136	43	208	41	1,192	46
Advising research	374	31	191	34	103	33	155	30	823	32
Career/life planning	728	60	326	58	179	57	331	65	1,564	60
Mentoring*	552	46	253	45	160	51	174	34	1,139	44
New student orientation*	1,001	83	456	81	244	78	371	73	2,072	80
Personal counseling	503	42	215	38	127	41	239	47	1,084	42
Course selection/ registration	1,128	93	533	95	295	94	477	94	2,433	94

Note. * Indicates a significant chi-square value and one or more significant standardized residuals among the categories.

Table 10 Special populations advised by institutional mission

Special Population	Institutional Mission									
	Research University (<i>n</i> = 1,211)		Comprehensive College/University (<i>n</i> = 564)		Liberal Arts College (<i>n</i> = 313)		2-Year College (<i>n</i> = 509)		Total (<i>N</i> = 2,597)	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%
Student athletes*	371	31	129	23	75	24	103	20	678	26
Specific department/ curricular advising*	744	61	260	46	146	47	231	45	1,381	53
Students with disabilities*	255	21	119	21	76	24	154	30	604	23
First-year student advising*	826	68	390	69	234	75	403	79	1,853	71
Graduate/professional school advising*	214	18	88	16	29	9	19	4	350	13
International/study abroad advising*	229	19	67	12	34	11	31	6	361	14
International student advising*	382	32	142	25	72	23	123	24	719	28
Graduate/professional school preparation*	396	33	104	18	46	15	46	9	592	23
Reentry/adult student*	623	51	290	51	161	51	370	73	1,444	56
Transfer students*	910	75	404	72	210	67	416	82	1,940	75
Undeclared students*	666	55	385	68	205	66	382	75	1,638	63
Underprepared students*	482	40	256	45	147	47	347	68	1,232	47
Underrepresented students	333	28	130	23	67	21	157	31	687	26
Probation, dismissal, reinstatement advising	777	64	343	61	187	60	298	59	1,605	62

Note. * Indicates a significant chi-square value and one or more significant standardized residuals among the categories.

among the respondents representing the various institutional missions; the overall participation rates for these three areas were 94%, 60%, and 32% respectively. The chi-square comparison on advising publications was significant, $\chi^2(3, N = 2,597) = 10.089, p = 0.018$; however, the standardized residual indicated no major variation from the overall average participation rate of 46%. We found a similar result for personal counseling: A significant chi-square was obtained, $\chi^2(3, N = 2,597) = 8.926, p = 0.0303$, but no substantial variations from the overall average of 42% were identified. We found significant and meaningful differences for two of the seven areas of responsibility among respondents from institutions of differing missions. Respondents from 2-year colleges were significantly less likely to be involved in mentoring than were their peers at other types of institutions: $\chi^2(3, N = 2,597) = 27.735, p < 0.0001$. With respect to new student orientation, respondents from research universities reported higher than expected levels of

involvement and those from 2-year colleges reported less than expected levels: $\chi^2(3, N = 2,597) = 22.260, p < 0.0001$.

Numerous significant differences were found among the four categories of institutional mission with respect to whether the respondents were involved in the advising of special populations of students. See Table 10. A general trend emerged from the findings: Advisors at comprehensive colleges and universities and liberal arts colleges indicated expected involvement levels while their counterparts in research universities and 2-year colleges reported greater than expected or less than expected involvement, depending upon the special population.

Advisors from research universities reported higher than expected levels of advising student athletes, while representatives of 2-year institutions reported lower than expected involvement: $\chi^2(3, N = 2,597) = 25.776, p < 0.0001$. Departmental and major advising was reported more often than

expected by representatives of research universities and significantly less often than expected by representatives of comprehensive colleges and universities and liberal arts colleges: $\chi^2(3, N = 2,597) = 62.310, p < 0.0001$. Advisors from 2-year colleges reported higher than expected involvement in the advising of students with disabilities, while advisors from the other three institutional categories responded as expected: $\chi^2(3, N = 2,597) = 18.907, p = 0.0003$.

