Annotated Bibliographies of Recent Research Related to Academic Advising

Allen, J. M., & Smith, C. L. (2008). Importance of, Responsibility for, and Satisfaction with Academic Advising: A Faculty Perspective. *Journal of College Student Development 49*(5), 397–411.

Although faculty may be responsible for 75 to 90% of academic advising in American colleges and universities, research examining their attitudes toward and experiences with advising is sparse. Further, in the scholarship that does exist, definitions of *faculty* vary as do the aspects of advising (e.g., setting goals, referrals, academic plans) examined. Likewise, the literature varies regarding the attributes, such as importance, satisfaction, or level of responsibility, that get investigated. In the present study, the authors limit *faculty* to those with instructional responsibilities whose annual "full time equivalent (FTE)" employment is ".50 or higher." Participants, $N = 171$ with a 23.3% response rate, were asked to evaluate the importance of, their responsibility for, and their satisfaction with 12 functions of advising grouped into five domains (Table 2, p. 402):

- integration (overall connections, major connections, general education connections, degree connections, and out-of-class connections);
- referrals (academic and nonacademic);
- information ("how things work" at the university and accurate information concerning degree requirements);
- individuation (taking into account advisees' skills and abilities, and knowing them as individuals);
- shared responsibility (encouraging students to assume responsibility for their education).

With regard to importance, on a 6-point Likert scale with 1 being *not important* and 6 being *very important*, accurate information concerning degree requirements received the highest mean rating (5.70), while academic advising that assists students in choosing out-of-class activities that support academic, career, and life goals received the lowest rating (4.51). However, one half of the 12 functions received a mean importance rating of over 5 points on the 6-point scale and the remaining six functions received an importance rating of higher than 4.

As for believing that faculty advisors are responsible for the 12 advising functions (1 = *strongly disagree* and 6 = *strongly agree*), overall connections (advising that helps undergraduates link academic, career, and life goals) and major connections (helping students choose among courses in a major that best relate to their goals) received the highest mean rating (both 5.08), and assisting students with understanding how things work at the university received the lowest mean rating (3.35). For all 12 functions, mean responsibility ratings were lower than importance ratings and exhibited greater variability across functions, but all were above 3 points on the rating scale.

Means for satisfaction with advising across the 12 functions (1 = *not satisfied* and 6 = *very satisfied*) were all between 4 and 5 points, which the authors note were higher than student satisfaction rates for the same functions obtained in a separate study. Faculty members were most satisfied with the category of providing accurate information (mean = 4.90) and least satisfied with assisting students in choosing among various general-education options (4.10) and with the category of how things work (4.10).

Not all faculty members performed all 12 functions listed in the study. In fact, for one half of the functions, more than 20% reported not providing them as follows: general education connections (31%), nonacademic referrals (26.9%), how things work (26.3%), degree connections (26.3%), shared responsibility (22.8%), and accurate information (21.1%); nearly 19.3% reported not providing information about out-of-class activities connected to students' goals.

A final aspect of the study examined faculty perceptions of how others value advising. Faculty members believed that academic advising is valued most by departmental chairs (4.75 with 6 = *strongly agree* and 1 = *strongly disagree*) and valued least by senior administrators (3.19). The perceived value by deans and colleagues fell in between those of the faculty members and administrators with mean scores of 3.61 and 4.07 respectively.

Allen and Smith suggested that the findings lend support for a dual model of advising in which each student has two advisors. In this type of model, faculty advisors would lend expertise in helping student address "big picture questions," a term the authors borrow from Frost and Brown-Wheeler (2003), related to academic, career, and life goals. Faculty would assist students in connecting these goals to choices within the major and refer students to resources for overcoming academic difficulties. Students' second advisor would be a student affairs

professional who would assist with course choices outside of the major, including those related to cocurricular activities; they would familiarize students with student services that address nonacademic barriers to success and would play a critical role in helping students understand processes at the university, a function that both faculty members and students report as being highly important, but one in which more than a one fourth of the faculty in the study do not engage.

