

Annotated Bibliography of Recent Research Related to Academic Advising

Bai, H., & Pan, W. (2009-2010). A multilevel approach to assessing the interaction effects on college student retention. *Journal of College Student Retention, 11*(2), 287–301.

Approximately 40% of college students do not finish their degree (Porter, 1990; Tinto, 1993), possibly creating limitations in their job or career paths. Universities also face consequences due to attrition, including an impact to the institution's growth and finances.

College student retention is a multifaceted issue involving many factors. Four models have emerged, and each identifies the risk factors related to retention. In his classic work, Tinto (1975, 1993) presented the social integration model, suggesting that retention is related to the social and academic integration of the student into the university. In his involvement model, Astin (1975) stressed the importance of students engaging in active learning to facilitate retention. In the industrial/organizational model, Bean (1983) proposed that student grades influence their satisfaction, which impacts retention. The financial impact model (Paulsen & St. John, 2002; St. John, 1990; St. John, Paulsen, & Starkey, 1996; Voorhees, 1985) suggests that retention is influenced a great deal by monetary factors such as financial aid, tuition, and housing expenses. Additional research suggests that environmental factors, such as student services and facilities, as well as student individual characteristics, such as attitude about school, are elements relating to retention. Parker, Hogan, Eastabrook, Oke, and Wood (2006) integrated concepts from multiple models in their unified theory of retention that includes emotional and social competencies.

Various proposals have been offered to improve retention including learner-centered (Zepke, Leach, & Prebble, 2006) and resource allocation strategies (Berger, 2000; Gansemer-Topf & Schuh, 2006); university executive management (Fincher & Katsinas, 2006); student expectation alternations (Longden, 2006); improved attendance data collection (Bowen, Price, Lloyd, & Thomas, 2005); and multimedia use (Moore & Miller, 1996.) Tinto (2006b) called for further development and expansion of knowledge in the areas of institutional action, program implementation, and student income.

Many institutions offer programs designed to promote student retention that most often target

first-year students. However, research is needed on the effectiveness of various retention programs with attention given to the interaction between student characteristics and program types to reveal the types of initiatives that benefit students the most.

Bai and Pan investigate how various types of students respond to different types of programs: advising and academic help as well as first-year experience (FYE), social orientation, and traditional general-orientation (for freshmen) programs over a 3-year period. The studied advising programs involved use of advising centers and a career development series. Academic help programs included academic support targeted to specific courses. FYE programs delivered courses with common curricula related to college adjustment, wellness, and career development. The social integration programs increased student-student and student-faculty interaction through learning communities. Bai and Pan compared each to the other and to the general orientation programs for freshmen. They addressed the following research questions:

- Do the special intervention programs have more effects on student retention than the general orientation?
- What types of the special intervention programs work better for students with specific characteristics?
- Do these program effects last for 3 academic years?

The sample used in this program included 1,305 first-time, full-time students at a large midwestern urban university in 20 intervention programs that fell into one of the investigated programs: 285 in advising, 71 in academic help, 284 in FYE, 238 in social integration, and 427 in general freshman orientation. The sample was comprised of 46.7% females and 53.3% males; 83.2% Caucasian, 11.3% African American, 2.1% Asian, .9% Hispanic, and 2.5% other. The mean age was 18.62 years ($SD = .56$) and mean high school GPA was 2.91 ($SD = .64$).

The outcome measure used in this study was student retention in three consecutive fall semesters. The results revealed that students in the advising programs were 24% more likely to return to campus after the first year than those in the general freshman orientation programs, but at 3 years the difference was not significant.

In relation to student characteristics and retention, the results suggest the following:

- Older and male students benefited most from FYE programs across the 3 years of the study. Older students were 11% more likely and males were 12% more likely to stay in school.
- Females and students from more selective colleges benefited more than other students from social integration programs. Females were 26% more likely to stay in school, and students from more selective colleges were 25% more likely than other students to continue in school.
- Students from more selective colleges benefited more than the other students from advising programs. The students from more selective colleges were 22% more likely to remain in school.