First-year student advising was reported significantly less often than expected among respondents from research institutions and more often than expected from those who work at 2-year colleges. The frequency was as expected for respondents from comprehensive colleges and universities and liberal arts institutions: $\chi^2(3, N = 2,597) = 24.212, p < 0.0001$.

As might be expected, survey respondents at research universities reported significantly higher than expected involvement in graduate or professional degree advising and advising in preparation for professional or graduate school enrollment. Advisors from liberal arts and 2-year colleges reported lower than expected levels of advising related to obtaining graduate or professional degrees: $\chi^2(3, N = 2,597) = 66.664, p < 0.0001$, and those from comprehensive colleges and universities, liberal arts colleges, and 2-year colleges all reported that they conducted significantly less advising directed toward professional and graduate school preparation: $\chi^2(3, N = 2,597) = 139.997, p < 0.0001$. We found similar patterns in advising for international study and international students as we did for graduate students. Advisors from research universities reported higher than expected levels. Those from comprehensive colleges and universities, liberal arts colleges, and 2-year colleges all reported expected levels of international student advising: $\chi^2(3, N = 2,597) = 17.357, p = 0.0006$. For international study advising, responses from those at comprehensive colleges and universities and liberal arts colleges were as expected, but those from 2-year institution advisors were significantly lower than expected: $\chi^2(3, N = 2,597) = 55.672, p < 0.0001$.

We also found significant differences regarding the advising of reentry and adult students among respondents whose institutions had differing missions. Responses from research university advisors were significantly lower than expected and those from 2-year college advisors were significantly higher than expected: $\chi^2(3, N = 2,597) = 74.892, p < 0.0001$. Respondents from comprehensive colleges and universities and liberal arts col-

leges provided answers as expected. The same pattern was found regarding the advising of underprepared students: $\chi^2(3, N = 2,597) = 117.062, p < 0.0001$. With respect to transfer student advising, respondents from 2-year colleges reported significantly higher levels of involvement than expected: $\chi^2(3, N = 2,597) = 25.829, p < 0.0001$. Representatives from comprehensive colleges and universities and 2-year colleges reported higher than expected levels of involvement on the advising of undeclared students: $\chi^2(3, N = 2,597) = 75.575, p < 0.0001$.

With regard to advising related to probation, dismissal, and reinstatement issues, we found no significant differences among advisors. While the chi-square value was significant on the advising of underrepresented populations, the standardized residuals failed to indicate a major contributor to the significance.

Table 11 summarizes the survey results related to advisor service on the 12 institutional committees and work groups. These data were also subjected to chi-square analyses in which we compared institutions of varying missions.

We found no significant differences among responses of individuals who represent institutions of differing missions with respect to service on admissions, judicial, and orientation committees. Based on survey results, we found no significant differences among respondents with respect to advisor service on committees or workgroups addressing administrative uses of technology.

We found significant chi-square values for differences among the institutional categories for service on academic policy or procedural exceptions as well as service on bodies that address probation, dismissal, and reinstatement issues. However, in both cases, standardized residuals failed to detect any meaningful contributors.

Respondents from research universities indicated lower than expected levels of service on groups addressing financial aid, while respondents from 2-year colleges reported greater than expected levels of involvement with financial aid groups: $\chi^2(3, N = 2,597) = 61.815, p < 0.0001$. We discovered a similar pattern with respect to participation on committees or workgroups dealing with student retention: $\chi^2(3, N = 2,597) = 26.851, p < 0.0001$.

Advisor participation on academic advising councils or committees was significantly higher than expected at research universities, $\chi^2(3, N = 2,597) = 18.467, p = 0.0004$ while service on curricular committees and workgroups was higher than expected for the 2-year college respondents:

Table 11 Advisor service on institutional workgroups and committees by institutional mission