Bell, N., Kanitar, K., Kerksiek, K., Watson, W., Das, A., Kostina-Ritchey, E. et al. (2009). "It has Made College Possible for Me": Feedback on the Impact of a University-Based Center for Students in Recovery. *Journal of American College Health, 57*(6), 650–57.

A study by the National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse at Columbia University (2007) found that 49% of full-time college students engage in binge drinking, other drug abuse, or both and that substance abuse by this population is often viewed as a "harmless rite of passage" (p. 93). However, for students in recovery, a campus climate that encourages substance abuse may threaten their sobriety, and without on-campus support newly sober students often drop out (Finch, 2004). Bell et al. investigated the impact of one such support program developed by the Center for the Study of Addiction and Recovery (CSAR) at Texas Tech University.

Two successive fall cohorts entering the university who were in enrolled in the CSAR seminar were invited to participate. Fifteen consented and completed the necessary interviews by investigators, who were not affiliated with the CSAR. Responses indicated that the primary challenges for students in recovery included balancing academic and recovery priorities, having few opportunities to socialize outside of the center because many social activities were organized around alcohol, and living in the residence halls where their freedom was limited and policies against substance use were not enforced. Follow-up contact with some of the students, however, indicated that over time the tension between recovery and meeting academic obligations eases, that students begin to "branch out in terms of organizational memberships and social activities," and that dependence solely on the CSAR for social needs and support diminishes as confidence increases.

Respondents cited a number of positive aspects of the CSAR program, the most important of which was having a "ready-made community of recovering students." Some indicated they would not have socialized at all if it were not for the center. Being with other recovering students gave participants a sense of comfort and security and a "place to hang out." Support from center staff was greatly appreciated, especially the availability of help "no matter what time of day." Students also commented on the fact that center staff treated them as equals. Many students were grateful for the availability of 12-step program meetings on campus and that attendees of these meetings were their peers of the same age. However, some students felt that attendance in CSAR meetings should not be obligatory.

Participants felt that the CSAR provided solid academic support with academic advising being the most frequently cited form of such support. One student noted,

> the advising . . . by now, probably two semesters of my four semesters . . . wouldn't count . . . I'd be like, "oh that class looks really interesting. I wanna take it," and it wouldn't have anything to do with what I was doing.

At the same time, respondents indicated that advisors need to understand the needs of recovering students, something apparently not always achieved by regular advisors.

Finally nearly one half of the respondents mentioned financial support and the ability to do community service and participate in on-campus activities connected to CSAR as beneficial. Most respondents in the study were receiving scholarships from the CSAR and community service provided an opportunity to give back and to represent the center in a positive light.

With the exception of mandatory 12-step meetings, which evoked mixed responses, many students indicated that they would not change anything about the program. When queried about how their first year would have been different without the CSAR program, the following themes emerged: lack of social network, more adjustment difficulties, fear of relapse, and dropping out or not attending college at all.

College students in recovery are a hidden population (Woodford, 2001) in the literature among college personnel. The number of campus programs for students in recovery is rising slowly, and as a result, calls have been seen in the literature to establish standards for collegiate recovery programs as well as calls for evidence-based strategies to prevent or reduce the use of substances by college students. Bell et al.'s study is a first step in answering two fundamental research questions concerning the challenges faced by recovering students and the types of support that best meet their

needs. They call for more studies as new programs and services are developed.

Cuyjet, M. J., Longwell-Grice, R., & Molina, E. (2009). Perceptions of New Student Affairs Professionals and Their Supervisors Regarding Application of Competencies Learned in Preparation Programs. *Journal of College Student Development, 50*(1), 104–19.

For over 50 years, scholars have debated what knowledge college student-personnel graduates need to be successful in their careers. Although student affairs practitioners continue to acquire new skills on the job, employers expect that these newly hired professionals bring certain knowledge and skills to the job as a result of their graduate preparation. Using the Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS) (2006) guidelines for master's degree programs preparing college student personnel as a foundation, supplemented with five additional items, Cuyjet, Longwell-Grice, and Molina surveyed 139 recent graduates of master's-level student personnel preparation programs at 11 institutions and 86 of their job supervisors.

