2020

A Phenomenological Study Of Academic Advisors And Advising Administrators Perceptions On The Framing Of Advising As Teaching

Ashleigh Crowe
Indiana State University

A PHENOMENOLOGICAL STUDY OF ACADEMIC ADVISORS' AND ADVISING ADMINISTRATORS' PERCEPTIONS ON THE FRAMING OF ADVISING AS TEACHING

A Dissertation

Presented to

The College of Graduate and Professional Studies

Department of Teaching and Learning

Indiana State University

Terre Haute, Indiana

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

---

by

Ashleigh Crowe

December 2020

Keywords: academic advising; advising administrators; learning paradigms; professional academic advisors; advising as teaching

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Committee Chair: Melissa Nail, Ph.D.

Professor, Teaching and Learning

Indiana State University

Committee Member: Cassandra Caruso-Woolard, Ph.D.

Instructor, Ed.D in Interdisciplinary Leadership

Creighton University

Committee Member: Ashley Gard, Ph.D.

Instructor, Kinesiology, Sport, and Recreation

Eastern Illinois University

ABSTRACT

Using a social constructivist framework, this phenomenological study intended to capture the lived experiences of academic advisors and advising administrators as they framed advising as teaching. I conducted nine semi-structured interviews with three professional advisors and six advising administrators representing five Midwest, four-year, public higher education institutions. I also reviewed official documents referencing academic advising from each institution to gain an understanding of how advising was framed at the institution and program levels. Five themes emerged from these data: (1) the form and function of academic advising, (2) advising as teaching, (3) learning theories used in advising, (4) other theories used in advising, and (5) the value of advising. My findings indicated that, although all participants affirmed advising as a form of teaching, student development theories as opposed to learning theories were more commonly utilized by the advisor and administrator participants to frame their advising practice and programs. Recommendations for future research include a call for more practitioners to engage in empirical research on the topic of academic advising and future studies which expand upon this research by creating two separate studies, one for each population and recruiting all participants independently. Furthermore, understanding a unit's priorities and approaches with regard to professional development would be worthwhile, as would exploring the recruitment, hiring, and training of new professional advisors and administrators. Finally, I recommend applying this study to additional settings, including extending this research to different regions within the United States and abroad and to various types of institutions.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This research would not have come to fruition without the patient guidance, tremendous support, and steady encouragement of my committee. Dr. Nail, thank you for your leadership as my chairperson and for providing a perfect balance of support and freedom to be creative and take ownership of my work. Dr. Caruso-Woolard, you are an exceptional teacher. Your feedback during my coursework helped make the completion of this dissertation a reality. Dr. Gard, thank you for your relentless encouragement and for sharing your advising expertise with me.

Thank you to my parents for instilling in me an understanding of the importance and transformational power of education. Thank you for passing down to me the kind of work ethic and tenacity required to achieve great things. After 19 years, I think I'm finally done with my college education.

To Aubrei, Amanda, Liz, Melissa D., and Wendy, along with the countless other friends and family who created an unbelievable support system for me and who trudged along with me through a seven-year journey, often keeping me going when I thought for sure I was done, thank you. Susan and Linda, thank you for your patience, flexibility, and support as I worked to balance full-time employment and this doctoral degree. You serve as two amazing examples of smart, strong, professional women.

To Andy, thank you for knowing I could do this when I was afraid I couldn't. Thank you for taking on more than your share of our family and home responsibilities to allow me the time, space, and energy to complete this degree. To Turner and Mason, you are my whole heart.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1

STUDY RATIONALE AND FOUNDATION

In 1972, B. B. Crookston published an article calling for a new approach to academic advising in higher education, which he coined as developmental advising. This article by Crookston has been credited as the catalyst which introduced a significant paradigm shift, where advising was re-conceptualized as an educational activity. Since the publication of Crookston's article, NACADA: The Global Community for Academic Advising, has thereby supported framing advising as a form of teaching. For more than three decades, scholar–practitioners have published on the various ways in which academic advising is a form of teaching (Appleby, 2001; Hughes, 2014; Hurt, 2007; Lowenstein, 2005; Pizzolato, 2008; Ryan, 1992). In exploring this topic, however, it became evident that a dearth of empirical research demonstrating the ways in which advising is conceptualized as teaching in advisors' practice and administrators' program design existed. Identifying this gap in the literature, I became curious about exploring beyond the theoretical framing of advising as teaching. Informed by my own experience as an academic advisor and advising administrator, I was interested in exploring how learning theories could be applied to the field of advising. Specifically, I designed this study to explore how the learning theory paradigms of behaviorism, cognitivism, constructivism, and humanism could be utilized when framing advising as teaching, in order to contribute to the body of knowledge on academic advising in higher education. Thus, the following chapters will provide rationale for the study, a

review of the relevant literature, and details about the methodology that was used to conduct the research.

Statement of Problem

Academic advising has been clearly demonstrated as a critical function within higher education with implications for students, faculty, and institutions (Drake, 2011; Museus & Ravello, 2010; Swecker et al., 2013; Tinto, 1993; Young-Jones et al., 2018). For students, academic advising can provide guidance, mentorship, and encouragement. For the faculty and staff providing advising services, advising can provide opportunities to introduce students to fields of inquiry, foster learning, and build fulfilling professional relationships. For institutions, effective advising models have been employed as a method to impact positively retention and graduation.

According to Aiken–Wisniewski et al. (2015), academic advising was first provided in American higher education by the president of Harvard University, Henry Dunster, in the 1640s. The initial advising model, which utilized faculty as academic advisors, was developed at The John Hopkins University in 1876. However, it was not until 1977 that an inaugural advising conference was conducted in the United States, signaling that academic advising had indeed become a significant function within higher education with a distinct body of practitioners (Aiken–Wisniewski et al., 2015). Prior to the 1970s, academic advising within higher education had focused primarily on assisting students in the selection of courses and in some cases exploring career options. In the early 1970s, however, a shift began to take place in which advising from this perspective was challenged. Instead, as Crookston (1972) argued, academic advising should be approached from a teaching and learning perspective. Influenced by student development theory, Crookston suggested a developmental relationship between advisors

and advisees, rather than a prescriptive relationship. In Crookston's model, both advisor and advisee engage in developmental tasks, and learning takes place for both advisors and advisees. More than 40 years later, NACADA continues to promote this philosophy.

Late in the 20th century, academic advising began to be recognized as valuable for retention and graduation efforts. Clark (1989) wrote, "A major factor in increasing student retention rates is the establishment of advising systems which take into account the developmental and academic needs of the students" (p. 27). Fewer than 20 years later, Light (2001) attributed quality advising to a successful higher education experience. Consequently, the roles and responsibilities of academic advisors began to expand as administrators moved to accomplish much more than just assisting students with course registration and showing concern for students' general well-being. Now, in the current climate, it is clear that academic advising within higher education has significant potential to affect positively not only students by providing guidance and fostering learning, but also colleges and universities striving to retain and graduate students. For example, as Thomas (2017) has suggested, "Academic advising is one of the two most important levers to pull within the university to positively impact student success" (para. 1).

In an effort to narrow the scope of this study, a review of the literature began that was relevant to two areas. First, related to NACADA's claim that advising is a form of teaching, the question of how to test this claim was researched. Second, assuming academic advising is indeed an invaluable resource and service, exploring what possibilities exist for legitimizing the role of academic advising within higher education was examined. Although indicated by Allen and Smith (2008) that the majority of academic advising is still performed primarily by faculty members, the number of professional academic advisors at colleges and universities across the

United States continues to grow, with many institutions reporting the use of hybrid advising models, which may utilize both faculty and professional advisors (Miller, 2012). Furthermore, while there has always been a need for students to receive guidance related to academic course planning, the field of academic advising continues to struggle to solidify its unquestionable value within the campus community. In many ways, advising remains invaluable to those who provide it and peripheral to those who do not.

The article that began the research for this study claimed that the current position of academic advisors did not meet the sociological definition to be considered a profession (Aiken–Wisniewski et al., 2015). This idea then led to literature discussing whether academic advising could be considered a discipline and field of study and to numerous articles supporting the claim by NACADA that advising is a form of teaching. Throughout that literature, the argument that the practice of advising required grounding in theory was clearly evident. Therefore, the focus shifted to researching how learning theory paradigms informed practice for academic advisors and program design for advising administrators. The rationale for this shift is, if advising is framed as teaching, identifying which learning paradigms are used and how they are used in advising practice and program development could be an appropriate way in which to explore this particular conceptualization of academic advising. More specifically, by understanding how behaviorism, cognitivism, constructivism, and humanism might influence advisors and advising administrators through this study, the body of knowledge on framing advising as teaching beyond just the theoretical is increased.

Significance of the Study

NACADA has supported for more than 30 years the concept of academic advising as a form of teaching (Crookston, 1972; Lowenstein, 2005; Ryan, 1992). However, within the context

of higher education, it is insufficient to claim simply what advising is or is not. To legitimize advising as teaching, it is imperative that practitioners and researchers within the field produce empirical research to defend or dispute the idea of advising as teaching. The claim should be examined from a variety of perspectives, including both advisors and administrators. Furthermore, if advising is teaching, it should be possible to apply or develop learning and curriculum theories to the setting. By producing such research, the concept of advising as teaching could be further justified or a new way in which to conceptualize advising in higher education could be uncovered.

As suggested by McGill (2016), the practitioner's perspective on the framing of advising as teaching appears to be missing within the literature on academic advising in higher education. Additionally, Erlich and Russ–Eft (2011) proposed that applying learning theories to advising has not yet been sufficiently tested. Therefore, this study was designed to produce additional empirical data and further contribute to the body of literature on academic advising by capturing the lived experiences of academic advisors and advising administrators as they frame advising as teaching. By studying how advisors and advising administrators use learning theory paradigms to shape their daily work and advising programs, valuable data will be collected to demonstrate the ways in which advising is conceptualized and practiced.

Research Questions

1. What are academic advisors' perceptions on the framing of academic advising as a form of teaching?
    a. How are learning theory paradigms utilized by academic advisors?
    b. How are other paradigms utilized by academic advisors?

2. What are academic advising administrators' perceptions on the framing of academic advising as a form of teaching?
    a. How are learning theory paradigms utilized by academic advising administrators?
    b. How are other paradigms utilized by academic advising administrators?

Theoretical Perspective

A social constructivist interpretive framework will be used as the theoretical perspective for this phenomenological study, as this research intends to discover and recognize participants' lived experiences when considering academic advising as teaching (Creswell & Poth, 2018; Hays & Singh, 2012). Social constructivism is an appropriate perspective from which to approach this study because academic advising involves interactions between practitioners and students who bring to the relationship various cultural identities and experiences (Hays & Singh, 2012). Furthermore, because advising can be approached using a variety of paradigms, multiple realities of how best to perform academic advising services certainly exist.

Definition of Key Terms

A number of key terms must be defined for this study. As indicated by Cate and Miller (2015), "The definitions of academic advising [are] equal to the number of postsecondary institutions" (p. 41). In an attempt to keep the definition broad while recognizing advising as more than simply aiding students with course registration, *academic advising* will be defined as "the process between the student and an academic advisor of exploring the value of a general education, reviewing the services and policies of the institution, discussing educational and career plans, and making appropriate course selections" (The University of Maine at Machias, 1986, p. 400).

Advising administrator will be defined as a person responsible for overseeing the facilitation of an academic advising operation. For this study, the learning theory paradigms which will be examined are behaviorism, cognitivism, constructivism, and humanism.

Behaviorism will be defined as that which "purports to explain human and animal behavior in terms of external physical stimuli, responses, learning histories and (for certain types of behavior) reinforcements" (Graham, 2015, section 2, para. 2).

Cognitivism will be defined as that which emphasizes "how knowledge is acquired, processed, stored, retrieved, and activated by the learner during the different phases of the learning process" (Yilmaz, 2011, p. 205).

Constructivism will be defined as proposing "that knowledge cannot exist outside our minds; truth is not absolute; and knowledge is not discovered but constructed by individuals based on experiences (Yilmaz, 2008, p. 162).

Humanism will be defined as that which "envisions a holistic perspective by emphasizing how individuals learn, develop and attain an ideal self-actualization state" (Arghode et al., 2017, p. 602).

Lastly, *professional advisor* will be defined as an individual "who [has] been hired to focus primarily on academic advising activities that promote the academic success of students, with additional attention to general student development at the institution" (Self, 2008, pp. 267–268).

Potential Limitations

A number of potential limitations exist for this study. For example, the complexity of my role as the primary researcher and an advising administrator is one limitation. Additionally, because numerous advising models are employed across American universities, variety during

data collection is yet another potential limitation. Also, participants' honesty as well as their years of advising experience could create possible limitations for this research.

Summary

Contributing to the body of knowledge regarding the field of academic advising is a worthwhile endeavor, given advising's potential impact on students, faculty and staff advisors, and higher education institutions. By exploring the lived experiences of academic advisors and advising administrators related to the phenomenon of framing advising as teaching, much can be discovered as to not only how advising as teaching is conceptualized by practitioners but also how theory and practice are potentially linked when using learning theory paradigms to deliver advising services. The following chapters will review the literature regarding academic advising in higher education and detail the methodology utilized to complete this study.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Despite its significant role in higher education, the field of academic advising continues to confront the narrative that advising is primarily prescriptive and transactional, with the assumption that students visit an advisor briefly once or twice a year for assistance with course selection. Instead, for many practitioners, academic advising is dynamic, focused on building relationships with students and campus colleagues throughout the year (Barker & Mamiseishvili, 2014). Furthermore, many advising administrators are tasked with establishing programmatic goals, student learning outcomes, professional development plans for advisors, and assessment cycles to ensure a comprehensive and robust advising operation exists to serve the needs of their students (Schuh, 2008; Troxel, 2008). This juxtaposition provides the foundation for the study. By exploring how advisors and advising administrators use learning theory paradigms to frame their advising practice and programs, investigating the claim that advising is a form of teaching has the possibility of demonstrating operationally a concept NACADA: The Global Community for Academic Advising has supported for more than three decades.

Because empirical qualitative research related to academic advising is limited, the initial scope for this literature review was necessarily broad in nature. Additionally, as NACADA serves as the authoritative body for the field of academic advising, the majority of the literature reviewed for this study was published in the NACADA Journal. Where available and relevant,

articles from additional sources were reviewed and included.

Perspectives of Academic Advising

Across the United States, both faculty members and professional advisors provide academic advising services to students. Throughout the literature, discussion appeared related to perceptions regarding both faculty and professional advisors. Some authors wondered whether academic advising could be considered a discipline or field of inquiry. Other writers discussed whether advising was actually a profession, while yet other scholars highlighted the advantages and disadvantages of faculty members providing advising services.