The authors recommend that special programs target different types of students at the beginning of their first year. They conclude that universities should develop smaller, student-specific intervention programs rather than large, general, freshman orientations.

Briggeman, B. C., & Norwood, F. B. (2011). Employer assessment of the college graduate: What advisors need to know. *Journal of Natural Resources and Life Sciences Education*, 40, 19–28.

Briggeman and Norwood discuss the importance of advisors sharing with their students the attributes that employers seek in job candidates as well as the indicators (“signals”) they use to discern these qualities from application materials. Across the research, several characteristics emerge as consistently desired by employers: communication skills, an ability to work well with others, high moral character, and self-motivation or work ethic (Hansen & Hansen, 2007; NACE, 2006; Training Reference, 2006; Victoria University, 2006).

Applicant qualities desired by employers may not be directly observable. Instead, employers look for signals of these desired characteristics within candidate application materials. For example, high grades may signal intellect, work ethic, and time management choices. The ability to convey signals in the application process is associated with better career opportunities, more job offers, and higher salaries. To date, few researchers have explored the specific nature of these signals. Advisors may tell students the attributes highly valued by employers, but they do not always discuss how to indicate possession of these attributes.

In this study, 453 employers were surveyed. Almost one half of the surveys were from employers at large organizations (over 500 employees), but organizations of all size were represented. Survey instructions asked that the person most responsible for hiring answers the questions. Only the responses from individuals who make hiring decisions were used in this study. The respondents rated the usefulness of 17 signals in discerning five desired attributes (qualities/skills): character, communication and problem-solving skills, ability to work with others, and crunch numbers. Specifically, employers were asked to imagine the typical job at their organization for a college-educated employee and then to rate the strength of 17 possible signals as “very useful,” “useful,” “somewhat useful,” or “not useful” in relation to the desired qualities: letters of recommendation; impression from interview; courses on transcript; major; knowledge of software as reported on resume; GPA; awards and honors on resume; affiliation with a religious organization; community service; membership in university clubs and organizations; leadership positions in academic organizations; leadership positions in university, community or industry organizations; extracurricular activities; and prior work or internship experience.

The results of the study revealed that employers used references and impression from interview as signals for all five attributes. Additional signals for number crunching include courses on transcript, major, knowledge of software as reported on resume, and GPA. Other signals for character were GPA, awards and honors, affiliation with a religious organization, and community service. Communication signals also included courses on transcript, knowledge of software as reported on resume, GPA, and leadership positions in university, community, or industry organizations. Problem-solving skills were linked with courses on transcript, major, knowledge of software as reported on resume, and GPA. Lastly, ability to work with others was signaled by membership in university clubs and organizations, leadership positions in academic organizations, extracurricular activities, and prior work or internship experience. In addition, the researchers found no significant negative correlations between any of the signal-characteristic ratings. The more useful a signal for one attribute, the more useful the others were for the other attributes.

The results of this study suggest that employers use letters of recommendation and impressions from interviews as indicators of the applicant’s

global or overall ability. Therefore, the authors recommend that letters describe many abilities and qualities of the applicant rather than focusing on just one. Because of the positive correlation between signals associated with both problem solving skills and number crunching, the authors also suggest that these are similar attributes. Only one half of the employers rate GPA and courses on a transcript as useful in evaluating candidates' skills. Employers use numerous other signals in their evaluation of candidates. The authors emphasize that effective advising conveys to students not only the attributes that employers value but also the ways that students can demonstrate that they possess these desirable attributes.

Near the end of the article, the authors include a list of discussion topics with advisees, and they place "manage your career according to your personal strengths and weaknesses" among the most important issues. In the next section, they summarize some key results of the study including signals that employers value and the overall importance of the personal interview, for which they urged students to practice extensively. They also pointed out that a single accomplishment signals multiple desired attributes. The last section of the discussion topics provides salary figures from Norwood and Henneberry (2006) that reflect the additional earnings employers report willingness to give to individuals with the desired attributes. The article ends with a reminder that academic advising communicates to students the attributes (qualities/skills) employers seek in candidates and how students can develop and convey them in pursuit of their career goals.