They developed two separate but parallel surveys examining 22 competencies: one for graduates and one for their supervisors. For each competency, respondents were asked to rate on a Likert scale (1 = *strongly disagree* and 6 = *strongly agree*) a set of paired statements (44 in total) regarding the importance of the competency and perceived level of preparation. For example, statements 1A and 1B ask recent graduates about their level of preparation with respect to the competency of understanding the history of education, and statements 2A and 2B are the counterparts that ask about perceived importance for this competency.

1A (graduates): "My graduate program has provided me with a strong understanding of the history of education."

1B (supervisors): "My employee's graduate program seems to have provided him/her with a strong understanding of the history of higher education."

2A (graduates): "In my current work, it is important that I have a high level of knowledge about the history of higher education."

2B (supervisors): "In his/her current work, it is important that my employee has a high level of knowledge about the history of higher education."

A 45th open-ended question asked the respondents to identify any other knowledge needed on the job that was not provided in the graduate program. No one responded to this question.

The authors' first research question for the study asked was "Do recent graduates of college student personnel preparation master's programs perceive that they have received a high level of knowledge or a strong understanding in various competencies for the profession?" Overall, recent graduates somewhat agreed that their programs provided adequate training in the competencies ($M = 3.64$ and $SD = .68$) with the highest levels of preparation reported for understanding student development, understanding how colleges can enhance student development, and knowledge of ethics and standards of practice. The lowest levels were reported for grant writing, budgeting and financial management, and supervising. Cuyjet et al. felt that the lower ratings for grant writing, budgeting, and financial management were understandable because these skills are generally acquired later, when student personnel assume positions in midmanagement. Likewise supervisory skills are more often and more easily acquired on the job than in a graduate program.

The second research question examined whether recent graduates perceive that a high level of knowledge of or a strong understanding of various competencies for the profession were important to their work. Overall, recent graduates agreed that the competencies developed in their graduate programs were important ($M = 3.85$, $SD = .57$) with ethics and standards of practice, working with diverse populations, and knowledge of how the college experience can enhance student development rated as the most important competencies, while grant writing, writing for publication, and knowledge of the history of higher education received the lowest importance ratings. For 13 items, recent graduates gave a higher importance score than preparation score, indicating that respondents did not feel as adequately prepared as they should be in these areas.

Paralleling the level of work asked of recent graduates concerning preparation, the third research question addressed whether the supervisors of the recent graduates perceived that their supervisees had received a high level of knowledge and understanding for each of the 22 competencies. Similar to reports by recent graduates, in general, supervisors somewhat agreed that recent graduates had received a high level of training in the competencies ($M = 3.60$, $SD = .41$). Supervisors perceived that recent graduates had received the most preparation in understanding student development, how college enhances student development, and working with diverse populations. They were perceived to be

least prepared in budgeting and financial management, grant writing, and writing for publication. The authors point out the high level of agreement for competencies related to student development. Supervisors and recent graduates both agreed that this was an area of strength with regard to preparation. Likewise, supervisors and supervisees both gave low ratings to preparation in grant writing and financial management and budgeting.

The fourth question, which parallels the second question related to graduates' perceptions of importance for the competencies, asked, "Do the supervisors of recent graduates of college student personnel preparation master's programs perceive that it is important in their current work that their supervisees have a high level of knowledge or a strong understanding in various competencies for the profession?" Supervisors rated most of the competencies as fairly important ($M = 3.87$, $SD = .52$). Knowledge of ethics and standards of practice as well as working with diverse populations were rated as most important, and grant writing, the only competency with a mean below 3.00 ($M = 2.70$), and writing for publication were perceived as the least important items.