While exploring the concept of advising as an independent discipline, Kuhn and Padak (2008) determined that academic advising should be thought of as a faculty responsibility, service, and field but could only be considered a discipline after appropriate credentialing was met. While likening advising to teaching, Ryan (1992) argued that despite the majority of academic advising on college campuses being facilitated by faculty members, those faculty members may not be interested or equipped to serve all of the developmental needs of students, particularly advising tasks more related to a counseling role. Similarly, Allen and Smith (2008) wrote that while faculty in their study were generally interested in and concerned about providing quality academic advising to their students, they did not necessarily see it to be their responsibility to serve students' development needs. Allen and Smith also argued that a skill set including integration, referral, information, individuation, and shared responsibility was critical to serve students effectively within the context of advising.

Writing on advisors' perceptions of academic advising, Aiken–Wisniewski et al. (2015) noted that "the typical academic advising position does not meet the sociological definition of a profession" (p. 60) and stated that, to be considered a profession, advising work must have four

important characteristics, including “education, sole jurisdiction, self–regulation, and public service” (p. 62). Similar to Kuhn and Padak (2008), Aiken–Wisniewski et al. also highlighted the importance of credentialing for the field of academic advising. As the authors stated, “Recognized professionals need not describe their duties to another professional in that same field” (Aiken–Wisniewski et al., 2015, p. 68), and yet the wide variety in roles, responsibilities, and titles make this a common exchange between advising colleagues. The authors stated that making advising a deliberate career choice and standardizing advising roles and responsibilities would assist in moving academic advising toward the sociological definition of a profession. As Pizzolato (2008) highlighted, academic advising in higher education has evolved past merely assisting students in registering for classes. This author argued that for academic advising to be effective, institutions needed to reconsider advising loads, be patient with assessment, ensure that advisors were aware of resources available to students, and provide advisors with time and space to meet with each other as a body of professional peers.

Student Perspective

Building and maintaining satisfactory relationships appeared in the literature repeatedly, indicating many students valued creating connections with their academic advisors. For example, Chan (2016) wrote that ”a good relationship with an advisor in university can encourage freshmen to build trust with others and improve their social skills” (p. 24) and ”a good relationship with advisors may facilitate family and school bonding, as well as life skills development” (p. 24). Ellis (2014) argued that “advisors serve as primary connections to the institution” (p. 42) and that “relationships between the academic advisor and the student facilitates these students’ satisfaction, success, and retention” (p. 42). Hagstrom et al. (1997) suggested that relationships with advisors were invaluable to students, stating,

"Advisors . . . need to build rapport and establish a close relationship" (p. 29) with students. Researching specifically about advising doctoral students, Schlosser et al. (2003) stated advising could "profoundly affect a . . . student's professional development within and even beyond her or his training program" (p. 178), thereby demonstrating that the relationships between advisors and advisees had the potential for significant impact.

In addition to the valuable aspects of relationships in advising, the literature indicated that advising could be beneficial to students by increasing their social integration. For instance, Chan (2016) wrote that advisors "assist in promoting freshmen's sense of affiliation and connection . . . providing them with information about academic regulations and requirements, assisting them in developing their interests and abilities, and connecting them with the corresponding resources, opportunities, and support" (p. 23). Similarly, Donaldson et al. (2016) wrote that "advisors can foster academic and social integration" (p. 37).

Finally, from the literature it was evident that academic advising had the ability to equip students with academic and personal success skills, thereby adding value to students' experiences. Whereas Donaldson et al. (2016) emphasized heavily that equipping students to navigate advising tools was a primary function of advising, Chan (2016) wrote that advising "can help under-prepared freshmen to design appropriate learning goals and strategies, thereby increasing their chances of success" (p. 24).

Advisor Perspective

In examining the literature, several skills and experiences were recommended as valuable to academic advisors. For example, the importance of relationship building between advisor and advisee was echoed in the literature as important to advisors (Chan, 2016; Ellis, 2014). Effective communication skills, accessibility, and adequate training were considered imperative for

advisors as well (Chan, 2016; Ellis, 2014; Smith, 2002). Having passion and pride in their work, assisting students with their personal and professional growth, and helping students to transition successfully from high school to college were also valuable experiences for advisors (Aiken–Wisniewski et al., 2015; Chan, 2016).

Institutional Perspective

Literature on academic advising is clear that effective advising can be very advantageous for institutions, capable of positively impacting retention and graduation rates. According to Donaldson et al. (2016), ”Academic advising programs are emerging as a promising means to increase graduation rates” (p. 30). In Chan’s (2016) study, the author boldly argued that “the academic advising scheme is important and should be highly valued by universities” (p. 28). Additionally, indicating that advising was capable of producing valuable outcomes for institutions, Smith (2002) wrote that “greater attention should be paid to outcomes assessment in academic advising” (p. 47).

Paradigm Shift: Advising as Teaching

A second theme that emerged from the literature was the notion that academic advising is a form of teaching which should be grounded in theory. While the idea that advising should be considered a form of teaching has been prevalent since the 1970s, scholars disagree as to whether current theories are sufficient to apply to advising or a need exists to develop a new theory specific to the field of advising. To narrow the scope of this review, three of the most prominent perspectives within the literature were considered—the emphasis on learner-centered models, the importance of grounding the practice of advising in theory, and the argument for the development of a theory specific to advising.

Learning-Centered Models

Hemwall and Trachte (2005) were supportive of learning-centered advising programs, arguing that considering both what and how students might learn within the context of academic advising was worthwhile. Stating that the utilization of developmental theories for academic advising were insufficient, the authors instead argued that constructing advising programs through the application of learning theories—citing theorists such as Dewey, Piaget, Kolb, Kitchener, Fischer, Gardner, and Vygotsky, among others—would better align with the goals higher education institutions establish.

Similarly, Lowenstein (2005) also called for a learning-centered model for advising, arguing that this approach was superior to both prescriptive advising and developmental advising. Lowenstein (2005) continued by writing that the core of an advisor's work "should always have a goal that goes beyond providing information" (p. 67) and argued that advisors could teach students the logic of their curriculum. He stated, "The advisor has the unique opportunity to introduce the student to the idea that an education is not just the sum of its parts" (Lowenstein, 2005, p. 71). While Lowenstein successfully showcased that both professional and faculty advisors have a place in academia, Allen and Smith (2008) concluded that, although faculty were genuinely concerned about completing advising functions well, they might feel as though not all aspects of advising are their responsibility. Hemwall and Trachte (2005) responded to Allen and Smith's (2008) conclusion with the suggestion that, "Framing academic advising as learning, and as such, part of faculty members' teaching responsibilities, changes the way faculty and administrators approach the task of advising students" (p. 81).

Grounded in Theory

Like Hemwall and Trachte (2005), Himes and Schulenberg (2013) provided a strong argument for grounding the practice of academic advising in theory and philosophy. These authors cited cognitive dissonance theory and self-authorship theory as examples of how advisors could build a "toolkit of theories" (Himes & Schulenberg, 2013, para. 8) to be utilized in the work of advising. Additionally, Roufs (2015) wrote that "no single paradigm characterizes academic advising: In fact, myriad theories frame it, and understanding and applying them in practice elevates the profession of academic advising" (p. 67), thereby equipping practitioners to better understand their advisees' overall development. Similarly, Reynolds (2010) called the advising community to embed learning into its practice, arguing that advisors could incorporate learning activities into advising interactions.

A New Theory for Advising

Taking the idea of grounding practice in theory one step further, Lowenstein (2012) argued the benefits of developing a specific theory for academic advising. He claimed a theory for advising would provide a definitive statement for the purpose and value of the profession and claimed that developing a theory for advising would provide advisors unity and institutions evidence of why advising is so vital (Lowenstein, 2012). Specifically, Lowenstein (2014) suggested a normative theory for advising to capture the ideal purpose for advising.

While developing a new theory for advising is an exciting endeavor to consider, applying current learning theories to the academic advising environment remains important work, to both support NACADA's claim that advising is teaching and to begin filling a clear gap present in the current literature. After reviewing both perceptions of advising and the concept that advising is teaching, this review will explore next four particular learning theories applicable to advising.

Learning Theory Paradigms

If advising is a form of teaching, an interesting angle through which to investigate conceptualizing advising is by exploring how theoretical paradigms for how learning happens shape advisors' and advising administrators' work as they deliver advising services. For this study, four major learning theory paradigms—behaviorism, cognitivism, constructivism, and humanism—will be considered. Understanding these theoretical paradigms in the context of academic advising in higher education will provide a foundation for exploring the paradigms utilized by advisors and advising administrators to inform their practice.

Behaviorism

The behaviorist learning theory paradigm, as defined by Graham (2015), is that which "purports to explain human and animal behavior in terms of external physical stimuli, responses, learning histories and (for certain types of behavior) reinforcements" (section 2, para. 2). Graham explained that behaviorists demand evidence through the demonstration of behavior. Similarly, Harasim (2012) explained that behaviorism "focuses on that which is observable: how people behave and especially how to change or elicit particular behaviors" (p. 31) and described behaviorism as "the earliest theory of learning developed" (p. 45). Prevalent theorists aligning with behaviorism include John Watson (1913), B. F. Skinner (1938), Walter Mischel (1968), and Albert Bandura (1969).

Behaviorism could be used to frame academic advising because of its emphasis on rote learning and the completion of tasks. For example, as White and Schulenberg (2012) noted, "All advisors acknowledge that there is a certain amount of administrative minutia that all students need to know to be successful students" (p. 14). Basic timelines and processes for course registration, including course drops, or the release of final grades could be considered examples

of that minutia, which could be understood by students via rote learning with the assistance of academic advisors.

Another way in which behaviorism could be linked to academic advising is through the utilization of learning objectives as a means of assessing student learning in the advising environment. Considering Ralph Tyler's (1949) influence on curriculum and instruction, aligning advising as a form of teaching could be connected in Tyler's work. In fact, using learning objectives to assess student learning within academic advising could serve as a way to frame advising as teaching, as it would permit both advisors and advising administrators opportunities to demonstrate concrete changes in behavior as a result of students engaging in advising services. Writing on assessing student learning in advising, Hurt (2007) stated, "Advising is a form of teaching; advisors are teachers in every meaningful sense. Thus, classroom assessment techniques can be adapted to give advisors feedback about their advisees' progression mastering learning outcomes" (p. 38).

Although behaviorism was popular as a learning paradigm from the 1920s to the 1950s, cognitivism quickly gained popularity in what has been called the cognitive revolution (Graham, 2015; Yilmaz, 2011). As Graham (2015) wrote, "The deepest and most complex reason for behaviorism's decline in influence is its commitment to the thesis that behavior can be explained without reference to non-behavioral mental (cognitive, representational, or interpretative) activity" (section 7, para. 4). Subsequently, cognitivism must also be explored when considering how learning theory paradigms could be utilized to frame advising as teaching.

Cognitivism

While popularity in behaviorism diminished, cognitivism gained traction as a way to explore and describe the learning process (Ertmer & Newby, 1993). According to Harasim

(2012), cognitivism developed as a reaction to behaviorism, where researchers were interested in "what comes between stimulus and response, seeking to understand the processes of the mind, the processes that the behaviorists had rejected" (p. 47). Furthermore, Harasim (2012) described cognitivism as "a reaction to what had become viewed as simplistic and rigid emphasis by behaviorists on predictive stimulus-response" (p. 58) and admitted that both behaviorists and cognitivists "shared certain fundamental views and pedagogies" (p. 58) and were organized around an instructor delivering knowledge to learners. Theorists such as Edward Tolman (1948) and Jerome Bruner (1964) are considered cognitivists (Yilmaz, 2011). Within cognitivism, focusing on how knowledge is gathered, processed, and activated by learners throughout the learning process is the main emphasis (Anderson et al., 1997; Greeno et al., 1997; Yilmaz, 2011).

Cognitivism could be a paradigm used to frame academic advising because inquiry and discovery learning, reciprocal teaching, and problem-based learning, all considered methods characteristic of cognitivism (Yilmaz, 2011), could be incorporated into academic advising in higher education. For example, in application, a student and advisor may together engage in discovery or problem-based learning as the student explores the best fit for a major after initially struggling academically in the major she first declared. Additionally, cognitivism could be applied to the advising environment as students work with advisors to explore their own understanding of the value of general education curriculum and even higher education as a whole. Functioning as more of a facilitator and from a cognitive perspective, advisors could aid students in gathering, processing through, and activating knowledge relating to their academic and personal journeys through the higher education landscape.

Although cognitivism was born in response to the limitations of behaviorism (Yilmaz, 2011), the paradigm is not without boundaries, particularly given its narrow instructor-centered focus (Harasim, 2012) as opposed to also considering learner-centered or learning-centered approaches. In fact, from cognitivism's limitations came a third learning theory paradigm: constructivism (Ertmer & Newby, 1993; Yilmaz, 2008). According to Yilmaz (2008), "The philosophy of constructivism evolved from dissatisfaction with traditional Western theories of knowledge" (p. 161). As a third major learning theory paradigm, constructivism must also be explored as a possibility for framing advising as teaching.

Constructivism

According to Yilmaz (2008), "Constructivism postulates that knowledge cannot exist outside our minds; truth is not absolute; and knowledge is not discovered but constructed by individuals based on experiences" (p. 161), and "knowledge is not passively received from the world or from authoritative sources but constructed by individuals or groups making sense of their experiential worlds" (p. 162). More simply put, the constructivist learning paradigm focuses on how a learner makes sense of her world, where knowledge is made instead of discovered (Bredo, 2000; Moon, 2004; Yilmaz, 2008) and meaning is made through experience (Bednar et al., 1991). Furthermore, Harasim (2012) stated that constructivism is "quite different from behaviorism and cognitivism, although some theorists are associated with more than one . . . of these theories" (p. 60) and explained that "constructivist learning theory, like behaviorist and cognitive learning theories, is not one unified entity. Rather, it is an umbrella term representing a range of perspectives based on two or more rather distinct positions while sharing some common denominators" (p. 60). Yilmaz (2008) highlighted Jean Piaget (1936), Lev Vygotsky (1962), and John Dewey (1933) and prominent constructivist theorists.

The constructivist paradigm could be applied to academic advising using pedagogical techniques such as collaborative learning and scaffolded learning. For example, during group advising sessions, advisors could facilitate collaborative learning opportunities for their advisees as the group explores how to navigate degree audit tools. Or, scaffolded learning could take place within academic advising as an advisor provides a higher level of support to his advisees during their first year together, eventually removing some of the support to provide advisees an opportunity to become more autonomous. Another common method for implementing constructivism is that of reflective practice, which could exist in the academic advising environment. Thinking of reflective practice as that which illuminates both what others and oneself have experienced (Raelin, 2002), advisors and advising administrators could certainly use this constructivist method to both inform their practice or program and assist advisees during their higher education experience. For example, advisors could engage their students in reflective practice in the context of a discussion related to a student being on academic probation. Together, the academic advisor and student could explore factors which lead the student to academic probation and ways in which to improve academic performance. Additionally, advisor and advising administrators could themselves engage in reflective practice at the conclusion of an academic year, taking time to explore practices which worked well and those which could be improved.