Taylor, M., Jowi, D., Schreier, H., & Bertelsen, D. (2011). Students' perceptions of e-mail interaction during student-professor advising sessions: The pursuit of interpersonal goals. *Journal of Computer Mediated Communication*, 16, 307-330.

The authors of this study investigate whether students prefer to use e-mail instead of face-to-face interaction with their faculty advisors. Specifically, they looked at students' preferences for use of e-mail rather than face-to-face communication in relation to three interpersonal goals in an advising context: instrumental goals, relational goals, and self-presentation.

While the rational actor model (Markus, 1994) relates the concept of technology use as a matter of free will and personal choice, structural adaptation theory suggests that social norms and rules shape its use (Pool & DeSanctis, 1990). These

theories offer different reasons for student use of e-mail communication with their faculty advisors. The former suggests students use e-mail because they prefer to do so; the latter suggests they use it due to the social norm. These theories relate to the authors' research question regarding whether e-mail interaction is the preferred mode of communication with advisors.

The vast majority of traditional-aged college students (88%) use the Internet and most employ it for conducting searches, e-mailing, and instant messaging (Belson, 2006; Flanagan, 2005; Del Conte, 2006; Internet Activities, 2006). In a survey of faculty perceptions of e-mail use with their students, 49% indicated that e-mail had replaced face-to-face meetings with their students, and 41% reported having fewer face-to-face meetings with students.

Computer-mediated communication may provide some advantages over face-to-face communication because students and advisors do not need to be in the same place at the same time to communicate. Students may prefer to interact with their faculty advisors via e-mail so that they can spend more time composing and presenting their messages, gain control of emotions, and enjoy freedom of time and location in which they communicate (Allen, 2001). However, possible disadvantages of computer-mediated communication include the lack of nonverbal messages and the less inhibited behavior and greater informality in expressions made over the Internet rather than in person (Harasim, 1990; Althaus, 1997). E-mail, which can be forwarded to others, may offer less privacy than face-to-face communication (Shapiro & Allen, 2001). While researchers have offered substantial exploration of computer-mediated instruction (e.g., Aitkin & Shedletsky, 2002; Easton, 2003; Palloff & Pratt, 2001; Shedletsky & Aitken, 2001; Vess, 2005), research is sparse in relation to student and faculty advisor communication.

In a convenience sample, 300 undergraduates from a northeastern university completed a questionnaire about their advising relationship and preference for e-mail use as their mode of communication with their advisor. The sample was comprised of 73.3% females and 26.7% males ranging in age from 18 to 36 years, with an average age of 19.37 years ($SD = 2.10$). In relation to ethnic background, 87% of the sample were Caucasian, 5.3% were African American, 2% were Asian, and the remainder of the sample reported ethnicity as Latino, African, or "other."

The questionnaire involved Likert-style ratings

(1 = *strongly agree* to 5 = *strongly disagree*) on items that comprised instrumental, relational, and self-presentation scales. The researchers employed an instrumental scale to assess students' preference for e-mail communication with advisors in relation to task-oriented goals such as schedule and degree planning. An example of an instrumental item on the scale as follows: "If I want to make changes to my class schedule, I prefer to e-mail my advisor rather than see him or her face to face." Relational goals involve the quality of the interpersonal connection between the advisor and student. A relational item from the questionnaire was rendered, "My advisor conveys real interest in me as a student (e.g., scheduling, grades, jobs after school, etc.) through e-mail more so than when we communicate face to face." The self-presentation scale included items used to assess the students' preference for e-mail communication with their advisor to make the best impression. An example from this scale includes, "I think I am perceived as more likable by my advisor when I e-mail my advisor rather than see him or her face to face."