Institutional Workgroups /Committees	Institutional Mission									
	Research University (n = 1,211)		Comprehensive College/University (n = 564)		Liberal Arts College (n = 313)		2-Year College (n = 509)		Total (N = 2,597)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	N	%
Academic policy/procedural exceptions	512	42	249	44	160	51	251	49	1,172	45
Admissions	446	37	204	36	138	44	203	40	991	38
Advising council/committee*	667	55	267	47	136	43	254	50	1,324	51
Curriculum*	516	43	212	38	139	44	249	49	1,116	43
Financial aid/scholarship*	285	24	144	26	73	23	210	41	712	27
First-year programs*	554	46	275	49	163	52	202	40	1,194	46
Judicial committees	243	20	117	21	73	24	98	19	532	20
Orientation committees	676	56	322	57	186	59	314	62	1,498	58
Retention committees*	642	53	326	58	197	63	333	65	1,498	58
Student life policy/procedures*	332	27	136	24	96	31	180	35	744	29
Probation/dismissal reinstatement	525	43	267	47	165	53	226	44	1,183	46
Administrative technology	468	39	198	35	104	33	195	38	965	37

Note. * Indicates a significant chi-square value and one or more significant standardized residuals among the categories.

Table 12 Primary advising model by size of institution

Primary Model of Advising Delivery	Size of Undergraduate Enrollment													
	<1,000 (n = 104)		1,000–2,499 (n = 315)		2,500–4,999 (n = 307)		5,000–9,999 (n = 369)		10,000–19,999 (n = 609)		≥20,000 (n = 546)		Total (N = 2,250)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	N	%
Individual contact	94	90	275	87	270	88	322	87	530	87	486	89	1,977	88
Group advising	3	3	22	7	23	7	27	7	51	8	41	8	167	7
Course-based advising	7	7	18	6	14	5	20	5	28	5	19	3	106	5

Note. $\chi^2(10, N = 2,250) = 7.711, p > 0.05$

Table 13 Average length of advising session by size of institution

Average Length of Advising Meeting (minutes)	Size of Undergraduate Enrollment													
	<1,000 (n = 116)		1,000–2,499 (n = 350)		2,500–4,999 (n = 336)		5,000–9,999 (n = 408)		10,000–19,999 (n = 676)		≥20,000 (n = 616)		Total (N = 2,502)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	N	%
<15	29	25	76	22	81	24	91	22	166	25	184	30	627	25
15–30	49	42	180	51	184	55	238	58	380	56	330	54	1,361	54
31–45	30	26	75	21	59	18	70	17	100	15	84	14	418	17
>45	8	7	19	5	12	4	9	2	30	4	18	3	96	4

Note. $\chi^2(15, N = 2,502) = 39.709, p = 0.0005$

$\chi^2(3, N = 2,597) = 14.345, p = 0.0025$. Service on first-year program committees was lower than expected for 2-year college respondents: $\chi^2(3, N = 2,597) = 14.583, p < 0.0001$. Service on groups dealing with student life policies and procedures was higher than expected for 2-year college respondents but lower than expected for comprehensive colleges and universities: $\chi^2(3, N = 2,597) = 18.430, p = 0.0004$.

Analysis by Institutional Size

In the third analysis of the five areas of advisor role and responsibilities, we compared survey responses by the size of the respondents' institutions. For comparison purposes, undergraduate enrollment was used to place the institution into one of six size categories: less than 1,000; 1,000–2,499; 2,500–4,999; 5,000–9,999; 10,000–19,999; and 20,000 and more. As was true on both the type of institution and institutional mission comparisons, no differences were found among the various size categories on the primary model of advising contact. In this third analysis, individual contact was noted as the primary method of delivery by nearly 90% of the respondents in each size category. However, we found significant differences on the average length of advising meetings: $\chi^2(15, N = 2,502) = 39.709, p = 0.0005$. The smallest institutions, those with undergraduate enrollments of less than 1,000, had larger than expected frequencies in the 31–45 minute and more-than-45 minute time frames. Institutions in the 1,000–2,499 size category had significantly larger than expected representation in the 31–45 minute category. The largest institutions, those with undergraduate enrollments of 20,000 or more, were overrepresented in the less-

than-15-minute category. These responses are summarized in Tables 12 and 13.

When we compared the seven areas of advisor responsibility (advising publications, advising research, career/life planning, mentoring, new student orientation, personal counseling, and course selection and registration), we found no significant differences among the various sized institutions on six of the seven areas. We found a significant chi-square value for career and life planning, but the standardized residuals failed to identify any major contributors. These comparisons are summarized in Table 14.