One of the few articles available explicitly applying a learning theory paradigm to the field of academic advising was published by Xyst (2016). In this article, the author stated that "constructivism has captured the imagination of advising theorists," (p. 12) highlighting that "practitioners and theorists seek to present their work as authentically educational" (p. 12) and going so far as to suggest that "if academic advising is a subfield of education, advisors would

naturally consider constructivism a viable operational theory" (p. 12). As suggested by Xyst, framing academic advising through a constructivist lens could help advisors resist the temptation to give in to advisees' requests to determine their academic path for them, instead of empowering students to take ownership of their educational experience. Because of its flexibility and multiple perspectives, constructivism could sufficiently shape an advisor's or advising administrator's framing of advising as teaching.

Humanism

As stated by Silva (2018), "The main premise of humanism is that people have a natural potential for learning and significant learning takes place when an individual can see that the subject matter is relevant to him" (p. 16). Arghode et al. (2017) added to Silva's definition by describing humanistic learning as one which "includes motivation, decision-making, and responsiveness" (p. 602) and stated, "Humanism envisions a holistic perspective by emphasizing how individuals learn, develop and attain an ideal self-actualization state" (p. 602). In contrast to behaviorism and cognitivism, which are both considered to be instructor-centered, humanism, like constructivism, focuses attention on the learner and the learning process. Within the humanism learning paradigm, instructors function most effectively as facilitators, with learners being the ones responsible for their own learning (Arghode et al., 2017). Silva (2018) highlighted transformative learning (Mezirow, 1991), andragogy (Knowles, 1973), and self-directed learning (Knowles, 1975) as prominent humanistic learning theories.

The humanism paradigm could be applied to the field of academic advising by conceptualizing the academic advisor as a facilitator with the advisee responsible for her own learning as it might relate to navigating higher education or understanding graduation requirements. Furthermore, prominent humanistic learning theories such as Knowles' (1973)

andragogy and Knowles' (1975) self-directed learning, which focus specifically on adult learners, as well as Mezirow's (1991) transformative learning, all provide viable theories which could inform the practice of both academic advisors and advising administrators. For example, given the population academic advisors work with, utilizing learning theories which recognize the unique needs of adult learners would be advantageous. Additionally, given that advisors often work through concerns far beyond course registration with students, having a working knowledge of a learning theory such as transformative learning could inform advisors' practice and administrators' programs in important ways, equipping practitioners to assist students in transforming their perspectives on a variety of topics.

By exploring the learning paradigms of behaviorism, cognitivism, constructivism, and humanism, including their basic tenets, prominent theorists, and examples of how each paradigm could be applied to the academic advising environment, the dialogue surrounding the claim that advising is a form of teaching can be expanded. Although much of the day-to-day work of an advisor or advising administrator is related to providing a service to students, when both populations reflect on which paradigms, whether learning theory or other, their work will likely be informed and enhanced. Now that behaviorism, cognitivism, constructivism, and humanism have been outlined, next, the empirical evidence available to justify this study will be discussed.

Empirical Evidence to Justify Study

Despite some literature available regarding the application of learning theories to academic advising, significant gaps remain, especially in regard to applying learning paradigms to the advising environment. With the inaugural edition of the NACADA Journal, Polson and Cashin (1981) stated, "There exists a limited amount of truly experimental research in current literature on advising" (p. 36), arguing that students' wide variety of needs make it difficult to

assess the effectiveness of academic advising programs. The authors went on to emphasize that no one best advising model exists but urged practitioners to pursue research in advising to further the field. Considering challenges only continue to grow regarding how to assess advising programs effectively, particularly as advising continues to be closely fastened to retention, (Young–Jones et al., 2018), research in this area suggests one example of a gap in the current literature.

Similarly, nearly 30 years after Polson and Cashin (1981) highlighted a lack of research in advising, Habley (2009) urged the NACADA community to produce more research in advising, citing multiple examples of criticisms for the lack of empirical studies in advising. Habley argued that the precarious position of advising was due to a history of proponents arguing its value without demonstrating effectiveness through a quality body of research. Habley (2009) also wrote that "to date, a unique and credible body of knowledge is non-existent, evidence supporting the impact of advising is insufficient" (p. 82) and boldly claimed that "the field of academic advising has not risen to any degree of prominence among individuals earning a doctorate in education" (p. 81). Echoing Habley, seven years later, McGill (2016) wrote that "although many outside the field do not fully recognize its purpose and potential, increasingly academic advising is seen as a teaching and learning endeavor . . . but absent in the literature are practitioner accounts examining the connection between teaching and advising" (p. 51). While NACADA has continued to make important strides in this area, the Habley and McGill texts still point to a relevant gap in the current literature.

Studies Supporting Research Questions

Although NACADA supports that academic advising is a form of teaching and an abundance of literature is available regarding how to apply learning theories effectively to

classroom settings, a gap remains in the literature combining these two concepts—how learning theory paradigms can influence the practice of academic advising. While research on the influence of learning paradigms is quite limited, some authors have explored how to apply learning theories to academic advising. One example of how to utilize current research of learning theory for academic advising is an article by Paris and Paris (2001) in which the authors applied self-regulated learning (SRL) to classroom settings. In their text, the authors acknowledged the wide applicability of the concept of self-regulated learning. They discussed two ways in which to think about SRL—either as a set of skills that can be taught or as a set of behaviors that can be organized. And while the authors provided four principles for promoting SRL in learners, the article was not intended for an audience related to academic advising within higher education.

An example of how recent the development is regarding applying learning theories to academic advising can be seen through research published by Erlich and Russ–Eft (2011). When these authors published an article on applying social cognitive theory to academic advising, they claimed that theirs was the first application of this learning theory to academic advising in the literature. Using Bandura's (1977) self-efficacy and Zimmerman's (2001) self-regulated learning, the authors demonstrated how such theories could be applied to learning outcomes for advising. Erlich and Russ–Eft referenced NACADA's emphasis on teaching and learning and named curriculum, pedagogy, and student learning outcomes as the three main components of this emphasis. While the authors provided a strong argument for effectively applying social cognitive theory to the field of academic advising, they also called for replication studies to validate their results and suggested future research hypotheses related to applying social cognitive theory to academic advising. Given the recent publication date for this article, it is

clear that empirical studies applying either learning theories or learning theory paradigms to academic advising is a prominent gap in the current literature.

In order to study academic advisors' influence on student retention in higher education, Museus and Ravello (2010) qualitatively examined advising's influence on the success of minority student populations at one large public and one small private institution. Their data indicated that successful students prefer advising that is proactive, humanized, and holistic. Future research on the impact of academic advising should focus on how advisors and advising administrators can use learning theories to frame academic advising in order to achieve proactive, humanized, and holistic advising.

In another study that examined the link between advising and retention, Swecker et al. (2013) used multiple logistic regression to examine the number of in-person advising meetings first-generation college students had with their advisors during their first year in college. The study sample included 363 first-year, first-generation students, and their data analysis indicated that for each in-person advising meeting, the chance a first-year student will be retained increased by 13%, summarizing that since the number of advising sessions was highly correlated with retention, it would serve as a way to predict student success. Using these data, the researchers argued, "Advising appointments may be one of the few institutional mechanisms that consistently connect students to the academic institution in meaningful ways" (Swecker et al., 2013, p. 49). Swecker et al.'s research contributes to the present study as it seems to imply the framework on behaviorism can be useful in the context of academic advising. For example, by making and keeping advising appointments, students could be rewarded with success in college. Furthermore, students could receive positive reinforcement through praise from their academic advisor for scheduling and keeping appointments and for successfully progressing through their

degree program. Additionally, advisors' feedback to students about not making adequate progress could help reinforce students' feeling of accountability.

Counterarguments

While my literature review demonstrates a variety of study results in which academic advising is valuable to students (Chan, 2016; Donaldson et al., 2016; Ellis, 2014; Hagstrom et al., 1997; Scholosser et al., 2003), advisors (Aiken–Wisniewski et al., 2015; Chan, 2016; Ellis, 2014; Smith, 2002), and institutions (Chan, 2016; Donaldson et al., 2016; Smith, 2002), the literature also illuminated a number of challenges related to successful advising in a variety of ways, to a variety of populations. For example, Hagstrom et al. (1997) admitted that "several students believed advisors could not help them in any way" (p. 27), indicating that it was necessary to continue to find ways in which to communicate explicitly the value of advising to students and parents. Speaking about the various ways in which advising was delivered, Chan (2016) found that students did not appreciate group advising settings because it was uncomfortable to share their questions and concerns among their peers. Similarly, Donaldson et al. (2016) specified a lack of buy-in from students regarding required advising and a lack of advisor availability as challenges. Recognizing that first-year students often struggle to understand the roles and responsibilities of academic advisors, several researchers highlighted the importance of helping to shape and manage students' expectations. Given that multiple studies revealed first-year students often expected advisors to function similarly to high school guidance counselors (Walker et al., 2017), additional strategies for how to do this effectively could be beneficial.

In addition to challenges expressed by students, advisors also shared challenges about academic advising. For example, Aiken–Wisniewski et al. (2015) found that advisors sometimes

view their jobs as stepping stones toward future careers and heard from advisors that ambiguity in responsibilities make it difficult to conceptualize advising as a distinct career path. Additionally, Barnes et al. (2010) pointed out that while specific models were available for undergraduate advising programs, such models were often not available for advising graduate students, leaving advisors for graduate students with little formal structure and few guidelines. Finally, the literature indicated training and development as a challenge from the advisors' perspectives as well. For example, although previous studies had indicated that students preferred development advising approaches, Smith (2002) stated, "Little empirical evidence is available to demonstrate that advisors consistently use developmental approaches in practice" (p. 40) due to either a lack of training in how to employ developmental advising or a lack of buy-in for the approach. Also having noted a lack of training, Knox et al. (2006) admitted that doctoral advisors in their study "reportedly had received no formal training for this role and instead had learned through their own experiences as advisees and advisors" (p. 514).

In another study that countered the claim that advising is a form of teaching, Filson and Whittington (2013) conducted a quantitative study with 2,294 participants. Although the researchers joined other writers in advocating that academic advising is an extension of the teaching role in higher education (Campbell, 2008; Eble, 1988; Hemwall & Trachte, 2003), Filson and Whittington actually concluded otherwise. Using a survey which included 26 variables and a Likert-type scale, data analysis show that "students were generally not engaged in educational experiences with their advisors beyond their assigned coursework" (Filson & Whittington, 2013, p. 10). For example, the researchers found that 91.4% of respondents never or only sometimes discussed class readings from their courses with their academic advisors. Additionally, 80.6% of respondents reported never or only sometimes discussing anything

beyond course selection with their academic advisors. Unfortunately, these researchers perhaps too-narrowly defined what constitutes educational experiences between advisors and advisees. This study, however, was designed to explore how framing advising as teaching through the lens of learning theories could demonstrate examples of teaching and learning that occur through academic advising in higher education.

Summary

Academic advising within higher education began a conceptual transformation in the early 1970s, with Crookston's (1972) pivotal article, in which he argued that academic advising should be approached not from a prescriptive and transactional perspective, but instead from a teaching and learning perspective. Since the late 20th century, academic advising has been recognized as valuable for retention and graduation efforts. This alignment with retention and graduation has served to increase awareness about the vital role advisors serve on campus but continues to increase the demand for empirical data to prove that the resources dedicated to academic advising are worthwhile and producing adequate results. As the literature suggested, the need for more empirical research in advising remains critical.

Despite the variety of ways in which academic advising is administered on campuses across the country, the literature suggests that identifying best practices in academic advising is complex and challenging. Furthermore, the argument that the practice of advising requires grounding in theory is clearly evident. Similarly, the clear lack of literature related to applying learning theories to academic advising points to an easily identifiable gap.

It is clear that the literature shows no lack of evidence from administrators and practitioners that NACADA's endorsement of advising as teaching is valuable and logical. Unfortunately, there seems to be a lack of relevant literature demonstrating empirical evidence

that NACADA's claim that advising is teaching has been sufficiently tested, particularly within the context of using learning paradigms to inform advising practice and programs. Thus, this literature review has ultimately shown a considerable gap in the current literature and establishes the need for further research.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

According to Williams (2007), “Research is the process of collecting, analyzing, and interpreting data in order to understand a phenomenon” (p. 67). More specifically, Williams (2007) explained that “qualitative research is a holistic approach that involves discovery” (p. 67) that effectively “builds its premises on inductive, rather than deductive reasoning.” (p. 67). In addition to using Williams’ overarching description of qualitative research to frame the study, this phenomenological research was designed using both a social constructivist and pragmatic interpretive framework as the study intended to recognize participants’ lived experiences while also identifying what is practical and useful when considering academic advising as teaching (Creswell & Poth, 2018). Framing academic advising in higher education as a form of teaching served as the concept or phenomenon to be studied. Understanding how advisors and advising administrators frame advising as teaching made phenomenology an ideal approach for this qualitative study. This study was conducted over an eight-month period. This included one month for recruiting participants, three months for collecting data, three months for transcribing and analyzing those data, and one month for writing up the findings and discussion components.

Research Questions

As this phenomenological study aimed to "understand an experience from the participants' point of view" (Leedy & Ormrod, 2001, p. 157), the following questions guided my inquiry of the framing of advising as teaching from the points of view of both professional academic advisors and advising administrators:

1. What are academic advisors' perceptions on the framing of academic advising as a form of teaching?
    a. How are learning theory paradigms utilized by academic advisors?
    b. How are other paradigms utilized by academic advisors?
2. What are academic advising administrators' perceptions on the framing of academic advising as a form of teaching?
    a. How are learning theory paradigms utilized by academic advising administrators?
    b. How are other paradigms utilized by academic advising administrators?

Setting, Population, and Sample

The participants for this study included professional advisors and advising administrators at five Midwest, four-year, public higher education institutions. Because the study was designed to examine advising from a phenomenological perspective, capturing the lived experiences of these participants was important data to collect. I attempted to partner with the NACADA Research Committee for the recruitment of participants. To do so, I followed their guidelines for sending members approved surveys via the listserv. These guidelines are available for review in Appendix A. Because NACADA did not approve my request, I contacted advising administrators whose programs meet the criteria for this research study directly to recruit participants. An

example of that initial communication sent to advising administrators directly is available for review in Appendix B.

Because this study was phenomenological, I utilized criterion sampling to ensure that participants had experienced the phenomenon being examined (Creswell & Poth, 2018). Therefore, the research locations used to recruit participants for this study must have utilized professional academic advisors in their advising model, meaning that the institutions employed staff members whose job responsibility was only academic advising. Additionally, each institution must have had at least one established advising center on campus where the unit's primary charge was to deliver academic advising services. Given that academic advising is facilitated in various ways among American institutions, limiting the scope of this study to five public institutions which employed an advising model that included professional academic advisors helped to ensure that the sample was purposeful.

In regard to sample size, selecting participants who included both professional advisors and advising administrators helped to ensure an appropriate number of individuals were included in the study and that various perspectives were represented. Additionally, sampling participants from multiple institutions helped to demonstrate that this study extended beyond a case study and could be applicable to a larger audience. Finally, the study included three professional advisors and six advising administrators from five institutions, for a total of nine participants.