Results of this study were statistically significant for all three of the scales—Instrumental: $M = 3.29$, $SD = .72$, $t(299) = 6.97$, $p < .001$, $D = .40$; Relational: $M = 3.85$, $SD = .68$, $t(299) = 21.86$, $p < .001$, $d = 1$; Self-presentational: $M = 3.56$, $SD = .79$, $t(299) = 12.42$, $p < .001$, $d = .71$. For each of the three scales, participants did not prefer e-mail over face-to-face communication with advisors. A small, but statistically significant difference was also found in relation to gender: Females reported higher use of e-mail ($M = 2.24$, $SD = .87$, $t[297]$, -2.02 , $p < .05$) than males, and males preferred addressing self-presentational goals through face-to-face communication with advisors ($M = 3.75$, $SD = .73$, $t[297] = 2.57$, $p = .01$, partial $\eta^2 = .02$). No significant difference was found between males and females for relational and instrumental goals. However, significant differences were also found (Wilks' Lambda = .91, $F[5, 294] = 1.95$, $p = .016$, partial $\eta^2 = .032$) for the instrumental ($F[5, 294] = 4.81$, $p < .001$, $.08$) and self-presentation scales ($F[5, 294] = 3.27$, $p < .001$) with African Americans, compared to Caucasians, having a stronger preference against use of e-mail with advisors for instrumental and self-presentational goals. No significant differences were found in relation to participants' major or class standing.

The authors conclude that despite the widespread use of e-mail, students do not prefer e-mail over face-to-face communication with their advisors. The results of this study are consistent with

structural adaptation theory, which proposes that technology use may be adopted because ubiquitous use of a communication mode does not necessarily indicate a preference for its use, and the authors suggest that students may perceive e-mail as more appropriate for social and superficial communications. The reasons that males prefer face-to-face communication, more so than females, for self-presentation goals offer other areas of future research. In addition, the relationship between ethnicity and a stronger desire for face-to-face communication with advisors in relation to instrumental and self-presentation goals needs further exploration.

The *Journal of Career Development* presented a special section devoted to multicultural graduate advising relationships. The *Journal* features a three-article series presenting a cultural awareness model for advising relationships with graduate students. The authors of the first article review the relevant existing literature and make a case for conceptualizing the graduate advising relationship as a multicultural endeavor. The authors of the second article go into much greater discussion of cultural and environmental variables impacting the faculty–graduate student advising relationship. The last article in the series presents a multicultural model of graduate advising relationships.

Article 1

Schlosser, L. Z., Lyons, H. Z., Talleyrand, R. M., Kim, B. S. K., & Johnson, W. B. (2011). Advisor–advisee relationships in graduate training programs. *Journal of Career Development, 38*(1), 3–18.

The authors of this article define advising, contrasts it to mentoring, and summarize the benefits of graduate advising for both advisee and advisor. The article provides a brief review of some of the current literature related to advising doctoral students and sets the stage for the authors' multicultural advising model presented in the last article of the series.

A graduate student's advisor may be known as a "major professor," "committee chair," or "dissertation chair." Regardless of the precise label used, the graduate advisor has the opportunity to play a major role in guiding the advisee through the doctoral program, socializing the graduate student into the profession, and facilitating the advisee's professional development. Quality advising is the "gateway to mentoring" (p. 5) by initiating the emotional bond and positivity present in a mentoring relationship. The authors note that not all advising relationships grow into true mentorships,

and improving the quality of the graduate advising relationship facilitates this evolution. Most doctoral students report having an advisor (Schlosser & Gelso, 2001), but only 50 to 66% report having a mentor (Clark, Harden, & Johnson, 2000).

Because the number of culturally diverse graduate students in doctoral programs is rising (National Opinion Research Center, 2007) and faculty advisors interact with graduate students who differ from them in cultural identities related to race, ethnicity, gender, and sexual orientation, advising models are needed that address multiculturalism. To develop a model of culturally conscious advising relationships, the authors formed a five-person, diverse writing team (p. 7) comprised of individuals of differing gender, ethnicity, age, and religion who all have experience in advising diverse populations. The more positive the advising relationship, the more it resembles mentorship.