Table 15 summarizes respondents' involvement in the advising of special populations. We found no significant differences among the various institutions with regard to size and the advising of first-year, reentry or adult students, and students on probation, dismissal, or who have been reinstated. Likewise, we found no differences among the institutional size categories on graduate and professional degree advising. However, we found significant differences on advising for professional or graduate school preparation. Institutions with undergraduate enrollments of more than 10,000 were significantly more likely to have advisors engaged in graduate and professional school preparation advising than were institutions with undergraduate enrollments of less than 10,000: $\chi^2(5, N = 2,604) = 92.357, p < 0.0001$.

Institutional size differences were also found for each of the nine remaining student populations. Representatives of institutions of 20,000 and more reported involvement in the advisement of student athletes at a higher level than expected. Advisors from institutions in the 2,500–4,999 enrollment

Table 14 Areas of advising responsibility by size of institution

Area of Advising Responsibility	Size of Undergraduate Enrollment													
	<1,000 (n = 124)		1,000–2,499 (n = 361)		2,500–4,999 (n = 347)		5,000–9,999 (n = 427)		10,000–19,999 (n = 703)		≥20,000 (n = 642)		Total (N = 2,604)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	N	%
Advising publications	52	42	170	47	157	45	197	46	315	45	302	47	1,193	46
Advising research	42	34	115	32	122	35	129	30	210	30	211	33	829	32
Career/life planning	63	51	198	55	198	57	261	61	451	64	398	62	1,569	60
Mentoring	62	50	168	47	137	39	167	39	319	45	289	45	1,142	44
New student orientation	92	74	285	79	266	77	335	78	562	80	536	83	2,076	80
Personal counseling	54	44	158	44	153	44	164	38	266	38	290	45	1,085	42
Course selection/registration	114	92	348	96	320	92	401	94	661	94	593	92	2,437	94

Table 15 Special populations advised by size of institution

Special Population	Size of Undergraduate Enrollment												Total (<i>N</i> = 2,604)	
	<1,000 (<i>n</i> = 124)		1,000–2,499 (<i>n</i> = 361)		2,500–4,999 (<i>n</i> = 347)		5,000–9,999 (<i>n</i> = 427)		10,000–19,999 (<i>n</i> = 703)		≥20,000 (<i>n</i> = 642)			
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%
Student athletes*	25	20	87	24	68	20	95	22	202	29	202	31	679	26
Specific department/ curricular advising*	55	44	166	46	153	44	206	48	418	59	388	60	1,386	53
Disabled student advising*	38	31	117	32	61	18	87	20	166	24	138	21	607	23
First-year student advising	91	73	268	74	264	76	297	70	498	71	442	69	1,860	71
Graduate/professional school advising	15	12	46	13	39	11	58	14	91	13	98	15	347	13
International/study abroad advising*	10	8	38	11	31	9	45	11	119	17	119	19	362	14
International student advising*	21	17	89	25	75	22	113	26	218	31	201	31	717	28
Graduate/professional school preparation*	17	14	56	16	45	13	69	16	193	27	211	33	591	23
Reentry/adult student advising	65	52	208	58	205	59	232	54	391	56	344	54	1,445	55
Transfer student advising*	86	69	259	72	258	74	303	71	561	80	476	74	1,943	75
Undeclared student advising*	79	64	255	71	231	67	279	65	440	63	354	55	1,638	63
Underprepared student advising*	67	54	183	51	174	50	201	47	347	49	263	41	1,235	47
Underrepresented student advising*	29	23	89	25	88	25	89	21	197	28	198	31	690	27
Probation, dismissal, reinstatement advising	77	62	218	60	204	59	270	63	430	61	407	63	1,606	62

Note. * Indicates a significant chi-square value and one or more significant standardized residuals among the categories.

range reported less than expected involvement: $\chi^2(5, N = 2,604) = 26.031, p < 0.0001$.