Data Collection

Interviews and document reviews were conducted to collect rich and varied data for this study. As the primary researcher for the study, I conducted all interviews and document reviews myself. All interviews took place either over the phone or via Skype, per the participant's preference. I recorded each interview on two separate devices simultaneously to help avoid

inadvertently losing any data due to a technology failure. I used the Super Voice Recorder application to record interviews on my password-protected tablet and the Call Recorder Lite for iPhone application to record interviews on my password-protected cellular phone. For each participant, I scheduled 60-minute interviews, per Williams' (2007) recommendation that "lengthy . . . interviews [help the researcher] to understand and interpret a participant's perception on the meaning of an event" (p. 69). Additionally, content analysis using published institutional documents available on their websites contributed to the data collected. After interviews were completed with each participant, I submitted recordings to Rev.com for transcription. No follow up interviews were required.

Interviews

I conducted a one-on-one interview either over the phone or via Skype with all participants. In addition to recording each interview, descriptive fieldnotes using low inference descriptors, as suggested by Bogdan and Biklen (2007), were collected. I utilized Berg's (1998) semi-standardized interview protocol with questions created to capture participants' perceptions of framing advising as teaching. The interview questions developed for both populations are available in Appendix C and Appendix D. As necessary, I used probing and clarifying to assist in reaching a depth of understanding that fully captures the participants' experiences.

Document Review

After participant interviews were conducted, I reviewed official documents referencing academic advising from each institution which are available on the associated websites to gain an understanding of how advising is framed at the institution and program levels. Additionally, I analyzed the data to explore in what ways the content aligned or diverged from the participants'

perspectives of framing advising as teaching at each location. I developed a checklist to guide the document reviews for this study, and it is available in Appendix E.

Data Analysis

Following data collection, I conducted inductive analysis (McMillan & Schumacher, 2010). First, I reviewed each of the interview transcripts and institutional documents to gain an overall understanding of these data. Then, I segmented each type of data sentence by sentence for the coding process. Once all data were coded, I analyzed and reorganized these codes according to the emergent themes present in the data. Ultimately, I used these emergent themes to represent the findings for this study.

Instruments

Because of the semi-structured protocol used for the interviews, an initial set of questions were developed to be used with each participant. I developed one set of questions for advisor participants and a second set of questions to use with advising administrators. Those questions are available for review in Appendix C and Appendix D. I clarified the questions and used probing with participants as necessary to gain a deeper understanding of their perspectives. In addition to these question sets, I developed a checklist for the document review portion of this study, which is available in Appendix E. This checklist served to ensure I administered a consistent procedure when searching each institution's website for information relevant to academic advising.

Credibility

To ensure integrity in the research design, validation standards were considered. For this study, I established credibility in a number of ways. First, I achieved data triangulation through the collection of data at multiple times, in multiple contexts, and with multiple people (Lincoln

& Guba, 1985). By collecting data at five Midwest public institutions and interviewing both professional advisors and advising administrators, I ensured data triangulation. Second, peer review and debriefing occurred. Third, because this study was conducted for the completion of a dissertation, I utilized the faculty members on my committee to review and debrief the research as it occurred. Fourth, I utilized member checking after data analysis was completed to provide participants an opportunity to review the data and confirm they has been represented accurately.

Transferability

I built transferability into the design of this study with the use of two sets of interview questions which were broad enough that they could be applied to multiple populations of participants. Additionally, these questions could easily be utilized at different locations within various settings when exploring the framing of advising as teaching in higher education. Furthermore, transferability was present with the thick description provided within the findings (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

Confirmability

To achieve confirmability, as suggested by Lincoln and Guba (1985), I kept an audit trail to document my research procedures and presented reflexivity in the final write up of the study. The audit trail provided transparency by documenting the data collection and analysis processes. Reflexivity was provided so that the reader understands my connection to academic advising to understand fully the study's findings.

Limitations

A number of limitations were important to consider for this study. As pointed out by Williams (2007), "The difficulty of [phenomenological studies] is that the researcher usually has some connection, experience, or stake in the situation so . . . setting aside all prejudgments is

required" (p. 69). Therefore, as the primary researcher, I first acknowledged that this study was developed out of a passion for my daily work as an advising administrator. As someone invested in the field of academic advising, recognizing my own potential for bias was of critical importance throughout the data collection, analysis, and findings representation phases. Because of this, ensuring validation standards were adhered to was vital to maintain the integrity of the study.

The second limitation for this study was the reality that the way in which academic advising is utilized across American campuses varies greatly depending on the institution's philosophy on advising and the resources available. Therefore, variety was captured during data collection, despite purposefully choosing five Midwest, four-year, public, institutions of higher education which utilize professional academic advisors. Although variety is not inherently negative and is often expected with qualitative research, it made the coding and identification of emergent themes challenging.

A third limitation to consider for this study was the honesty of each participant. Although it should be assumed that all participants answered the interview questions openly and honestly, given that the information was self-reported and not verified in any way, what each participant chose to share or withhold must be recognized as a limitation. To create an environment conducive to open dialogue during the Skype and phone interviews, as the primary researcher for this study, I intentionally took time at the start of each interview to build rapport with participants in an effort to ensure those participants felt comfortable and at ease.

A fourth limitation for this study was the amount of experience participants had. Given that the framing of advising as teaching has been largely promoted in the advising field by NACADA, and yet neither membership in NACADA nor credentialing by NACADA is required

to operate as an academic advisor, participants new to the field of academic advising may have been less familiar with conceptualizing advising in this way. Additionally, participants with fewer years of experience with academic advising may not have yet had enough practice to consider framing their advising practice in multiple ways and could therefore struggle to identify during the interviews paradigms they utilize to frame their practice.

In summary, limitations are important to recognize in any study. By understanding the complexity of my role as the primary researcher and an advising administrator, anticipating that variety is likely during data collection, and recognizing that participants' honesty or lack of experience could be limitations, potential pitfalls were avoided. More importantly, by disclosing limitations, the research design was strengthened, and integrity was maintained.

Delimitations

Three research decisions must be discussed regarding this study. First, my decision to recruit participants from five Midwest, four-year, public, higher education institutions was deliberate but admittedly limited the scope of the study. I selected this type of institution for the study because it reflects the type of university where I have built my advising career, and therefore I was curious about researching institutions that reflect a similar population and mission.

The decision to delimit this study to only professional academic advisors and advising administrators was another boundary to consider. I made this research choice with the assumption that programs that utilized professional advisors would have a well-developed mission, vision, and goals for the advising unit, as well as a defined training program which would either explicitly note or imply any learning paradigms that are used to frame their advising practice. Additionally, limiting the scope of this study to these participants assumed such

advisors and advising administrators may be familiar with NACADA and the organization's philosophy that advising is a form of teaching.

Finally, paradigms were chosen as the variables to explore in this qualitative study in order to broaden and deepen the conversations with participants in the Skype and phone interviews. Learning paradigms were specifically chosen to explore advisors' and administrators' perceptions on framing advising as teaching. I incorporated inquiring about other paradigms used to frame advising practice into the research questions to explore additional ways participants frame their practice, if not through the utilization of learning paradigms.

Ethical Considerations

All participants were described generically to prohibit identification. Participants were identified as either an academic advisor or an advising administrator, without specific titles collected. All participants were asked to identify their years of experience in higher education and academic advising as well as the types of advising experience they had. During data collection, I organized this information in order to protect participants from being identified.

In addition to taking measures to protect participants, I also designed the data collection processes to ensure students served by the participants are also protected. For example, during Skype and phone interviews, participants were asked to omit any identifying information when sharing about their experiences advising students. When such information was inadvertently shared during the interviews, I documented it in my field notes and audio recordings that the information should be omitted during transcription.

I collected informed consent from each participant before interviews began. Examples of the informed consent documents for academic advisors and advising administrators are available as Appendix F and Appendix G. Once participants had been recruited, I emailed the appropriate

informed consent document with instructions to print, complete, scan, and email back to me prior to scheduling an interview. An example of this direct communication with recruited participants is available as Appendix H. Participants were free to withdrawal from the study at any point during the process. Should participants have chosen to remove themselves from the study, field notes and audio recordings associated with those participants would have been destroyed.

Appropriate measures were taken to secure the data associated with this study. Both devices used for audio recordings were password protected. All collected data, including recordings, field notes, and audio recording transcriptions were kept on an encrypted flash drive. Once the audio recordings had been successfully transferred to the flash drive, all recordings deleted from the tablet and iPhone. I then stored the flash drive securely in a locked desk drawer in a locked work office.

Accounting for Bias

I considered accounting for bias during the development of the methodology for this study. First, as the primary researcher, it must be disclosed that I am also an advising administrator with 12 years professional experience in higher education, seven of which have specifically been in the field of academic advising. Therefore, I have a vested interest in the advising profession. Additionally, as a practitioner, I utilize learning paradigms to frame my daily work with professional advisors and first-year students. Therefore, I addressed this potential for bias with transparency in all phases of data collection and analysis. For example, I used the technique of bracketing, as outlined by Hays and Singh (2012), before data analysis began in an attempt to minimize the potential for researcher bias or assumptions about the focus of this study. Additionally, the research questions were independently reviewed by a methodologist. Moreover, because of my dual role at my own institution as both a student and

staff member, I intentionally recruited participants from institutions other than my home university, with which I have had no previous affiliation.

Selecting to focus only on programs that utilized professional advisors, instead of designing a study with random sampling which would thereby include participants from various advising models, also had the potential for bias, as these programs may have been more inclined to be framed by specific learning or other paradigms. Additionally, because of NACADA's significant influence on the professional advising community, and their support of the advising as teaching mentality, utilizing this population as participants for the study could have produced bias in the data. In an attempt to address this bias, during interviews with participants, I explicitly asked what influenced their selection of paradigms for framing their advising practice.

Summary

This phenomenological study aimed to gather the perspectives of advisors and advising administrators as they considered framing academic advising as teaching. In particular, I focused the research on the exploration of how advisors and advising administrators used learning paradigms to frame their advising practice and programs. Participants were from five Midwest, four-year, public, higher education institutions that utilized professional advisors to deliver advising services. I collected data through either Skype or phone interviews, as well as through the review of official university documents which addressed academic advising at each institution. I then used Rev.com to have records from data collection transcribed. Triangulation, peer review, debriefing, and member checking were used to achieve internal validity. I addressed external validity through the use of thick description within the findings and the utilization of a consistent set of questions for all participants. I achieved confirmability through an audit trail and reflexivity. Limitations of the study included the research interest coming from a passion for

my own work as an advising administrator, and the reality that, because of the variety in how advising is deployed from institution to institution, there was variety in the data. Delimitations considered for this research included restricting this study to public four–year institutions, limiting participants to professional advisors and advising administrators, and narrowing the research to explore how these participants perceived framing advising as teaching. Ethical considerations included protecting the identity of both participants and the students they served. Finally, to account for bias within this study, transparency in regard to my role as the primary researcher and an advising administrator who uses learning paradigms to frame my daily work and recognizing that participants were not selected through random sampling measures, was necessary.

CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS

Purpose

This study was designed to produce additional empirical data and further contribute to the body of literature on academic advising by capturing the lived experiences of academic advisors and advising administrators as they framed advising as teaching. By studying how advisors and advising administrators used learning theory paradigms or other paradigms to shape their daily work and advising programs, I collected valuable data to demonstrate the ways in which advising is conceptualized and practiced. To triangulate data collected for this study, I conducted nine semi-structured interviews via phone or Skype with three professional advisors and six advising administrators. These participants represented a total of five Midwest, four-year, public, higher education institutions. I also reviewed official documents referencing academic advising from each institution that were available on the associated websites to gain an understanding of how advising was framed at the institution and program levels. This research study focused on two main research questions, each with two sub-questions: (1) what are academic advisors' perceptions on the framing of academic advising as a form of teaching?, (1a) how are learning theory paradigms utilized by academic advisors?, (1b) how are other paradigms utilized by academic advisors?, (2) what are academic advising administrators' perceptions on the framing of academic advising as a form of teaching?, (2a) how are learning theory paradigms utilized by

academic advising administrators?, (2b) how are other paradigms utilized by academic advising administrators?

Participants

The participants for this study represented five Midwest, four-year, public institutions. Each research location utilized professional academic advisors in their advising model, meaning that the institutions employed staff members whose job responsibilities are only academic advising. Additionally, each institution had at least one established advising center on campus where the unit's primary charge was to deliver academic advising services.

Participants were recruited directly via email. To locate potential participants, I reviewed all four-year, public institutions from one Midwestern state that fit the criteria for this study and contacted advising administrators directly for recruitment. When potential participants responded, we scheduled a 60-minute interview via phone or Skype, depending on the advising administrator's preference. After scheduling the interview, I confirmed with each advising administrator whether they would permit me to contact academic advisors from their advising centers to recruit those individuals for this study. Some participants sent my request directly to their advising staff members while other administrators confirmed that I could contact their staff members directly for recruitment. Once potential academic advisor participants responded to my recruitment email, we scheduled a 60-minute interview via phone or Skype, depending upon the advisor's preference. I repeated this process for two additional Midwestern states to reach a minimum of nine participants for the study.

Institution A

Institution A enrolls approximately 11,000 students per year and operates five advising centers for undergraduate students. Two participants were interviewed from Institution A,

identified as Michael, an advising administrator, and Patricia, an academic advisor. Documents reviewed for Institution A included the university's undergraduate catalog, information available via the Registrar, and various sections of the website specific to the division that oversees the five advising centers.

Institution B

Institution B enrolls approximately 40,000 students per year and operates five advising centers for undergraduate students. I interviewed one participant from Institution B, identified as Debra, an advising administrator. Documents reviewed for Institution B included the university's academic programs catalog and information specific to the advising centers.

Institution C

Institution C enrolls approximately 33,000 students per year and operates an advising division for undergraduate students. Two participants were interviewed from Institution C, identified as Daniel and Teri, both advising administrators. Documents reviewed for Institution C included the university's course catalog, information specific to the division that oversees undergraduate advising, and an advising handbook, also specific to the division.

Institution D

Institution D enrolls approximately 13,000 students per year and operates one academic advising center for undergraduate students. I interviewed one participant from Institution D, identified as Naomi, an advising administrator. Documents reviewed for Institution D included the university's undergraduate catalog and information specific to the advising center.

Institution E

Institution E enrolls approximately 5,400 students per year and operates one academic advising center for undergraduate students. Three participants were interviewed from Institution

E, identified as Tarah, an advising administrator, Craig, an academic advisor, and Lori, an academic advisor. Documents reviewed for Institution E included the university's undergraduate catalog and information specific to the advising center.

Table 1 summarizes the participants' demographic information. Each participant was permitted to choose how to be identified in the data. Overall, participants' experience in higher education ranged from eight to 26 years and their experience in advising ranged from three to 26 years. Information within Table 1 is organized according to each participant's institution and role.