Advising is characterized as “a relationship that may be positive, neutral, or negative with regard to valence, and the content of said relationship will also vary based on the degree to which the advisor facilitates the advisee’s professional development” (p. 7). Advising ranges from providing only basic assistance with course selection to much more in-depth guidance through program requirements (comprehensive exams, dissertations processes) and career direction. Advising relationships range from positive to negative (Knox et al., 2006; Schlosser et al., 2003) and involve interaction in an academic setting from an advisor who is in a formalized, advising role with the student. Quality advising relationships can result in mentoring, and thus advising and mentoring are not mutually exclusive (Schlosser & Foley, 2008). In contrast, mentoring requires a positive relationship in which the advisee is guided by a more experienced person (Green & Bauer, 1995) who may or may not be part of the mentee’s department. When done correctly, mentoring, by definition, involves a positive bond between the mentor and mentee, and it may involve informal, nonacademic interactions and settings. Most appealing to mentors are the strongest students (Green & Bauer, 1995) who are most similar to the mentor in career interests and path (Chapman & Cameron, 1981).

After defining advising and contrasting it to mentoring, the authors reviewed current literature on doctoral advising including the formation of the Advisory Working Alliance Inventories (AWAI). The student version (AWAI-S) (Schlosser & Gelso, 2001) yields rapport, apprenticeship, and identification-individuation subscale scores. These

scores have been found to positively correlate with advisee attitudes about research and their research-related self-efficacy as well as with the advisee’s assessment of their advisor’s expertise, attractiveness, and trustworthiness. The advisor version (AWAIS-A) (Schlosser & Gelso, 2005) provides the advisor’s assessment of rapport, apprenticeship, and task focus within the advising relationship. Because of these instruments’ solid reliability and validity, the authors recommend their use in future research.

Based on interviews with doctoral students, Schlosser et al. (2003) found that doctoral students who were satisfied with advising described these relationships as respectful and supportive while dissatisfied students perceived these qualities to be absent. This study suggests that doctoral students may benefit from having the freedom to choose their own advisors rather than have them assigned to them. Knox et al. (2006) interviewed faculty advisors and found they perceived their responsibilities as offering support and assisting their advisees’ advancement through the doctoral program. Advisors perceived lack of communication, respect, and compatible career goals as contributors to negative advising relationships. In the negative relationships, the students often struggle with research and the advisor felt unsuccessful. Student research productivity has been linked with the quality of the advising relationship (Faghihi, 1998; Peacock 1996). Advisors reported personal satisfaction as a benefit and time consumption as a drawback of their advising relationships.

Article 2

Schlosser, L. Z., Talleyrand, R. M., Lyons, H. Z., Kim, B. S. K., & Johnson, B. W. (2010). Multicultural issues in graduate advising relationships. *Journal of Career Development, 38*(1), 19–43

In this article, the authors discuss the importance of addressing the role culture plays in the advisor-advisee relationship. This discussion is not inclusive to race, but also addresses biological sex and sexual orientation. Furthermore, they examine the effects of race and cultural socialization processes on advising relationships and in organizational contexts. They focus the racial/ethnic component on the five major cultural groups in the United States. However, because the literature on advising is still in the early stages of development, the article categorizes these five groups collectively into two distinct groups: People of Color (African Americans, Latin Americans, Asian Americans, and Native Americans) and Whites (European

Americans).

The authors stress the importance of addressing the role of culture and diversity in the advising relationship because graduate programs have become much more diverse with respect to race, gender, and sexual orientation (National Opinion Research Center, 2007). For example, in the period 1996-2004, People of Color seeking a master's degree in psychology increased 90.8%. During this same time, People of Color seeking doctorates in psychology increased by 16.6% (American Psychological Association, Office of Ethnic Minority Affairs, 2008). The representation of women in graduate programs is also climbing. According to the American Psychological Association, in 2005, women accounted for 72% of those graduating with a doctorate in psychology. Moreover, of those enrolled in a master's program in psychology, 75% were woman (American Psychological Association, Center for Psychology Workforce Analysis and Research, 2007). In 2006, 20% of research doctorates were awarded to People of Color, while 51% of research doctorates were awarded to women (Hoffer, Hess, Welch, & Williams, 2007).