Respondents from institutions of 10,000 and more indicated greater than expected involvement in departmental and major advising while those from institutions ranging from 1,000–4,999 undergraduates reported lower than expected involvement: $\chi^2(5, N = 2,604) = 51.790, p < 0.0001$. Advisors from institutions in the 1,000–2,499 enrollment category reported greater than expected involvement in the advising of students with disabilities, and representatives from institutions in the 2,500–4,999 enrollment category reported lower than expected rates of advising students with dis-

abilities: $\chi^2(5, N = 2,604) = 30.106, p < 0.0001$.

Respondents from institutions with undergraduate enrollments of less than 1,000 and those from schools with 2,500–4,999 enrollments both reported less than expected levels of advising international students, $\chi^2(5, N = 2,604) = 23.663, p = 0.0003$, and advising students pertaining to international study: $\chi^2(5, N = 2,604) = 35.053, p < 0.0001$. Advisors from institutions with undergraduate enrollments of 10,000 or more reported greater than expected levels of advising for international study. Transfer student advising was greater than expected at institutions of 10,000–19,999 enrollments: $\chi^2(5, N = 2,604) = 16.462, p = 0.0056$. The largest insti-

Table 16 Advisor service on institutional workgroups and committees by size of institution

Institutional Workgroups/ Committees	Size of Undergraduate Enrollment												Total (N = 2,604)	
	<1,000 (n = 124)		1,000–2,499 (n = 361)		2,500–4,999 (n = 347)		5,000–9,999 (n = 427)		10,000–19,999 (n = 703)		≥20,000 (n = 642)			
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	N	%
Academic policy/procedural exceptions	65	52	172	48	163	47	189	44	328	47	256	40	1,173	45
Admissions*	64	52	148	41	136	39	151	35	267	38	228	36	994	38
Advising council/committee*	51	41	151	42	173	50	202	47	389	55	362	56	1,328	51
Curriculum	65	52	151	42	161	46	171	40	297	42	267	42	1,118	43
Financial aid/scholarship	42	34	103	29	102	29	105	25	197	28	161	25	710	25
First-year programs	59	48	168	47	158	46	180	42	341	49	299	47	1,205	46
Judicial committees*	34	27	83	23	84	24	68	16	135	19	134	21	538	21
Orientation committees	78	63	203	56	203	59	245	57	421	60	352	55	1,502	58
Retention committees*	92	74	226	63	221	64	226	53	406	58	338	53	1,509	58
Student life policy/procedures*	49	40	110	31	120	35	108	25	186	26	178	28	751	29
Probation/dismissal reinstatement*	74	60	184	51	176	51	180	42	306	44	272	42	1,192	46
Administrative technology	43	35	124	34	124	36	150	35	274	39	259	40	974	37

Note. * Indicates a significant chi-square value and one or more significant standardized residuals among the categories.

tutions, those with undergraduate enrollments of 20,000 or more, reported lower than expected levels of advising underprepared, $\chi^2(5, N = 2,604) = 16.565, p = 0.0054$, and undeclared students, $\chi^2(5, N = 2,604) = 28.984, p < 0.0001$.

Respondents from institutions of 1,000–2,499 enrollments reported greater than expected involvement in the advising of undeclared students. Respondents from the largest institutions (20,000 and more) reported greater than expected involvement in the advisement of underrepresented students while those from institutions in the 5,000–9,999 range reported lower than expected levels: $\chi^2(5, N = 2,604) = 15.545, p = 0.0083$.

Institutional size was not related to advisor service on institutional workgroups and committees in 5 of the 12 service categories: curriculum, financial aid, first-year programs, orientation, and administrative uses of technology. See Table 16. We found a significant chi-square value for service on workgroups and committees dealing with academic policy and procedural issues, but the standardized residuals failed

to identify any meaningful contributors.