Table 1

Demographic Information of Participant

Participant	Institution	Role	Level of Education	Years in Higher Education	Years in Advising
Michael	A	Administrator	Master's	26	26
Patricia	A	Advisor	Master's	14	14
Debra	B	Administrator	Master's	29	Not disclosed
Daniel	C	Administrator	Doctorate	23	15
Teri	C	Administrator	Master's	26	26
Naomi	D	Administrator	Doctoral candidate	21	13
Tarah	E	Administrator	Doctorate	16	12
Craig	E	Advisor	Master's	8	3
Lori	E	Advisor	Master's	13	8

Once the five institutions were established and all interviews had been conducted, I reviewed official documents referencing academic advising from each institution that were readily available on the universities' websites to gain an understanding of how advising was framed at the institution and program levels. Additionally, I analyzed the data to explore in what ways the content aligned or diverged from the participants' perspectives of framing advising as teaching at each location.

Findings of the Research Questions

This phenomenological study focused on the framing of advising as teaching from the points of view of both professional academic advisors and advising administrators. My inquiry was guided by two research questions, each with two sub-questions: (1) what are academic advisors' perceptions on the framing of academic advising as a form of teaching?, (1a) how are learning theory paradigms utilized by academic advisors?, (1b) how are other paradigms utilized by academic advisors?, (2) what are academic advising administrators' perceptions on the framing of academic advising as a form of teaching?, (2a) how are learning theory paradigms utilized by academic advising administrators?, (2b) how are other paradigms utilized by academic advising administrators? Data from the nine semi-structured interviews as well as the document reviewed were coded and analyzed. Subsequently, five themes emerged from these data: (1) the form and function of academic advising, (2) advising as teaching, (3) learning theories used in advising, (4) other theories used in advising, and (5) the value of advising. Below these themes are addressed within the context of the participants' roles as either an academic advisor or advising administrator.

The Form and Function of Academic Advising

The first theme to emerge from the data was that participants were eager to describe how academic advising operated on their respective campuses. To understand the participants' lived experiences as advising professionals, details were shared about their institutions' advising models, and the populations served by the advising centers. Furthermore, we discussed whether participants' institutions mandated academic advising for students, details about the frequency of advising appointments and the various topics discussed during advising sessions. Various ways in which to frame advising were explored, as were both the characteristics and functions of advising at participants' institutions. A few participants also provided commentary on the progress the field of advising has made over the last 25 years in regard to being an intended career path.

Advisors

During each interview, I aimed to explore how participants framed their advising practice in order to understand their lived experience with advising as a precursor to exploring how each participant utilized theory within academic advising. During our interview, advisor Craig from Institution E shared that his approach to advising had been shaped by a combination of his own experience as a student and the influence of one of his mentors and explained that "I just really think of my job as being human to students." Craig shared his own experience with faculty advisors, describing faculty as "distant" when serving in an academic advising capacity and admitting that he could not rely on his faculty advisor for help when navigating the transition issues inherent in the college experience. He explained:

> I was sort of on my own for a lot of the other questions that I would have had about resources and opportunities on campus just because the faculty member, they're

> dedicated to the classroom and they're not as functional to be able to help in that role of transitioning into a new university.

Craig likened his work to "the role of being a success coach" for first-year students. He rejected the notion that his proactive advising style was "handholding," admitted that students had responsibilities within the advising relationship, and emphasized that the type of advising provided at Institution E was much more than simply "transactional or prescriptive."

For advisor Lori, from Institution E, her framing of advising came from a combination of her own experiences as a student, teacher, and parent, as well as her opportunities to attend NACADA conferences. Lori admitted that she framed advising within the context of student development theories. However, Lori also shared that academic advising must be learner-centered and that "you have to have a lot of kindness. You just have to care a lot about these students." Lori shared a similar perspective to Craig regarding faculty advisors, describing them as inconsistent, saying "there are faculty that are really responsive and then there are faculty who aren't as responsive."

Advisor Patricia, from Institution A, echoed Lori, shared that her personal experiences and background influenced her approach to advising and that she thought she had something to offer the field of advising. Patricia also shared that she took a mainly developmental approach to advising though admitted that ideally she would use multiple theories within her work. Also, like Lori, Patricia felt strongly that advising must be student-centered, aimed to create a safe environment for her students, and was concerned about her advisees' feelings. Echoing Craig's discussion on "handholding" Patricia shared,

> I know that there are some schools of thought in advising is that maybe we do too much handholding, but I think for where the students are and the fact that they are

> developmental college students, I think you have to hold their hand. I mean if you had a little kid who was walking, you wouldn't just [say], "There you go," and then laugh when they fell down. You'd hold onto their hand when they were learning to walk until they were able to let go a little bit and do it on their own, and I guess that is my perspective. It's being able to meet the student where they are, even if I feel like, "How can you be a high school senior and not know this?" Even if I'm feeling that, to be able to say, "Well, this is where they are. How can I make this okay for them?"

Throughout the interviews, advisor participants shared various characteristics of advising, which further helped me to understand how they approached their work. For example, Craig emphasized that academic advising was less about helping students with course schedules and more about the relational aspect of advising. He shared,

> I think the scheduling part of the job [is] by far, the easiest part of the job. It really is much more about those relationships and making sure that students can know that they have someone to ask a question of or someone that they can just count on to be there when they're needed.

Additionally, Craig shared during our interview that both he and his students value the relationships they build together and that it was the relational aspect of this work that drew him to the field of advising. Other characteristics of advising, according to Craig, was that advising should be proactive and holistic and, echoing Lori, advisors should truly value students. Craig also stressed the importance of advisors being accessible to their students and that advisors can provide consistency for students throughout their time at the institution, connect students to resources in a way that faculty may not be prepared to provide, and bridge students' journeys from college and careers. He described it in this way:

> It's basically that idea of us being that connective tissue to be able to show them [where] this is going and where their goals are going to be. And I think that, that's where we can step in and do a good deal of teaching about the process of even obtaining that career after college or those more existential questions about what life has ahead of us.

Mirroring Craig, Lori also indicated that she advised holistically and focused on the relationship between advisor and advisee. Lori also described advising as intrusive and work that required significant patience. For Lori, advising was rewarding work. Also echoing Craig, Lori expressed that advising entailed much more than course scheduling and suggested advisors should have a passion for their work. She shared her ideas in this way:

> I mean I think that it's important that anybody who has studied this or who is going to work in the field understand that it's not a 9 to 5 job, that it's not a come in and create a schedule for students and help them sign up for classes. That it has a lot of different aspects and if you're really [looking for] one thing to do this, you should have a passion for it, I think. And you should really want to work with students. I mean I've worked with people in the past who did this job who weren't necessarily student-centered people and it's noticeable. If you're doing it for glory or doing it because you think it's cool or you think it's a good job, or whatever. It's not that. It is, it's all of those things.

Similarly, Patricia described her work as both relational and holistic as well. She shared the importance of approaching advising from a student-centered perspective, described her advising style as intentional, and admitted that much of her work involved helping students to understand that multiple possible pathways could lead to graduation. Patricia shared an example of working with pre-nursing students, a competitive program at her institution. She said:

> So I think that, too, being able to talk to a student and help them, because of where we are, the demographic in the community around here, I think everybody thinks they have to be a nurse or an engineer, and I think getting them to see that, well no, there are all these other things out here, or, "Well I'm not going to be a nurse. How can I help people?" "Well, nurses aren't the only ones who help people. Let's have a look and see what else you can do."

Institutions' advising models varied among the five universities represented in the study. Although each institution employed professional advisors, some schools also utilized faculty as academic advisors after students' first year. Advisor Craig, from Institution E described his university moving from a faculty advising model to a professional advising model fewer than 10 years ago. Craig admitted that although professional advising was a new model for his institution and that there were a few areas within the university resistant to the new advising model, overall Craig's institution communicated it valued professional advisors' contributions to campus and affirmed that for Institution E, advising was a form of teaching.

When speaking about their institutions' advising models, all advisor participants acknowledged the relationship academic advising and student retention had on their campuses. While acknowledging this relationship, the participants also implied that the relationship between retention and advising could at times create tension for advisors. For example, advisor Patricia, from Institution A, discussed the reality that all students could not be retained and that some students, although enrolled at the institution, were either not yet ready for college or not interested. Patricia shared,

> I mean, I think right now our university is very, very focused on the retention issues, and there are some students who are not ready for college. I mean it's going to be difficult to

> retain them, and we can do everything we can, but that still is going to be difficult, retaining some of the students, but I don't feel like anybody has ever left my office feeling like, "Oh, my advisor thinks I'm too dumb to do this. I am not going to be successful in college."

The advisor participants for this study served mainly first-year undergraduate students, though advisor Patricia, from Institution A also routinely worked with other undergraduates as well because she also specialized in advising for a state scholarship program. While Craig and Lori shared that they served students in particular majors, Patricia shared that she worked with first-generation and low-income students, international students, at-risk students, and students who had not yet declared a major. For all three advisor participants, a typical advising session lasted approximately 30 minutes. Follow-up appointments were available as needed though Craig, Patricia, and Lori all shared that typically their advisees saw them once or twice a semester at minimum and at-risk students had more frequent contact with their advisors. Not all advising centers where these participants were housed required mandatory advising for first-year students. All three advisor participants explained that the topics of advising appointments depended upon what time of year they were meeting with students but often included transition issues, scheduling and registration, goal setting, financial aid, and major or career exploration.

Finally, the various functions of advising at these participants' institutions were discussed. For Craig, course scheduling was often a primary reason why students visited the advising center, though he reiterated that transactional advising was not a primary focus for advising. Instead, Craig described advising as a place for students to ask questions and advisors to provide help. Craig shared that he also worked on goal formation and career planning with students, provided general support, served as a "navigator" for students as they learned about

institutional policies and procedures, and filled a core role for the university beyond curriculum and instruction.

Lori also shared that course registration and goal development were common functions of advising at her institution. Additionally, Lori described herself as a "guide" for students, saying she helped students accurately and efficiently progress through their program's curriculum, understand university policies and procedures, navigate the college experience, and move toward self-advocacy. Lori also helped to motivate students, assist them in locating and utilizing resources, normalize asking for help, and connect students to campus. Lori summarized her function by saying her priority was to meet her students' needs and that "my job is to help them develop as a student, help them become the person that they need to be."

Helping students to navigate higher education also surfaced in my interview with Patricia. She described herself engaged in helping students with tangible things like declaring a major, locating campus resources, developing time management skills, and providing career advising. Patricia also described her function as someone who helps students to build confidence, empowers, encourages, and motivates students and assists students in exploring their passions. Patricia said she strives to serve as a sounding board for students and appreciated opportunities to celebrate students' accomplishments. She also identified collaborating with campus partners and student retention as core functions of her position.

In summary, the form and function of advising emerged as a theme from my interviews with three advisor participants, Craig, Lori, and Patricia. Together we explored the participants' institutional advising models, populations served by the advising centers, and details about advising appointments including typical topics covered, average appointment length and how often advisees saw advisors. Finally, the various ways in which to frame advising were explored,

as well as both the characteristics and functions of advising at participants' institutions were discussed.

Administrators

As administrator participants shared about their institutions' advising models, they focused more broadly, often sharing the history of advising at their institutions or within their advising centers and shared about the various advising models they had encountered throughout their professional careers. For example, administrator Michael, from Institution A, discussed his opportunity to establish numerous advising centers on his campus, speaking of the process for conceptualizing and implementing those centers. Administrators Daniel and Teri, both from Institution C, shared how their university established a division dedicated to providing academic advising and support. Administrator Tarah, from Institution E, discussed how her university utilized both program advisors who primarily assisted students with course scheduling and professional advisors who provided a more holistic, robust advising experience. Tarah also shared that her institution utilized an early alert system in order to provide faculty a way to notify advisors of students who were struggling and described her institution's advising model as "moving toward a centralized model."

All administrator participants were associated with advising centers that served primarily first-year undergraduate students. Some programs also provided support services for at-risk students. For both Daniel and administrator Naomi, from Institution D, their units specialized in advising students who had not yet declared their major.

Participants shared various information regarding advising appointments, including whether or not advising was mandatory, whether or not advisors had set advising rosters, the average length and frequency of meetings, and general topics discussed during advising. For

Institution C, Daniel shared that advising was mandatory for all students to enroll initially at the university but otherwise only required for specific populations, while Teri, also from Institution C, explained that most advisees do not have assigned advisors, with the exception of pre-engineering students and students on academic probation. For administrator Debra, from Institution B, advising is not required for students and, although advisors are assigned a specific group of students to advise, the advisor/advisee pairing was driven more by the student, meaning students were permitted to select to meet with whomever they felt a connection. For Naomi, academic advising is required for students at least once per semester while at Tarah's institution, advising requirements are determined by students' class standing.

Both Michael and Teri indicated a typical advising appointment lasted approximately 30 minutes in their advising centers, while in Naomi's advising center, appointments were likely to last closer to 45 minutes and for Debra's advising center, the student usually determined the length of the appointment. For Tarah's institution, the length of appointments ranged from one hour for first-year students to 30 minutes for sophomores, juniors, and seniors. All advising centers provided mostly one-on-one advising to students. The frequency of advising varied widely among these institutions, with some advisees typically seeing their advisor only once per semester while others advisees might see their advisor multiple times weekly in instances where academic advisors also served as instructors for freshmen transition courses. Students considered at-risk were expected to see their advisor more frequently at most of these institutions.

During my interviews with administrator participants, discussing how these individuals framed academic advising provided important insight for how their advising programs were conceptualized and structured. Michael, at Institution A, shared that his own background, his institution's organizational structure, and his previous experience within student affairs

influenced the way in which he framed academic advising. For Michael, he framed day-to-day advising developmentally, though he admitted the possibility of utilizing a variety of frameworks in advising. Michael also described advising as an organic process where advisors and advisees were “partners in a process” and students could be served holistically.

Echoing Michael, Debra, from Institution B, also attributed her own background and personal experiences for shaping how she framed advising. Throughout her interview Debra, described herself as an “educator” committed to “pouring into the next generation” and shared she strives to create spaces for her students that she would want for herself.

Daniel, from Institution C, also mirrored Michael in that he too framed advising primarily from a student development perspective, attributing this to his personal experience and professional background. Daniel shared that he also framed advising as teaching, due to his association with NACADA. For Teri, also from Institution C, her framing of advising came from her background, her work with students, relevant literature, and her use of intuition in her work.

Mirroring the other administrator participants, Naomi, from Institution D, reiterated that she primarily framed advising from a student development perspective. Naomi attributed her framing of advising in this way to her advising center’s focus on helping students with the transition to college, as well as her undergraduate degree in family and child studies, her graduate work and professional development opportunities.

Of the administrator participants, only Tarah explicitly admitted to framing advising as teaching. She attributed this approach to her experience working with a collaboration between residential life and academic affairs, called a living learning community as well as her previous experience as a faculty member. Tarah also shared that while she framed advising in a particular

way, her advising program was not built upon any particular framework but her unit strived to serve students holistically.