Because of the significant impact this relationship has on an advisees' career and life development, advisors and advisees must understand cultural and gender differences and how they can impact the advising relationship (Schlosser, Knox, Moskovitz, & Hill, 2003; Schlosser & Gelso, 2001, 2005). Additionally, career development professionals also benefit from awareness of multicultural issues, for example, to better understand how a Person of Color progresses through a doctoral program and also how an individual interacts in culturally different circumstances (Schlosser et al., 2010).

A person's cultural identity is acquired through various social processes including racial socialization, which involves race-related messages that either support or deter healthy racial identity development (Helms & Cook, 1999). Students of color may experience and internalize racist, discriminatory, and prejudicial attitudes (Speight, 2007; Szymanski & Inman, 2009). Ultimately, the potential for success of the advising relationship can be strengthened through the examination of the racial and cultural conditions of both the faculty and the student, especially because the majority of faculty advisors are heterosexual White males (LaSala, Jenkins, Wheeler, & Fedriksen-Goldsen, 2008; Murray & Williams, 1999).

Because few people of color hold tenured faculty positions (LaSala et al., 2008; Murray & Williams, 1999), they report difficulty finding same-

race mentors (Daniel, 2009), and graduate school faculty members tend to select students most similar to themselves (Blackburn, Chapman, & Cameron, 1981). The similarities sought include race, ethnicity, social background, and gender. A number of factors may contribute to a graduate student's reluctance to enter into a cross-race mentorship, including mistrust (Johnson-Bailey & Cervero, 2004), skepticism about an advisor's motives, or feelings of selling out (Thomas, 2001). While minimal research shows the various functions in same-race and cross-race mentoring relationships, sufficient evidence allows one to conclude that once entered into the advisor-advisee relationship, either same-race or cross-race, no consistent differences are found in the functions delivered by the mentors, the satisfaction of the students, or the students' perceived benefits gained from the mentor (Ensher & Murphy, 1997).

Two strategies identified by Thomas (1993) address cross-race issues in the mentoring relationship. The first strategy is denial and suppression, which involves the dyad agreeing to avoid discussion of racial differences. The second is direct engagement or positively viewing racial differences and discussing these differences openly. The latter has been found to be more effective.

In addition to the aforementioned concepts applicable in a cross-race advisor-advisee relationship, one must also consider how an individual racially identifies him or herself. According to Helms, racial identity is defined as the extent to which an individual identifies with her or his own racial/ethnic group, including the manner in which this person internalizes racial oppression (1995). New faculty and Students of Color often feel alone and isolated in predominately White graduate programs (Gay, 2004).

In conjunction with racial identity, Schlosser et al. offer the constructs of acculturation and enculturation, as proposed by Kim and Abreu (2001), to understand the extent to which levels of adaptation differ among Students of Color (2010). According to Kim and Abreu, acculturation is the process of acclimating to the standard of the European American culture and enculturation is the act of preserving the standards of an individual's native culture (2001). Berry, Kim, Power, Young, and Bajaki (1989) identified four theorized adaptation levels that vary in degree from integration (high acculturation and high enculturation), assimilation (high acculturation and low enculturation), separation (low acculturation and high enculturation), and marginalization (low acculturation and low encul-

turation). Marginalization is the most problematic of these levels, while integration is viewed to be the healthiest (Schlosser et al., 2010).

Schlosser et al. (2010) maintain the importance of staying mindful of the possibility that Students of Color are exposed to various forms of prejudice that can result in cultural mistrust. Schlosser et al. predict that high levels of cultural mistrust can significantly inhibit the development of a working relationship between the advisor and advisee. Therefore, advisors are encouraged to identify and attend to this situation to reduce and eliminate the effects of cultural mistrust.