With respect to service on advising councils or committees, only advisors from institutions of 1,000–2,499 enrollments provided significant responses, which reflected a lower than the expected level of involvement: $\chi^2(5, N = 2,604) = 32.237, p < 0.0001$. Respondents from institutions in the 5,000–9,999 size category reported less than expected levels of involvement on judicial committees: $\chi^2(5, N = 2,604) = 14.085, p = 0.0151$. Respondents from the smallest institutions reported greater than expected involvement on retention committees, $\chi^2(5, N = 2,604) = 33.163, p < 0.0001$, committees addressing student-life policies and procedures, $\chi^2(5, N = 2,604) = 17.880, p = 0.0031$, and probation, dismissal, and reinstatement issues $\chi^2(5, N = 2,604) = 23.687, p = 0.0002$. In the same analyses, respondents from institutions of 20,000 and more reported less than expected involvement on retention committees, and respondents from institutions in the 2,500–4,999 enrollment range reported greater

Table 17 Comparison of faculty advisors and professional-staff advisors on primary model of advising delivery

Primary Model of Advising Delivery	Current Position					
	Professor/Instructor Teaching Faculty (n = 141)		Academic Advisor/Advising Specialist (n = 1,071)		Total (N = 1,212)	
	n	%	n	%	N	%
Individual contact	125	89	960	90	1,085	90
Group advising	9	6	67	6	76	6
Course-based advising	7	5	44	4	51	4

Note. $\chi^2(2, N = 1,212) = 0.234, p > 0.05$

Table 18 Comparison of faculty advisors and professional-staff advisors on average length of advising meeting

Average Length of Advising Meeting (minutes)	Current Position					
	Professor/Instructor Teaching Faculty (n = 157)		Academic Advisor/Advising Specialist (n = 1,190)		Total (N = 1,347)	
	n	%	n	%	N	%
<15	35	22	284	24	319	24
15–30	86	55	693	58	779	58
31–45	27	17	179	15	206	15
>45	9	6	34	3	43	3

Note. $\chi^2(3, N = 1,347) = 4.445, p > 0.05$

Table 19 Academic advising loads of full-time faculty advisors and full-time professional-staff advisors

Position	n	Median Number of Advisees			
		Quartile Range (Advisees)		75th Percentile	
		25th Percentile	75th Percentile		
Professor/instructor teaching faculty	150	35	15	68	
Academic advisor/advising specialist	1,059	250	70	500	

than expected involvement on student-life policies and procedures.

Comparisons of Professional-Staff Academic Advisors and Faculty Advisors

Survey respondents were requested to provide the title of their current positions. The 13 response item included professor or instructor (teaching faculty) and academic advisor or advising specialist. One hundred and sixty-one respondents indicated that they were professors or instructors, and 1,209 indicated that they were academic advisors or advising specialists. The remaining respondents selected 1 of 11 other titles, most of which conveyed some

degree of administrative responsibility or an appointment affiliated with student affairs.

Those respondents who indicated a position title of professor or instructor were assumed to provide a valid indication of the roles and responsibilities of faculty advisors (teaching faculty). Those responding as academic advisors or advising specialists were assumed to provide a valid indication of the roles and responsibilities of professional or staff advisors.

Tables 17 and 18 summarize the survey responses of the faculty advisors and the professional-staff advisors regarding their primary model of advising delivery and the average length of the advising meeting respectively. We found no significant difference between the two advisor cate-

Table 20 Median time allocated (%) to advising and other institutional responsibilities by faculty advisors and professional-staff advisors

Activity	Position	
	Faculty Advisor (n = 156)	Professional-Staff Advisor (n = 1,201)
Direct service advising	20	60
Administration of advising and support programs	1	10
Advising-related activities (i.e., reviewing academic policy petitions, evaluating transfer credits, etc.)	3	10
Other institutional responsibilities	75	20

Table 21 Comparison of faculty advisors and professional-staff advisors on areas of advising responsibility

Area of Advising Responsibility	Current Position					
	Professor/Instructor Teaching Faculty (n = 161)		Academic Advisor/Advising Specialist (n = 1,209)		Total (N = 1,370)	
	n	%	n	%	N	%
Advising publications*	34	21	484	40	518	38
Advising research*	28	17	325	27	353	26
Career/life planning	91	57	752	62	843	62
Mentoring*	107	66	478	40	585	43
New student orientation*	110	68	998	83	1,108	81
Personal counseling	64	40	477	39	541	40
Course selection/registration	155	96	1,169	97	1,324	97

Note. * Indicates a significant chi-square value and one or more significant standardized residuals among the categories.

gories on either variable. Individual contact was the primary delivery model for both: Faculty indicated that it is used 89% of the time and professional-staff advisors report using this contact 90% of the time. Over one half of the advisors in each category reported the average length of an advising meeting to be between 15 and 30 minutes. Over three quarters of advising meetings were reported to last 30 minutes or less by both groups.