The administrator participants shared a variety of characteristics of advising during our interviews. For example, Debra explained the importance of "being sensitive and aware of where the student is at" developmentally and working to empower students to use their own experiences to their advantage. Additionally, Debra indicated the importance of understanding advising extended beyond knowing curriculum and emphasized the importance of life-long learning for both students and advisors. Daniel addressed during his interview that, despite the potential benefits, not all students engage in advising while Teri emphasized the relational aspect of advising, the importance of developing trust in the advisor/advisee relationship, and her commitment to approaching advisees in a caring and kind manner. Naomi characterized advising as conversational and goal-oriented and shared that for students and from her perspective, students did not differentiate between faculty and professional advisors but instead simply looked "to their academic advisors" for guidance and assistance.

Finally, the various functions of advising were discussed throughout these administrators' interviews. A number of tangible skills were identified by administrators, such as working with students on major and career exploration, connecting students to campus resources, curriculum planning, discussing academic success strategies such as note-taking, study strategies, and coping skills, understanding academic planning tools, and communicating university policies and procedures. Additionally, numerous intangibles were also mentioned. For example, Michael mentioned his advisor centers' role in assisting students with the transition to college, while Debra referenced advising functioning more in a coaching capacity, where advisors helped students navigate the intricacies of higher education and listened to students' "dreams and

aspirations." During our interview Daniel shared that his division strives to help students understand the role of an academic advisor and works to help students develop "their own autonomy, independence, critical-thinking and making these decisions for themselves." For Teri, advising can function as an opportunity to provide parallel planning for students in competitive academic programs so they are prepared early to pivot to a new path should they not be accepted into their first-choice program. Similar to my interviews with advisor participants, Naomi acknowledged the tension present when academic advising and student retention are linked. Speaking on the increased pressure placed on advising regarding retention, she said "and so when you always are focusing on retention it can cause both the student and the advisor to feel like these activities are very transactional." Also echoing advisor participants, Tarah shared that advising often provided students with opportunities to explore their motivation for earning a degree.

In summary, the form and function of advising emerged as a theme from my interviews with six administrator participants, Michael, Debra, Daniel, Teri, Naomi, and Tarah. The history and current structure of institutional advising models were discussed, as well as the populations served by the administrators' advising centers. Various details about the frequency of appointments and the topics discussed during appointments surfaced, as did the framing of advising for these participants. Finally, both the characteristics and functions of advising at participants' institutions were explored.

Advising as Teaching

The second theme that appeared in the data was that all participants in this study affirmed advising as a form of teaching. Many administrators and academic advisors also provided examples of how they saw their staff members or themselves as educators. Most participants

acknowledged their recognition of advising as teaching had at least, in part, been influenced by their involvement with NACADA.

Advisors

All three advisor participants, Craig, Lori, and Patricia, affirmed during our interviews that they thought of advising as teaching. Participants discussed their thoughts conceptually on the idea of advising as teaching, provided examples of advisors serving in instructor roles, and shared examples of various content and skills advisors teach. For example, when asked about his thoughts on advising as teaching, advisor participant Craig, from Institution E, responded in this way:

> I think it is. I mean, a few of our academic advisors actually do physically teach on campus. They teach things like freshmen seminars and things. But what we are able to do, a lot of times in the classroom, it's difficult for instructors in every single class to relate this back to the future and to career planning and to where you want to go beyond here.

Similarly, advisor participant Lori, also from Institution E, summarized her thoughts on advising as teaching by sharing:

> I think it's very important that we see this as a teaching role and that our job is to help them learn how to navigate and self-advocate and be a part of the campus, and who to reach out to and where to go and how to do even just simple processes that you wouldn't think about. So, I think it's really important that we see it as a teaching experience, not just us here is how you do everything here and get out of my office.

Like participants Craig and Lori, advisor participant Patricia, from Institution A, also affirmed that she considered advising as teaching and referred to this concept as an idea that was

"coming back" to discussions throughout professional advising organizations. Throughout our interview, Patricia referred to herself as an educator. She confirmed that at her institution academic advisors served as instructors for freshmen transition courses. In addition to teaching this course, Patricia also routinely taught a developmental reading course at her institution to help stay attuned to students' changing characteristics and needs. Patricia was familiar with the idea of pedagogy and shared the importance of providing scaffolding for students to help ensure academic and personal success. Throughout our interview, Patricia likened advising to educating and that, as educators, advisors should constantly adapt to the changing needs of the student body and should consistently remind students to take ownership of their college experience. She describes helping students take ownership in this way:

> And, that is another part of my advising that I do is, "Okay, you don't like that and you're not used to that. How are you going to adjust to that and how are you going to learn from that kind of situation? Because I've got news for you, that professor is not going to change."

In terms of content, Patricia provided examples of how she worked with students to examine the information they gathered in both their academic and personal lives and apply it toward their success. For instance, Patricia shared that when reaching out to students about midterm grade concerns, she would put the responsibility back on the student, tasking them with collecting information about what was happening in class and in their personal lives which contributed to the poor academic performance and then exploring together how the student might improve.

Administrators

Like the advisor participants, all six administrator participants affirmed considering advising as a form of teaching, though most administrators admitted that this concept was not the

primary organizing principle for their programs. For example, administrator participant Michael, from Institution A shared his familiarity with concepts of pedagogy and discussed his commitment as an administrator to help shift the institution's perspective of advising, saying, "I think practically, there are some things that our area has done since I've been here at [Institution A] where I believe that we're really trying to approach advising from a teaching perspective." He also clarified that, at his institution, advising is classified for faculty as teaching instead of service and identified this as a significant shift in institutional perspective. Michael went on to articulate advising as an "academic pursuit" where advisors and advisees could learn from each other, stating:

> I think from my perspective, connecting to the academic side of things does make the most sense. And so, maybe that also frames the way I think about advising as teaching is that, from my perspective, it is an academic pursuit per se, but it is also very relational.

Michael provided an example of advising as teaching by describing the overlap between the two endeavors at his institution. There, academic advisors served as instructors for the university's freshman transition courses. Advisees in the courses were assigned to the instructors for academic advising and various aspects of academic advising were incorporated into the curriculum for these courses.

Administrator Debra, from Institution B, affirmed advising as teaching as well, describing advising as "indirectly" a form of teaching. Throughout our interview Debra identified herself as an educator and referred to advisors as educators. Debra also shared her awareness that considering advising as teaching was not a universal concept. Similarly to Debra, administrator participant Naomi, from Institution D, affirmed advising as teaching, specifically

describing advising as “teaching in a non-formal setting” and emphasized the importance of exploring this conceptual framework.

Both administrators from Institution C, Daniel and Teri, affirmed advising as teaching. Teri, for example, shared how their advising center used an advising syllabus to help communicate to students how to conceptualize advising as a class to progress through. Teri, who even as an administrator continues to advise students, described an example of how she used advising as teaching by providing instruction to students, assigning them tasks to complete, and inviting them back to review and assess their work. She also shared recommending to her advising staff that they should gradually increase the difficulty of tasks assigned to advisees to best meet their educational abilities at that moment. Echoing advisor participant Patricia, from Institution A, Daniel, though he affirmed advising as teaching, perceived that this conceptual framework did not currently get much attention from NACADA. However, Daniel explained poignantly,

> I think advising is absolutely a type of teaching. I think it is a critical pedagogical role that we play in higher education. Quite honestly, I think that academic advising needs to be better respected or better acknowledged. That’s probably the better word to use, for the role that we play in teaching, and really critical to the teaching role that higher education plays. So I think we are all about teaching, quite honestly.

Daniel went on to argue that viewing advising as teaching could be an effective tool to more broadly articulate the value of academic advising. He explained the challenge in this way:

> The thing that is difficult for me, being in this profession and living this all the time, is looking at how academic advisors are viewed on college campuses. We’re still not viewed at the level of a lot of folks, a lot of categories of people on campuses, and to me

> it's really advising is teaching. It's something that we've got to utilize to continue to enhance the profession and help faculty members see the critical role that academic advising plays.

Finally, administrator participant Tarah, from Institution E, shared a myriad of ways in which advising was teaching from her perspective. Whereas at Institution A, advising for faculty was not recognized as teaching, at Tarah's institution, professional advisors were classified by Human Resources in the same way as faculty. Like Teri at Institution C, Tarah described her advising center's use of an advising syllabus as well as their use of learning outcomes and objectives. At Tarah's institution, some academic advisors also taught freshman transition courses, echoing the structure at Institution A. Furthermore, Tarah described advising and teaching as "interconnected" and advising having a "partnership with teaching" where success in the classroom was related to advising services. Tarah went on to explain:

> I'm a very firm believer that learning at the higher education level is not something that just happens in the classroom. I think higher education is a broader experience and I think learning takes place in lots of different environments and scenarios and contexts within higher education. I think the classroom is one example of where that learning takes place. So, because that learning is taking place in other ways, it makes sense that teaching would also be taking place in other contexts as well.

Like Naomi, Tarah also shared during our interview the importance of researching the topic of advising as teaching, identifying this topic as a gap in the literature, as well as the necessity of bringing awareness to the field of advising through empirical research.

In summary, all nine participants affirmed the idea that advising was a form of teaching. Both administrators and academic advisors provided various examples of how they saw their

staff members or themselves as educators. Additionally, this theme from the data revealed that most participants acknowledged their recognition of advising as teaching was at least in part influenced by their involvement with NACADA.

Learning Theories Used in Advising

The third theme that emerged from the data was that most participants either were not familiar with specific learning theories or admitted that learning theory paradigms were not the primary way in which they consciously framed advising or structured their advising programs. There were a few instances during my interviews with participants where learning theories were identified, including social learning theory (Bandura, 1971), Bloom's (1956) taxonomy of learning domains and adult learner theory (Knowles, 1973). Although most participants did not cite specific learning theories or learning theory paradigms, their examples and experiences alluded to familiarity with Freire's (1972) critical pedagogy, Fleming and Mills' (1992) learning styles, and Kolb's (1984) experiential learning theory.

Advisors

This phenomenological study revealed advisor participants lacked knowledge regarding specific learning theories or learning theory paradigms. For example, advisor participant Craig, from Institution E, stated he did not use any specific learning theories within his work. Similarly, participant Lori, also from Institution E, did not specify learning theories used in her work, although she did briefly mention her awareness of research on learning styles (Fleming & Mills, 1992).

Advisor participant Patricia, from Institution A, did identify Bloom's (1956) taxonomy as a theory she used in her work and spoke specifically about how the affective domain can determine whether at-risk students would be successful academically. For example, Patricia

discussed how, when working with students who were struggling academically, she would explore with them their feelings and attitudes toward their education and the value they placed on earning a college degree. Patricia also implied the ideas of Freire's (1972) critical pedagogy and the value of experiential learning (Kolb, 1984). For instance, Patricia referenced helping students move from understanding education as an experience where professors "open up [their] heads and pour knowledge in" to one where professors and students are both learners within the classroom and students are active participants in the learning process. Furthermore, discussing her work with students on academic probation, Patricia shared how she worked with students to reflect on the experience of struggling academically, consider what steps they could put into place to improve, and then put those steps into practice to move back into good academic standing with the institution. Like advisor participant Lori, Patricia also shared her familiarity with Fleming and Mills' (1992) VARK model of learning styles, which posits students use *visual*, *aural*, *read/write*, and *kinesthetic* methods for learning information.

Administrators

The administrator participants for this study also lacked familiarity with learning theories or learning theory paradigms, though a few specific theories were mentioned. For example, administrator participant Michael, from Institution A, referenced Bloom's (1956) taxonomy "as kind of a starting point for how we help our students" given the particular populations his university served. Neither participant Naomi, Daniel, nor Tarah named any specific learning theories they utilized in their advising centers. While administrator participant Teri, from Institution C, claimed during our interview not to have a background in theory, she did reference throughout our discussion both social learning theory (Bandura, 1971) and adult learner theory (Knowles, 1973). Echoing both advisor participants Patricia, from Institution A and Lori, from

Institution E, Teri also referenced learning styles (Fleming & Mills, 1992) influencing her advising work.

To summarize, I explored the theme of learning theories within my three interviews with advisors and six interviews with administrators. Though the data indicated most participants either were not familiar with specific learning theories or learning theory paradigms, there were instances during my interviews with participants where learning theories were identified by name, including social learning theory (Bandura, 1971), Bloom's (1956) taxonomy of learning domains, and adult learner theory (Knowles, 1973). Although most participants did not cite specific learning theories or learning theory paradigms, their examples and experiences alluded to familiarity with Freire's (1972) critical pedagogy, Fleming and Mills' (1992) learning styles, and Kolb's (1984) experiential learning theory.

Other Theories Used in Advising

The fourth theme to emerge from the data was that participants were much more likely to utilize other theories to frame their advising and advising programs. Student development theories were cited most often, including Astin's (1984) theory of involvement, Baxter Magolda's (2001) theory of self-authorship, Chickering's (1969) identity development theory, Kohlberg's (1981) stages of moral development, Perry's (1970) theory of intellectual and ethical development, Sanford's (1962) theory of challenge and support, Schlossberg's (1984) transition theory and Tinto's (1993) model of institutional departure. Participants also specifically cited Bolman and Deal's (1991) leadership models, Brown's (2012) work on shame and vulnerability, Cross' (1991) racial identity development theory, and Dick and Carey's (1985) model of instructional design as influencing their work. Additionally, participants cited appreciative

advising, developmental advising, and intrusive advising as specific models that influenced their approach to advising.

Advisors

The findings for this study found that advisor participants' lack of familiarity with learning theories extended to their knowledge and utilization of other theories, as well. For advisor participant Craig, from Institution E, he shared that he did not necessarily think of his daily work with students in the context of theory application. He explained his relationship to theories in this way:

> It's interesting because I knew you were going to ask something about this. So I was talking to my coworkers yesterday and I'm like, I never really know. I know about models and what NACADA says, but I never actually know what I'm doing at any given time based on those. And I know that there's appreciative advising, and I know that there's more of an intrusive advising, and I know that there's other theories on teaching, but because I haven't actually formally had that education, it's one of those where I don't necessarily recall them at any given time. It's not like I'm interacting with a student and I'm like, oh, I'm being appreciative right now.

Instead of specific theories, Craig referenced both appreciative advising and intrusive advising as models he incorporated into his advising practice.

Advisor participant Patricia, from Institution A, also referenced advising models instead of specific theories when describing her work. Like Craig, Patricia named appreciative advising as influential in her advising work. She also used the term "reflective advising" to describe how she worked with students, emphasizing "valuing the student for who they are and for whatever experience they're going through is important."

Administrators

Administrator participants named numerous theories that influenced their work, with the majority of those theories being student development theories. For example, Tinto's (1993) model of institutional departure was named as influential to the work of administrator participant Debra, from Institution B, administrator participant Naomi, from Institution D, and administrator participant Teri, from Institution C. Both Naomi and Teri, as well as administrator participant Daniel, from Institution C, also referenced Schlossberg's (1984) transition theory as important to their advising practice. Additionally, Naomi mentioned both Astin's (1984) theory of involvement and Chickering's (1969) identity development theories as instrumental in her work. Administrator participant Michael, as well as both Daniel and Teri, all referenced Baxter Magolda's (1983) theory of self-authorship as the main theory that influenced their advising centers as well as their personal approaches to academic advising. Other student development theories cited during these interviews included Michael naming Sanford's (1962) theory of challenge and support, Daniel referencing Kohlberg's (1981) stages of moral development and Perry's (1970) theory of intellectual and ethical development as being prevalent in their work.