When addressing areas in graduate advising relationships, advisors should explore the effects that gender and sexual orientation have on the relationship. Gender involves culturally construed attitudes, thoughts, and beliefs about males and females (Hamilton, 2000). The number of mentoring opportunities available for females has been explored, but no significant differences in male and female student access to mentoring has been found (Johnson & Huwe, 2003; Ragins & Scandura, 1997). Also, men and women initiate a relationship with a mentor at the same rate and exhibit no differences in length of mentorships (Ragins, 1999; Ragins & Scandura, 1997; Turban et al., 2002). Cross-gender mentor relationships last as long or longer than same gender mentorships.

Nevertheless, 75% of men and 72% of women prefer same-sex mentor relationships (Clark, Harden, & Johnson, 2000). Gilbert (1985) found that women gravitate toward other women and same-sex professional relationships. Females with protégé-type mentor relationships have special type bonds and are referred to as “power with,” which is legitimate and shared with advisees (Heinrich, 1995). These same-sex female relationships resemble friendships, while male same-sex mentorships are more hierarchical.

Sexist stereotyping during a mentorship is evident as throughout everyday life. For example, a woman’s ability to successfully complete graduate school may be questioned (Joseph, 2006; Kram, 1985; Noe, 1988), and mentors may be uncomfortable with the idea of cross-sex mentorships (Johnson & Huwe, 2003; Noe, 1988). Sexual attraction when mentoring can weaken, if not ruin, the status of the professional relationship.

The authors address lesbian, gay, and bisexual (LGB) issues in the advising relationship. The environment in higher education for the LGB community is questionable and somewhat negative (LaSala et al., 2008). LGB students are the only

set of individuals who face legalized discrimination because they do not receive full health benefits from their universities due to their sexual orientation, nor are they eligible for military internships. They often struggle to find openly LGB faculty role models. They actively seek a supportive, affirming advisor (Lark & Croteau, 1998), but when they are unavailable, LGB students may experience emotional stress, loneliness, and rejection (University of Michigan, 1999). LGB students experience a high level of avoidance and lowered expectations (Burkard, Knox, Hess, & Schultz, 2009), and they often receive inappropriate comments (Pilkington & Cantor, 1996).

Environments influence advising relationships, and therefore, the advisors needs to understand how the culture of an environment impacts advisor-advisee relationships. For this reason, all of the following are important: the organizational and relational demography (i.e., the percentages of total individuals who are People of Color, women, and LGB); attitudinal or racial climate; and formal rules and regulations that guide professional behavior (Schlosser et al., 2003). Due to the importance of the context surrounding the advising relationship, the authors encourage conceptualization of the advisor-advisee relationship as a multilevel construct.

Article 3

Schlosser, L. Z., Lyons, H. Z., Talleyrand, R. M., Kim, B. S. K., & Johnson, B. W. (2011). A multiculturally infused model of graduate advising relationships. *Journal of Career Development, 38*(1), 44–61.

Based on their review of the literature presented in the first two articles in the special section on multicultural graduate-advising relationships, the authors present a multiculturally infused model of graduate advising that includes components of interpersonal and instructional aspects of advising relationships, the advising relationship process, and advising relationship outcomes.

The authors propose five core interpersonal and instructional aspects of advising relationships: advisor-advisee similarity, support and challenge, role perceptions, advising tasks and functions, and task-related empathy. Advisors and advisees are more likely to initiate connection with and have a stronger relationship with those whom they share similar traits such as research and career interests, personality traits, values, and racial identity. The perception of similarity in regard to the degree of biculturalism or marginalization contributes to the

strength of initial attraction. Universal-diverse orientation, the degree to which people endorse both awareness and acceptance of similarities and differences in people, could be helpful in determining the faculty members best suited to work with Students of Color (Miville et al., 1999.) Therefore, leaders of graduate programs should consider matching advisors and advisees based on these variables, including those that influence the student's cultural experience.

Good advising relationships are characterized by a balance between support and challenge. Advisors should also take cultural variables into account when attempting to strike the ideal balance, realizing that some students will require more support while others will require more challenge. Effective advisors are able to assess their student's strengths and weaknesses and alter their mentoring to match, providing constructive feedback every step of the way.