Faculty and professional-staff advisors were compared on two additional aspects of role and responsibility: the number of assigned advisees and the proportion of professional time allocated to advising and other institutional responsibilities. In making these comparisons, we only looked at the responses of the faculty and professional-staff advisors who indicated they that were serving on a full-time appointment (as opposed to half-time or quarter-time).

Table 19 indicates the median number of advisees served as reported by full-time faculty and full-time professional-staff advisors. Full-time faculty reported to serve a median of 35 advisees. The

median advising load for full-time professional-staff advisors was 250 advisees. Table 19 also reports the quartile range for both categories of advisors (loads falling at the 25th percentile and the 75th percentile). Faculty advisors reported a quartile range of 15 to 68 advisees. The quartile range for full-time professional-staff advisors was 70 to 500 advisees.

Respondents were requested to indicate the percentage of their professional appointment time they devoted to direct service advising, advising administration, other advising-related activities, and other institutional responsibilities. Table 20 provides the median time allocations to each of the four areas of responsibility as indicated by faculty advisors and professional-staff advisors. The median time allocation for full-time professional-staff advisors to direct service advising was 60%. For faculty advisors, the allocation was 20%.

Faculty and professional staff advisors were also compared on their involvement in each of the seven areas of advising responsibility. Results of these comparisons are provided in Table 21.

Table 22 Comparison of faculty advisors and professional-staff advisors on special populations advised

Special Population	Current Position					
	Professor/Instructor Teaching Faculty (n = 161)		Academic Advisor/ Advising Specialist (n = 1,209)		Total (N = 1,370)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Student athletes*	26	16	305	25	331	24
Specific department/ curricular advising*	130	81	682	56	812	59
Students with disabilities advising	20	12	235	19	255	19
First-year student advising*	91	57	867	72	958	70
Graduate/professional school advising*	43	27	140	12	183	13
International/study abroad advising	17	11	169	14	186	14
International student advising*	26	16	334	28	360	26
Graduate/professional school preparation	16	10	135	11	151	11
Reentry/adult student advising*	47	29	276	23	323	24
Transfer student advising*	57	35	706	58	763	56
Undeclared student advising*	101	63	963	80	1,064	78
Underprepared student advising*	60	37	750	62	810	59
Underrepresented student advising*	43	27	562	46	605	44
Probation, dismissal, reinstatement advising*	22	14	323	27	345	25

Note. * Indicates a significant chi-square value and one or more significant standardized residuals among the categories.

Table 23 Comparison of faculty advisors and professional-staff advisors on service on institutional workgroups and committees

Institutional Workgroups and Committees	Current Position					
	Professor/Instructor Teaching Faculty (n = 161)		Academic Advisor/ Advising Specialist (n = 1,209)		Total (N = 1,370)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Academic policy/procedural exceptions	58	36	499	41	557	41
Admissions	52	32	403	33	455	33
Advising council/committee	62	39	593	49	655	48
Curriculum	73	45	466	39	539	39
Financial aid/scholarship	42	26	266	22	308	22
First-year programs	61	38	505	42	566	41
Judicial committees	33	21	189	16	222	16
Orientation committees*	65	40	667	55	732	53
Retention committees	70	43	620	51	690	50
Student life policy/procedures	43	27	309	26	352	26
Probation, dismissal, reinstatement*	47	29	512	42	559	41
Administrative technology	42	26	398	33	440	32

Note. * Indicates significant chi-square value and one or more significant standardized residuals among the categories.