The final research question examined possible differences between recent graduates' and their supervisors' perceptions of importance and preparation levels for the 22 competencies. For the most part, both groups were in agreement with respect to levels of preparation and importance, although for 13 items, recent graduates rated their knowledge more highly than did their supervisors. In only five items did mean differences between each group turn out to be significant at $p < .001$. For four items, knowledge of the history of higher education, understanding how colleges enhance student development, and understanding of qualitative and quantitative research methodologies, recent graduates rated their preparation significantly higher than did their supervisors. The authors speculate that these differences might be attributed to overconfidence on the part of recent graduates or a failure by supervisors to recognize the level of knowledge possessed by their supervisees. The majority of supervisors had been in the profession for 11 years or more. The authors further speculate that, as a result, competencies emphasized in seasoned professionals' training programs may have been different than that currently taught, which might account for variance in perceptions across groups.

The final category for which differences were statistically significant was that related to grant writing. Supervisors believed that recent gradu-

ates were better prepared for grant writing than the latter believed of themselves. However, both groups rated knowledge in this area below 3.00 points ($M = 2.80$ and $M = 1.66$, respectively); this category received a lower mean importance rating from both groups.

Practical implications resulting from the study include ensuring that the competencies with the highest means be covered thoroughly in college student-personnel master's programs and be applicable to work situations. Seasoned practitioners should be aware that although recent graduates may be well prepared in general, these new hires will need to continue developing professionally and will be in need of continued training in certain areas. At the same time, seasoned professionals may also need professional development to keep current with and appreciate competencies now being addressed in college student-personnel programs.

Hyde, M, Punch, R., Power, D., Hartley, J., Neale, J., & Brennan, L. (2009). The Experiences of Deaf and Hard of Hearing Students at a Queensland University: 1985–2005. *Higher Education Research & Development, 28*(1), 85–98.

Hyde et al. reported on the educational and social experiences of former and current students with hearing impairments who attended Griffith University, a five-campus institution of 32,000 students in South-East Queensland, Australia. Potential participants were identified from a list, generated by the university's Student Equity Services, of 257 former and current students who had self-identified as having a hearing loss on their admission form or who had contacted or used the Deaf and Hard of Hearing Student Support Program (DSSP), which was established at the Mt Gravatt College of Advanced Education and which has been maintained and extended since the college and Griffith University merged in 1989.

Contact information was available for 180 of the students on the list, 72 of whom returned the study survey. The survey consisted of both forced-choice questions that asked participants about their language background, linguistic affiliation (hearing, deaf, bicultural), support services in primary and secondary schools as well as those used at Griffith, degree of hearing loss based on the scale by a government organization called Australia Hearing, age of onset for hearing loss, years of attendance at universities, program of study, and reasons for choosing Griffith. Open-ended questions asked participants to explain which communication tools were most helpful to them, to describe challenges

and highlights of their university experience, and to make recommendations to deaf or hard of hearing individuals planning to study at a university.

Although only 72 surveys were completed, enrollment data and information concerning the use of DSSP were available for the full study population. Of the 257 individuals on the Student Equity Services list, only 43% had accessed the DSSP, and they had higher graduation rates: 47% compared to 37%. Deferral and withdrawal rates were higher for those who had not accessed the service. Deferral rates were 8% for those who accessed the service and 18% for those who did not; withdrawal rates were 12 and 19% for those who accessed and those who did not, respectively.

Reasons for non-use of the DSSP are unknown, but the authors offer some possible explanations. Fifty-seven percent of the respondents indicated that they had not received special services for deaf or hard of hearing students in primary school; 58% reported that they did not receive services in secondary school. Lack of services in school may have lowered respondents' expectations for or perceived need for services. Some students may have been unaware of the DSSP. Instructors' practice of posting lecture notes to the Internet may also lessen students' need for certain DSSP services, such as having a note taker.

Survey respondents ($N = 72$) who used communication tools and DSSP supports reported using interpreters (36%); manual/peer note taking (65%); laptop computer note taking (19%); technological aids, such as hearing aids, FM aids (wireless devices that transmit the teacher's voice directly to the student, softening background noise), telephone-typewriters, and so forth (35%); or other (15%), such as taping tutorials, E-mail, captioned video, peer supports, and specialist tutorials. Some students also used general university supports, such as learning assistance, personal counseling, career advice, welfare services, and student associations. However, 53% indicated that they did not use any of these general support services.