The interpersonal and instructional aspect of advising of role perception involves the advisor actively taking on mentoring of the student and willingly contribute to the advisee's professional and personal development. However, the formation of a close mentoring relationship can be impeded when students come from cultures that emphasize hierarchical relationships. For example, Asian American students may enter into an advising relationship with cultural values that resist the mutuality and collegiality of the typical mentoring relationship.

Advisors who engage in many functions such as coaching, networking, supporting, and modeling have more satisfied and successful advisees (Schlosser & Gelso, 2001). However, the authors note the possibility that Students of Color may not receive all of these functions in their advising relationships. They may not enter into an advising relationship due to the inability to find the same-race advisor or be hurt by the model-minority stereotype such that advisors assume that some students of a certain race require less advising than others (Goto, 1999). The authors also note that an area of future research rests in the exploration of similar dynamics with male advisors and female advisees.

Task-related empathy characterizes a good advising relationship. In successful advising relationships, advisors encourage the student to pursue their own interests and ideas. The advisor does not impress her or his own theoretical commitments and interests onto the advisee. The authors theorize that Students of Color may be sensitive to this sort of coercion, which can seriously impair the advis-

ing relationship, especially if an advisor imposes a culture-discrepant worldview onto the student.

The authors then discuss important elements of the advising relationship process, which include relationship formation, relationship maintenance, and working alliance. Advising relationships are most effective and satisfying when both the advisor and the advisee freely choose to enter the relationship. The authors recommend that graduate programs put effort into forming strong student-faculty matches, utilize student input into advisor choice, and institute "no harm" policies for students deciding to change mentors. Advisors who are multiculturally affirming will attract and form effective advising relationships with diverse students (O'Neill, Horton, & Crosby, 1999; Ragins, 1999; Turban, Dougherty, & Lee, 2002).

Relationship maintenance requires an advisor who is available. Perceived availability is more important than frequency of meetings (Schlosser et al., 2003). In relation to multicultural advising, perceived availability can help prevent cultural mistrust. Advisors are encouraged to actively address multicultural issues and differences at the beginning of the relationship.

The stronger the advising relationship or working alliance, the better the outcomes of the relationship. In regard to multicultural advising relationships, the working alliance is facilitated by a mutually preferred strategy for dealing with differences (such as denial and suppression or direct engagement) and matched racial-identity status.

The authors discuss advising proximal outcomes and distal advising outcomes. Proximal outcomes might include satisfaction with the advisor and the graduate program. They also involve research and practice outcome variables. In relation to research, potential outcomes include the advisee's research-related self-efficacy, confidence, attitude, productivity, autonomy, presentations, and publications. Practice outcome variables might include practice-related self-efficacy, competency, attitudes, evaluations, and successful completion of a practicum. Distal outcomes reflect the long-term. Examples in relation to research include efficient completion of the dissertation and continued publication or licensure. General distal outcomes might include the quality of the first position obtained, promotion, career success and satisfaction, expertise, and service to the profession. The authors note that satisfaction should be assessed in relation to satisfaction with the advisor, the program, the department, university, and profession.

Implications for graduate training are also

discussed. First, excellent advising should be an essential role for any faculty member, and advising competence should be included in hiring criteria and for promotion and tenure. Incentives for good advising can be implemented as well as advisor training programs. In the admissions process, students should be selected who demonstrate strong potential to form good advising relationships. Increasing faculty diversity through recruitment of People of Color, women, and LGB individuals as advisors and advisees is also essential.

Future research should focus on the percep-

tion of advising relationships between students and advisors including the factors that make them successful and the characteristics seen as desirable. Psychometrically sound advising outcome measures need to be developed. Attention must be given to the advisor's perspective and experience rather than solely those of the student. The authors also discuss the idea of studying the more successful and multiculturally competent faculty advisors and looking at whether those in certain academic disciplines are more multiculturally aware and affirming.

The bibliography is compiled by Karen Mottarella.