We found no significant differences between faculty advisors and professional-staff advisors on the extent to which they were involved in career or life planning, personal counseling, or course selection and registration. Faculty advisors indicated significantly less involvement with advising publications, $\chi^2(1, N = 1,370) = 21.618, p < 0.0001$; advising research, $\chi^2(1, N = 1,370) = 6.690, p = 0.0097$; and new student orientation, $\chi^2(1, N = 1,370) = 18.587, p < 0.0001$, than did their professional-staff counterparts. However, faculty reported significantly greater involvement with mentoring, $\chi^2(1, N = 1,370) = 42.091, p < 0.0001$, than did professional-staff advisors.

Table 22 summarizes the responses of faculty and professional-staff advisors regarding their involvement in the academic advising of any of 14 special populations. We found no significant differences between the advisor categories on advising students for international study and professional or graduate school preparation. We found a significant chi-square value for the advising of students with disabilities; however the standardized residual indicated no major contributor to the significance. For the 11 remaining special populations in which we found significant chi-square values, faculty advisors were significantly less involved than professional-staff advisors with 9 populations. Faculty advisors reported significantly higher levels of involvement with respect to departmental and curricular advising, $\chi^2(1, N = 1,370) = 34.854, p < 0.0001$, and graduate or professional degree advising, $\chi^2(1, N = 1,370) = 28.096, p < 0.0001$. Faculty advisors were significantly less involved in the advising of student athletes, $\chi^2(1, N = 1,370) = 6.391, p = 0.0115$; first-year student advising, $\chi^2(1, N = 1,370) = 15.590, p < 0.0001$; advising of international students, $\chi^2(1, N = 1,370) = 9.661, p = 0.0019$; advising reentry and adult students, $\chi^2(1, N = 1,370) = 30.437, p < 0.0001$; advising transfer students, $\chi^2(1, N = 1,370) = 23.447, p < 0.0001$; undeclared students, $\chi^2(1, N = 1,370) = 36.064, p < 0.0001$; underprepared students, $\chi^2(1, N = 1,370) = 22.535, p < 0.0001$; underrepresented students, $\chi^2(1, N = 1,370) = 12.846, p = 0.0003$; and probation, dismissed, and reinstated students, $\chi^2(1, N = 1,370) = 77.102, p < 0.0001$.

Comparisons of faculty advisors and professional-staff advisors on the 12 categories of institutional workgroups and committees produced few significant findings. Faculty advisors were less likely to report service on orientation committees, $\chi^2(1, N = 1,370) = 12.502, p = .0004$, and committees dealing with issues of probation, dismissal,

and reinstatement than expected: $\chi^2(1, N = 1,370) = 10.182, p = 0.0014$. A significant chi-square value was found for service on advising councils or committees, but the standardized residual failed to identify a major contributor. All other categories of questions regarding institutional workgroups and committees indicated no significant differences in the service levels of faculty advisors and professional-staff advisors.

Authors' Note

We encourage our readers to exercise appropriate caution in generalizing the data and analyses herein reported. The voluntary nature of the respondents, coupled with the fact that 75% of the respondents were NACADA members, precludes us from considering these data to be representative of all advising in higher education. However, the number of respondents (2,695) does lend credibility to the profile presented by the data. The frequencies and percentages are intended to provide a profile of academic advising as reported by the NACADA membership and their associates—both overall and according to various subcategories of institutions (type, mission, and size) and advisors (faculty and professional staff). The chi-square analyses are intended to indicate those categories of institutions or advisors who differ significantly from the overall aggregate.

Michael Lynch is Associate Vice President for Educational and Personal Development and Associate Professor of Counseling and Educational Psychology at Kansas State University. He is a past editor of the NACADA Journal and NACADA Special Publications Editor. He also serves as Coordinator of Academic Advising Initiatives at Kansas State University where he oversees a number of initiatives designed to enhance academic advising.

Karen Stucky is an Academic Advisor II in the University Advising Center at the University of Texas at Arlington. She coordinates advising programs and maintains the Advising Center's Web page, database, and computer system. She was employed as a graduate assistant with the NACADA Executive Office and assisted in the administration and compilation of the NACADA Academic Advising Survey 2000.

A copy of the NACADA Academic Advising Survey 2000 may be obtained by contacting the NACADA Executive Office by E-mail at nacada@ksu.edu or calling (785)532-5717.