Responses from the open-ended questions indicate both positive and negative experiences with support services designed to increase access to academic content. Manual/peer note taking and interpreting were frequently mentioned as being most useful. However, some indicated dissatisfaction with note taking because the notes reflected the note taker's subjective judgments and not all not takers had the disciplinary expertise to take notes for the range of courses taken by deaf and hard of hearing students, whose choice of programs and pro-

fessions has expanded extensively since the 1980s to include, not only education and special education (38% of the respondents were majoring in these), but also law, science, arts, social sciences, visual arts, human services, health sciences, communication, multimedia, information technology, and hotel management. Lack of available interpreters was also cited as being problematic as were the difficulties encountered when asking questions in class through an interpreter.

Students who relied on their residual hearing experienced a different range of issues, some resulting from poor acoustics, noisy air conditioning, classroom chatter, and lack of lighting for lip reading during slide presentations, and some resulting from the traits and behaviors of the lecturer, such as a possession of a foreign accent, failure to use a microphone, and not repeating audience's questions and responses. Lecturers' speaking indistinctly, while walking around the room, or while writing on the black board also limited participants' comprehension of lectures.

Although some participants reported having supportive lecturers, the authors call for more awareness and sensitivity on the part of instructors noting that "academic staff understands that supports such as note-taking and interpreting do not necessarily provide full access to the content of lectures and other teaching situations." Various studies have shown that deaf and hard of hearing students receive less information from lectures and tutorials than their hearing peers (e.g., Marschark, Sapere, Convertino, & Seewagen, 2005; Napier & Barker, 2004). In the Napier and Barker study, participants reported comprehending between 50 and 90% of lecture materials.

In addition to academic needs, social integration is a critical part of the university experience. Here again, respondents' experiences were mixed. Many reported satisfaction with being able to interact with other deaf people, and consequently, feeling less isolated. One observed that having other deaf and hearing impaired students in the same class resulted in a feeling of not being "the only one." Another noted that encountering the "First Deaf lecturer! . . . was the best and most exciting moment of my life!" Nevertheless, hearing impairment also created social barriers. Some respondents commented on not being able to participate fully in group work with peers. Socializing in noisy environments was difficult and interpreting services did not extend to social activities or impromptu meetings.

Classroom participation and a sense of academic and social integration are essential for aca-

demic success (Tinto, 1993). The authors conclude that findings from their study, which reveal both positive and negative outcomes for academic and social integration of students with hearing impairment, "should inform practices designed to support deaf and hard of hearing students in a range of postsecondary education settings."

Kolek, E. A., & Saunders, D. (2008). Online Disclosure: An Empirical Examination of Undergraduate Facebook Profiles. *NASPA Journal 45*(1), 12–25.

Per information gathered from the Facebook Web site, in 2006 (the same year data for Kolek and Saunder's study were gathered), approximately 80% of the undergraduates at the 2,200 institutions at which Facebook was available had accounts with this social networking Web site. Facebook "seems to have enormous potential to be used by students, faculty and staff in positive and constructive ways." At the same time, university personnel have had to wrestle with issues such as privacy, consequences, and policies related to on-line disclosures, the notion of community, and the amount of time students spend on-line. Kolek and Saunders set out to provide a "descriptive foundation from which administrators, researchers and students may better comprehend students' use of Facebook."

Between March 18 and 27, 2006, the researchers performed a content analysis of three fields—Interests, About Me, and Groups—within student Facebook profiles. They drew from a final sample of 464 undergraduates; seven cases had been removed due to coder error. To gain access to the Facebook profiles, the researchers registered themselves on the Web site under their true identities as staff members, which would enable them to access only those profiles for which students did not restrict staff access. Slightly more than 11%, did, in fact, restrict access leaving 339 viewable profiles for this study.

The first research question, stated broadly, was "Who uses Facebook"? Eighty-two percent of the total sample of 464 students had Facebook profiles. Females were significantly more likely than males to have profiles, and first-year students were significantly more likely to do so than senior students. No significant differences in likelihood of having an account were found between White students and students of color, nor between honors and nonhonors college students. Further, mean grade-point average (GPA) did not differ significantly between those who had an account and those who did not.