In addition to student development theories, the administrator participants cited other theories that influenced their work and their advising programs. For instance, Michael commented on the impact Bolman and Deal's (1991) leadership models made on his work as an administrator. For Naomi, Cross's (1991) racial identity development theory had a significant influence on her work while Debra cited Brown's (2012) work on shame and vulnerability. For Daniel, Dick and Carey's (1985) model of instructional design had a significant impact on his work, particularly in the areas of training and professional development for his advising staff. Echoing advisor participants Craig and Patricia, Debra cited the model of appreciative advising

while Naomi reiterated that the model of developmental advising was a primary influencer for her advising program.

In summary, the fourth theme to emerge from the data related to the variety of other theories participants utilized to frame their advising and advising programs, with student development theories cited most often. Participants also specifically cited Bolman and Deal's (1991) leadership models, Brown's (2012) work on shame and vulnerability, Cross' (1991) racial identity development theory, and Dick and Carey's (1985) model of instructional design as influencing their work. Additionally, participants cited appreciative advising, developmental advising, and intrusive advising as specific models that influenced their approach to advising.

The Value of Advising

The fifth theme that emerged from these data was the participants' abilities to articulate the value of advising. In particular, the value of advising from the student, participant, and institution's perspectives were discussed. Additionally, a recognition of the value of utilizing various theories within the field of academic advising, as well as the possibility of requiring a specific credential in order to elevate the profession of advising were present in the data.

Advisors

Advisor participants Craig, Lori, and Patricia spoke mainly on how they valued advising and what they perceived students valued about advising. For example, advisor participant Craig, from Institution E, valued both the amount of student contact he had within his position at the university as well as the campus connections he had established. Craig described students valuing the relationship and emotional connections built between advisor and advisee at Institution E. Like Craig, advisor participant Lori, also from Institution E, valued the amount of student contact she had in her position as well as working for a supervisor who had direct

advising experience and knew the job she asked her staff to complete. As for her students, Lori stated that her advisees valued having a consistent resource, sharing “it’s really important to actually have that contact and for them as well. They need to know someone’s there for them.”

Advisor participant Patricia, from Institution A, perceived that students value the accessibility and knowledge their advisor could provide. She said during our interview that students “recognize, okay, you have information that I may not necessarily get from my peers or I may not necessarily get from my professors.” Patricia also mentioned that her advisees valued the relationship that could develop between advisors and students, indicating that advising was much more than just disseminating information. Patricia shared “you can give them all the websites in the world, but they want to talk to somebody.”

Administrators

Administrator participants spoke mostly to their perceptions of what students valued about advising as well as the value their institution placed on academic advising. Only administrator participant Teri, from Institution C, shared what she valued about advising. For Teri, it was important to serve as an administrator who continued to advise students directly. Teri also valued maintaining a proximity to the student experience through consistent student interaction.

Both administrator participant Debra, from Institution B, and administrator participant Daniel, from Institution C, discussed what they thought students valued about academic advising. Debra explained that students valued authenticity, relatability, and vulnerability from their advisors as well have acceptance, approval, and validation. She also stated that students were looking for advisors who listened without judgement and valued them as people. From

Daniel's perspective, students also valued advisors who could accurately provide answers when students' sought help.

Administrator participants Michael, Naomi, and Tarah all referenced how their institutions valued academic advising during our interviews. Michael described advising as "under a microscope" and shared that faculty have not been asked to prove their effectiveness to the extent as student service units. He went on to say that advising could be placed at risk when executive leadership had concerns about student persistence and retention and emphasized the importance of advising programs effectively articulating their value to the institution. Michael shared:

> Advising seems to be more than a check the box kind of activity. We've defined it as a high impact activity and so if we're not able to prove that steady impact, I sometimes get nervous that folks will just look at retention rates and enrollment and start to say, "Well, maybe we don't need advising." And, I would say we absolutely do and we have to find effective ways to articulate that.

For Michael, connecting advising to academics and building relationships with faculty and academic departments were tangible ways to demonstrate the effectiveness of advising programs. At Naomi's institution, academic advising was seen as valuable because of its ability to impact positively persistence and retention. From Tarah's perspective, academic advising is "undervalued as a part of the higher ed experience. And I think the weight that it carries in terms of the students' ability to be successful is often underestimated."

Finally, both Michael and Daniel emphasized the value of utilizing theory in the field of academic advising to advance the profession. For example, Michael shared that one of his staff members was a social worker and they had discussed "bringing discipline-based concepts to the

advising process" in order to expand advisors' breadth and depth of knowledge. Daniel also spoke of the value of using theory within academic advising, highlighting the various experiences staff members bring to advising, and considering the possibility of introducing a credential required to practice advising, all in an effort to elevate the field. During our interview he shared:

> Part of this might even one day get into looking at actual certification for academic advisors, a national certification, like school counselors have. They are licensed school counselors, licensed by the professional organization based on their academic experiences or professional experiences. That is something that I think we need to be moving towards and forward as a profession. And I think that the more we can be thinking about how we utilize theory, the background of advisors, the significant role that advisors play in higher education, the more we can do to really enhance this profession.

To summarize, the participants' ability to articulate the value of advising emerged as a theme in these data. In particular, the value of advising from the student, participant, and institution's perspectives was discussed. A recognition of the value of utilizing various theories within the field of academic advising, as well as the possibility of requiring a specific credential in order to enhance the profession of advising were also present in the data.

Document Review

To explore how my participants' perspectives on the framing of advising as teaching aligned or diverged from the institution's published materials, I reviewed documents accessible via each of the five Midwestern institution's websites. For this review, I considered eight elements noted in the following questions: (1) did the institution have a statement in their undergraduate course catalog regarding the main goals of academic advising?, (2) did the

institution outline the advisor's responsibilities to the undergraduate student related to academic advising?, (3) did the institution outline the undergraduate student's responsibilities related to academic advising?, (4) did the institution outline learning objectives for academic advising?, (5) did the advising center have a statement regarding the main goals of academic advising?, (6) did the advising center outline the advisor's responsibilities to the undergraduate student related to academic advising?, (7) did the advising center outline the undergraduate student's responsibilities related to academic advising?, (8) did the advising center outline learning objectives for academic advising?

Overall, data gathered from the document review aligned with information gathered during participant interviews. Documents at both the institutional and advising center levels focused mainly on the form and function of advising at each university. No documents explicitly identified any theories that framed the institutions' advising programs. Institution A and Institution C did provide a list of learning outcomes at both the institution level and program level. Overall, documents for Institution A satisfied all eight elements within the document review, while documents for Institution C met seven of the eight elements. Documents for Institution B met four of the eight elements and Institutions D and E met three of the eight elements. Table 2 summarizes the data I gathered during the document review process.

Table 2

Summary of Document Review

	Did the institution have a statement in their undergraduate course catalog regarding the main goals of academic advising?	Did the institution outline the advisor's responsibilities to the undergraduate student related to academic advising?	Did the institution outline the undergraduate student's responsibilities related to academic advising?	Did the institution outline learning objectives for academic advising?	Did the advising center have a statement regarding the main goals of academic advising?	Did the advising center outline the advisor's responsibilities to the undergraduate student related to academic advising?	Did the advising center outline the undergraduate student's responsibilities related to academic advising?	Did the advising center outline learning objectives for academic advising?
Institution A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Institution B	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Institution C	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Institution D	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Institution E	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No

Summary

My intention for this study was to produce additional empirical data and contribute to the body of literature on academic advising by capturing the lived experiences of academic advisors and advising administrators as they frame advising as teaching. To triangulate data collected for this study, I conducted nine semi-structured interviews with three professional advisors and six advising administrators. These participants represented a total of five Midwest, four-year, public, higher education institutions. I also reviewed official documents referencing academic advising from each institution which were available on the associated websites to gain an understanding of how advising is framed at the institution and program levels. This research study focused on two main research questions, each with two sub-questions: (1) what are academic advisors' perceptions on the framing of academic advising as a form of teaching?, (1a) how are learning theory paradigms utilized by academic advisors?, (1b) how are other paradigms utilized by academic advisors?, (2) what are academic advising administrators' perceptions on the framing of academic advising as a form of teaching?, (2a) how are learning theory paradigms utilized by academic advising administrators?, (2b) how are other paradigms utilized by academic advising administrators? Chapter 5 will address the implications, recommendations, and conclusions of this phenomenological study.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Academic advising has been clearly demonstrated as a critical function within higher education with implications for students, faculty, and institutions (Drake, 2011; Museus & Ravello, 2010; Swecker et al., 2013; Tinto, 1993; Young-Jones et al., 2018). For students, academic advising can provide guidance, mentorship, and encouragement. For the faculty and staff providing advising services, advising can provide opportunities to introduce students to fields of inquiry, foster learning, and build fulfilling professional relationships. For institutions, effective advising models have been employed as a method to impact retention and graduation positively.

Since the publication of B. B. Crookston's (1972) article calling for academic advising to be re-conceptualized as an educational activity, NACADA: The Global Community for Academic Advising, has supported framing advising as a form of teaching. For more than three decades, scholar–practitioners have published on the various ways in which academic advising is a form of teaching (Appleby, 2001; Hughes, 2014; Hurt, 2007; Lowenstein, 2005; Pizzolato, 2008; Ryan, 1992). However, due to a dearth of existing empirical research demonstrating the ways in which advising is conceptualized as teaching in advisors' practice and administrators' program design, I created this phenomenological study. This research aimed to produce additional empirical data and further contribute to the body of literature on academic advising by

capturing the lived experiences of academic advisors and advising administrators as they framed advising as teaching. Using a social constructivist interpretive framework, I conducted semi-structured interviews and document reviews to study how advisors and advising administrators used learning theory paradigms or other paradigms to shape their daily work and advising programs. Ultimately, I collected valuable data to demonstrate the ways in which advising was conceptualized and practiced by these participants.

Discussion

This section will discuss the findings of my interviews with both academic advisors and advising administrators, as well as my document review. Although five themes emerged as a result of this phenomenological study, three themes were particularly strong. Therefore, this section, organized by the study's research questions, will examine the themes of advising as teaching, the use of learning theories in advising, and the use of other theories in advising as it connects to the study's literature review.

Research Question 1

The first research question for this study was designed to examine academic advisors' perceptions on the framing of advising as teaching. Through semi-structured interviews, the advisor participants and I discussed how they used learning theory paradigms as well as other paradigms to shape their academic advising practice. Important insights were captured regarding how these advisors approached their work.

Specifically, I explored how the learning theory paradigms of behaviorism, cognitivism, constructivism, and humanism could be utilized when framing advising as teaching, in order to contribute to the body of knowledge on academic advising in higher education. While all the advisor participants within this study affirmed that advising could be framed as teaching, they

lacked familiarity with learning theories and learning theory paradigms and admitted that they primarily framed their work using developmental approaches to advising. In fact, only one advisor participant referenced a specific learning theory, Bloom's (1956) taxonomy, during the interviews. However, while only one participant cited a specific theory, examples provided of advisors' practice implied Freire's (1972) critical pedagogy and Kolb's (1984) experiential learning theories. Advisors' examples of helping students to become active participants in the learning process and equipping students to reflect on an academic experience, consider what steps to take to improve their situation, and practice putting those steps into action demonstrated learning theories. Therefore, despite lacking the language of the cognitivism and humanism learning paradigms, the experiences these advisor participants shared with me indicated learning theory paradigms were indeed utilized in their advising practice.

The behaviorist learning theory paradigm, as defined by Graham (2015), is that which "purports to explain human and animal behavior in terms of external physical stimuli, responses, learning histories and (for certain types of behavior) reinforcements" (section 2, para. 2). Similarly, Harasim (2012) explained that behaviorism "focuses on that which is observable: how people behave and especially how to change or elicit particular behaviors" (p. 31) and described behaviorism as "the earliest theory of learning developed" (p. 45). Because of its emphasis on rote learning and the completion of tasks, behaviorism could be used to frame academic advising. The findings of this study, specifically the emergent theme of the form and function of advising, support White and Schulenberg's (2012) assertion that "all advisors acknowledge that there is a certain amount of administrative minutia that all students need to know to be successful students" (p. 14). As advisor participants described their work with students, examples of rote learning were provided such as helping advisees build an understanding of basic timelines and

registration processes so that eventually they could complete the registration process independently.

The cognitivism learning theory paradigm, as described by Harasim (2012) is organized around an instructor delivering knowledge to learners. Within cognitivism, the main emphasis focuses on how knowledge is gathered, processed, and activated by learners (Anderson et al., 1997; Greeno et al., 1997; Yilmaz, 2011). The findings of this study provided an example of cognitivism being utilized in academic advising, as one advisor participant described the importance of understanding and applying Bloom's (1956) taxonomy to her work with advisees. For example, she described working with students to help them understand the course registration process, use a curriculum map to plan for courses, navigate the registration timeline to prepare in advance and register on time, and analyze curricular demands to make informed decisions about course loads while balancing personal decisions such as work and social commitment. Additionally, participants implied the use of cognitivism in their practice as they described where, together with their advisees, they engaged together in discovery or problem-based learning as the student explored alternate major or career options after initially struggling academically in their first declared major. This study's findings demonstrated instances where, functioning as more of a facilitator, advisors assisted their students in gathering, processing through, and activating knowledge relating to their academic and personal journeys through higher education.

The constructivist learning theory paradigm focuses on how a learner makes sense of her world, where knowledge is made instead of discovered (Bredo, 2000; Moon, 2004; Yilmaz, 2008) and meaning is made through experience (Bednar et al., 1991). Regarding advisor participants, the constructivist paradigm appeared in one participant's example of encouraging

her students to examine their experiences. In her example, the advisor helped students to reflect upon an issue, understand that issue, and create plausible solutions, thereby implying a constructivist paradigm.

As stated by Silva (2018), “The main premise of humanism is that people have a natural potential for learning and significant learning takes place when an individual can see that the subject matter is relevant to him” (p. 16). Arghode et al. (2017) added to Silva’s definition by describing humanistic learning as one which “includes motivation, decision-making, and responsiveness” (p. 602) and stated, “Humanism envisions a holistic perspective by emphasizing how individuals learn, develop and attain an ideal self-actualization state” (p. 602). Findings from this study support that humanism is indeed utilized by academic advisors. Advisor participants implied both Freire (1972) and Kolb (1984) as theorists whose ideas about learning were incorporated into their work with advisees. Additionally, advisor participants in this study supported Arghode et al. (2017) as they frequently described working with students to explore their motivation for earning a college degree or pursuing a particular major as well as serving their advisees holistically. Another example of humanism within these data were participants’ emphasis on building positive relationships and trust with their advisees in order to enhance the advising experience.