The authors examined patterns of restriction and disclosure of personal and contact information. While 11.3% restricted access, no significant differences between those who restricted access and those who did not were found by gender, class, race, GPA, or membership in the honors college. Because only profiles with nonrestricted access could be examined, all of the authors' nondemographics findings pertained solely to the 339 viewable profiles.

With respect to general profile content for the viewable samples, students with accounts had a mean of 93 (median = 84) Facebook friends from their own institution. Overall, in 87.3% of the profiles, students had posted an image of themselves in the central photograph section and 46.9% had photo albums. However, females were significantly more likely to have photo albums and to have a picture of themselves in their central photograph area. Nearly one half (48.1%) provided a full local address and 86.8% of those living in a residence hall ($n = 212$) provided the name of their hall. Telephone numbers were provided in 14.6% of the profiles. More than one half (58.2%) posted their course schedule. Disclosure of contact information and class schedules may be of concern because people have been sexually assaulted, kidnapped, or killed by individuals who found their profiles on social networking sites such as MySpace.Com (Williams, 2006). Cases of cyber stalking of students has also been reported (Alexy, Burgess, Baker & Smoyak, 2005).

The posting of content related to alcohol abuse and drugs is, likewise, worrisome to university personnel. Analysis of the 339 profiles indicates that only 7.2% of the central photographs contained clear pictures of alcohol or individuals consuming it. Another 8.0% of the central photographs appeared to depict individuals drinking alcoholic beverages, but this could not be determined with certainty. Although 7.2% of central photographs displayed the use of alcohol, 53.6% of the profiles contained at least one photograph of someone drinking, and 38.3% contained a positive reference to alcohol. Positive references included listing beer and liquor brands as "interests" and postings that advocate, celebrate, or otherwise positively reference alcohol (e.g., statements about drinking games and getting drunk). Similar coding was used to codify positive references to drugs, which occurred in 8.6% of the profiles. Additionally, approximately 25.0% of the profiles contained positive general references to partying.

In addition to exploring disclosure of contact information and positive references to alcohol, drugs, and partying in general, Kolek and Saunders

searched profile contents for positive references to the institution and to learning. Two thirds (66.4%) of the profiles contained some sort of positive reference to university academics, structures, or activities. Nearly 42.0% of the profiles included positive references to university structure; approximately the same percentage of profiles (41%) contained positive references to university activities, and a smaller number (27.1%) contained positive references to academics.

The authors make a number of recommendations for practice based on the findings. First, because Facebook usage among college students is very prevalent, they feel that student affairs professionals "have an obligation to engage with issues arising from its use." Students seem to lack awareness of the "openness of access" to Facebook accounts and to the information contained in their profiles. Kolek and Saunders propose that institutions should raise students' awareness of potential (adverse) consequences of disclosing personal information on social networking sites. Because many university students activate Facebook accounts even prior to their first day of classes (e.g., Stutzman 2006), discussion of Facebook might be done in orientation sessions. Recommended topics could include discussing how to restrict access to profiles; potential ramifications of posting address information or pictures of illegal or embarrassing activities; institutional policies on the use of social networks, including disciplinary procedures for violations; and institutional uses for Facebook of which students should be aware, such as student group recruitment and publicity.

Institutional policies and practices regarding the use of Facebook and other social networking sites must be established and made transparent to students and university personnel alike. Institutions will need to determine the appropriate "official use" of information obtained from Facebook profiles and communicate that to students. For instance, they need to make clear if profiles are being used to make decisions on acceptance or for awards and scholarships. Further, when university personnel access student profiles for official use, they should be logged in with "staff" accounts to comply with the site's policies, an issue that can be complex when a person has multiple roles within an institution such as is the case with residence assistants who are both staff and student. Facebook can inform institutional decisions and enable student affairs professionals "to understand and better connect with students." However, more research about the effects of social networking on student development is needed.

The bibliography is compiled by Jessie Carduner and Barbara Miller.