In addition to learning theory paradigms, I explored the use of other theories in the practice of academic advising with my advisor participants. While each advisor participant affirmed that advising was a form of teaching, they also shared that their daily practice primarily utilized a more developmental approach with students. Although a range of other theories were not present in the data gathered from advisor participants, those advisors did share in their interviews their use of additional advising models with their students, including appreciative

advising, intrusive advising, and reflective advising. Therefore, it could be suggested that findings from this study provided at least some support for Filson and Whittington's (2013) research, which countered the claim that advising was a form of teaching. However, it was also clear from this study that while advisor participants did not primarily use learning theory paradigms to frame their practice, they did not struggle to conceptualize advising as teaching.

Overall, findings from my research with advisor participants implied the utilization of learning theory paradigms as well as other paradigms in academic advising. Although the academic advisors who participated in this study did not credit themselves as having much familiarity with learning theory paradigms, some participants cited specific learning theories they used in their work. More significantly, the participants' examples of their work with advisees both explicitly and implicitly aligned with applications of behaviorism, cognitivism, constructivism, and humanism. Additionally, my findings demonstrated that advisor participants consciously used more frequently other paradigms to frame their advising practice.

Research Question 2

The intent of my second research question was to examine advising administrators' perceptions on the framing of advising as teaching. Through semi-structured interviews, the administrator participants and I discussed how they used learning theory paradigms as well as other paradigms to shape their academic advising practice and their advising programs. Important insights were captured regarding how these administrators approached their work.

All administrator participants within this study affirmed that advising can be framed as teaching. However, only a few learning theories were explicitly cited during our interviews. Specifically, Bloom's (1956) taxonomy, Bandura's (1971) social learning theory, and Knowles' (1973) adult learner theory, as well as Fleming and Mills' (1992) VARK model of learning styles

were named by administrators as learning theories prevalent in their work and advising programs.

Evidence of behaviorism presented in both my interviews with advising administrators and the results of my document review as these findings demonstrated the utilization of learning objectives as a means of assessing student learning in the advising environment. These findings support Ralph Tyler's (1949) influential work regarding learning objectives and demonstrate a clear connection to advising as teaching. Furthermore, my findings with advising administrators' and institutions' use of learning objectives to assess their advising programs supported Hurt (2007) who claimed that, because advising was teaching, "classroom assessment techniques [could] be adapted to [provide] feedback about their advisees' progression mastering learning outcomes" (p. 38).

Echoing advisor participants, findings demonstrated advising administrators' explicit use of cognitivism in their advising programs. Specifically, administrators shared their use of both Bloom's (1956) taxonomy as well as Bandura's (1971) social learning theory within their advising programs. Additionally, cognitivism appeared in the data as some administrators described their programs helping students to explore their own understanding of the value of curriculum and higher education.

No explicit evidence of the constructivist paradigm appeared in my data for advisor administrator participants or within the document review. However, one application of constructivism is reflective practice. Therefore, constructivism could be applied to this study by considering participation in this research a reflective practice. By doing so, the application of constructivism within academic advising could be considered present.

Humanism also presented in my findings with advising administrators. In particular, Knowles' (1973) adult learner theory was cited as influential for one advisor administrator's work. Additionally, serving students holistically was frequently discussed by administrator participants, as was a concern for developing learner-centered advising programs. Furthermore, the humanism paradigm was implied by administrators through their conceptualizing of advisors as facilitators and advisees as responsible for their own learning as it might relate to navigating higher education or understanding graduation requirements.

In addition to learning theory paradigms, I explored the use of other theories to frame advising and advising programs with my advising administrator participants. While all administrator participants affirmed that advising was a form of teaching, my findings indicated that student development theories were more often used to frame these participants' advising programs. In particular, my study found that Astin's (1984) theory of involvement, Baxter Magolda's (2001) theory of self-authorship, Chickering's (1969) identity development theory, Kohlberg's (1981) stages of moral development, Perry's (1970) theory of intellectual and ethical development, Sanford's (1962) theory of challenge and support, Schlossberg's (1984) transition theory and Tinto's (1993) model of institutional departure were specific student development theories used by administrator participants. In addition to student development theories, Bolman and Deal's (1991) leadership models, Brown's (2012) work on shame and vulnerability, Cross' (1991) racial identity development theory, and Dick and Carey's (1985) model of instructional design were also cited by administrator participants as influential to their advising programs. Like my findings with advisor participants, these findings also support Filson and Whittington's (2013) research, which countered the claim that advising was a form of teaching.

Implications

The following section will address the implications of this phenomenological study. I will discuss how the findings of this study contribute to the current body of knowledge, provide examples of how my findings support current research, and provide plausible explanations as to why student development theories primarily framed participants' practice. Finally, I will provide recommendations for how to equip advisors and administrators better to utilize learning theory paradigms in their work.

First, my study assisted in addressing the lack of research in the field of academic advising. Despite some literature available regarding the application of learning theories to academic advising, the results of this study addressed a significant gap in regard to applying learning paradigms to the advising environment. For example, Polson and Cashin (1981) stated, "There exists a limited amount of truly experimental research in current literature on advising" (p. 36), and urged practitioners to pursue research in advising to further the field. Furthermore, Habley (2009) argued that the precarious position of advising was due to a history of proponents arguing its value without demonstrating effectiveness through a quality body of research. Therefore, by pursuing this research, I contributed to the body of knowledge on academic advising and aid in demonstrating academic advising as a legitimate field of inquiry. Additionally, McGill (2016) wrote that "although many outside the field do not fully recognize its purpose and potential, increasingly academic advising is seen as a teaching and learning endeavor . . . but absent in the literature are practitioner accounts examining the connection between teaching and advising" (p. 51). By conducting this phenomenological study and capturing the lived experiences of both academic advisors and advising administrators on the

framing of advising as teaching, examples were provided of practitioners' accounts of this endeavor to address the gap in the literature identified by McGill.

I also used this study to address counterarguments in the literature, as participants shared that not all students fully engaged with academic advising centers and admitted that considerable time was invested in helping students reframe their understanding of the intent and purpose of advising as well as a college education. For example, Hagstrom et al. (1997) admitted that "several students believed advisors could not help them in any way" (p. 27), indicating the necessity of continuing to find ways in which to communicate explicitly the value of advising to students and parents. Similarly, Donaldson et al. (2016) specified a lack of buy-in from students regarding required advising and a lack of advisor availability as challenges. Recognizing that first-year students often struggle to understand the roles and responsibilities of academic advisors, several researchers highlighted the importance of helping to shape and manage students' expectations. Given that multiple studies revealed first-year students often expected advisors to function similarly to high school guidance counselors (Walker et al., 2017), my findings revealed that developing additional strategies for how to do this effectively is worthwhile.

The results of this study indicate that student development theories, as opposed to learning theories, were more consciously utilized by the advisor and administrator participants to frame advising practices at their institutions. I would suggest this is likely related to more student affairs professionals making an intentional decision to transition to academic affairs by way of academic advising as well as current administrators seeking terminal degrees in programs such as higher education administration. For example, in this study, half of the administrator participants either held previous professional positions within student affairs or were pursuing a

doctoral degree in higher education and credited those experiences as influential in framing their advising practice and advising programs.

These findings suggest that advising administrators' perceptions of academic advising and decisions regarding how to create and implement their advising centers heavily influenced their advisors' framing and practice of academic advising. For example, in the instances where I interviewed advisors and administrators from the same institution, these participants often utilized similar language to describe how both advising and students were approached within the advising center, thereby demonstrating a triangulation of the data. This alignment of perceptions and practice, while perhaps anticipated, certainly demonstrates the significant influence a single administrator can have on an advising unit responsible for serving hundreds or thousands of students. In this study, each administrator participant seemed to understand the weight their position carried and the substantial responsibility they had for their staff and students.

In addition to student development theories, this phenomenological study demonstrated that advising was framed using a variety of perspectives, including various theoretical viewpoints such as leadership models, racial identity development, and contemporary research on shame and vulnerability, as well as various advising models such as intrusive advising, developmental advising, and reflective advising. This demonstration of various perspectives influencing advising supports Schulenburg and Lindhorst's (2008) claim that "professional academic advisors have increasingly varied academic and professional backgrounds and diverse journeys into advising. Advisors from varied academic backgrounds need to recognize more explicitly their theoretical perspectives and consider their contributions to the theories and practice of advising" (p. 49). Therefore, I suggest this study can be used as an example of the

importance of recognizing and celebrating academic advising as complex work enhanced by the utilization of various theoretical perspectives.

While Schulenberg and Lindhorst (2008) suggested that using the metaphor of advising as teaching did not "adequately [represent] the full purpose, value, or effect of academic advising" (p. 43), I suggest that framing advising as teaching provides an invitation to practitioners to consider their work integral to the higher education landscape. Given that all of the participants in this study affirmed the framing of advising as teaching, this perspective seems to serve as a tangible entry point to the more scholarly side of academic advising. By providing practitioners opportunities to engage in research, particularly studies such as this one which highlight participants' lived experiences and voices, advisors and advising administrators contribute to advancing the field and promote the building of a deeper body of knowledge related to academic advising.

Finally, in addition to recognizing advising as complex work and encouraging advisors and administrators to embrace their various educational backgrounds to serve students best, my findings demonstrate the importance of continuous professional development for both advisors and advising administrators. In order to approach advising from a variety of perspectives, practitioners must be regularly exposed to various viewpoints and given ample opportunities to ponder a myriad of theoretical perspectives as they reflect on the context of academic advising. Ultimately, by equipping practitioners with the knowledge and language of scholarship, they may be more interested and willing to engage in scholarly work that advances the field of academic advising.

Limitations and Recommendations for Future Research

Despite the value of this study's findings and its applications, discussing the limitations of the research is necessary. Likewise, even with the value added to the field by this study's findings, the process of conducting this study and the findings from this study prompt the consideration of additional questions. This section will discuss the three limitations of the study and explore recommendations for future research.

Limitations

First, as the primary researcher, I acknowledge that I developed this study out of a passion for my daily work as an advising administrator. As someone invested in the field of academic advising, I recognized the critical importance of my own potential for bias throughout the data collection, analysis, and findings phases. Because of this, I adhered to validation standards in order to maintain the integrity of the study.

Second, academic advising is operationalized in various ways across American campuses depending on the institution's philosophy on advising and the resources available. Expectedly, I captured variety during data collection, despite purposefully narrowing the focus of this study to five Midwest, four-year, public institutions of higher education which utilize professional academic advisors. Although variety is not inherently negative and is often expected with qualitative research, it added a layer of challenge to the coding and identification of emergent themes for this study.

Third, the honesty of each participant served as a limitation. Although it should be assumed that all participants engaged with me during interviews openly and honestly, given that the information was self-reported and not verified in any way, what each participant shared or withheld must be recognized as a limitation. To create an environment conducive to open

dialogue during the Skype and phone interviews, as the primary researcher for this study, I did intentionally take time at the start of each interview to build rapport with participants, in an effort to assure those participants felt comfortable and at ease during the process.

Recommendations for Future Research

The field of academic advising is underrepresented in empirical research (Habley, 2009; McGill, 2016; Polson & Cashin, 1981). Therefore, I urge practitioners in the field to consider engaging in scholarly inquiry in order to contribute to the body of knowledge on academic advising, as I did with this study. In this section I provide recommendations for future research. I also reflect on the ways in which this research could be applied to different settings.

I focused this study on capturing the lived experiences of both professional advisors and advising administrators as they used learning theory paradigms as well as other paradigms to frame their advising practice. Admittedly, because I recruited administrator participants first and asked for their permission to recruit advisors from their advising centers, recruiting advisors was unexpectedly challenging. Therefore, future studies could expand upon this research by creating two separate studies, one for each population and recruiting all participants independently. Additionally, similar studies could include more professional advisors and administrators from the same institution in order to capture a deeper understanding of how a particular advising center frames its advising practice.

Furthermore, with this study I only inquired about the paradigms used to frame the practice of advising. However, given the complexity of the field of academic advising, exploring various topics related to the framing of advising would further contribute to the literature. For example, understanding a unit's priorities and approaches in regard to professional development would be worthwhile, as would exploring the recruitment, hiring, and training of new

professional advisors and administrators. Understanding how advising centers approach these topics would further contribute to the understanding of how academic advising is framed. Moreover, additional research could be conducted to explore the use of student development theories within academic advising, considering how frequently these types of theories were present in the data for this study.

Finally, it is important to remember that I limited this phenomenological study to five Midwest, four-year, public institutions. Applying this research to additional settings would be a worthwhile endeavor. Expanding this study to additional four-year, public institutions in the Midwest would be a logical expansion of the research, as this study was intentionally narrowed to only five universities that represented three states. Also, extending this research to different regions within the United States and abroad, as well as to different types of institutions, including two-year institutions and private institutions, should also be considered.

Conclusion

For more than three decades, scholar–practitioners have published on the various ways in which academic advising is a form of teaching (Appleby, 2001; Hughes, 2014; Hurt, 2007; Lowenstein, 2005; Pizzolato, 2008; Ryan, 1992). However, within the context of higher education, it is insufficient to claim what advising is or is not. To legitimize advising as teaching, it is imperative that practitioners and researchers within the field produce empirical research to defend or dispute the idea of advising as teaching. The claim should be examined from a variety of perspectives, including both advisors and administrators.

This study was designed to produce additional empirical data and further contribute to the body of literature on academic advising by capturing the lived experiences of academic advisors and advising administrators as they framed advising as teaching.

My findings indicated that student development theories, as opposed to learning theories, were more commonly utilized by the advisor and administrator participants to frame advising practices at their institutions. I suggest this was likely related to more student affairs professionals making an intentional decision to transition to academic affairs by way of academic advising as well as current administrators seeking terminal degrees in programs such as higher education administration. I also posited that how advising is framed within a particular advising center was largely influenced by the administrator's decisions regarding the conceptualization and implementation of academic advising.

This study assisted in addressing the lack of research on the field of academic advising simply through my interest and willingness to engage in research on the topic. It also addressed counterarguments in the literature, as participants shared that not all students fully engaged with academic advising centers and admitted that considerable time was invested in helping students reframe their understanding of the intent and purpose of advising.

Three limitations were present in this study. First, my acknowledgement as the primary researcher that I developed this study out of a passion for my daily work as an advising administrator. Additionally, the variety of ways in which advising is operationalized across American campuses was a limitation of this study, as was the honesty of each participant.

Recommendations for future research include a call for more practitioners to engage in empirical research on the topic of academic advising, as well as future studies expanding upon this research by creating two separate studies, one for each population and recruiting all participants independently. Additionally, similar studies could include more professional advisors and administrators from the same institution in order to capture a deeper understanding of how a particular advising center frames its advising practice. Furthermore, understanding a

unit's priorities and approaches in regard to professional development would be worthwhile, as would exploring the recruitment, hiring, and training of new professional advisors and administrators. Finally, I recommended applying this study to additional settings, including extending this research to different regions within the United States and abroad, as well as to different types of institutions, including two-year institutions and private institutions.

REFERENCES

Aiken–Wisniewski, S., Johnson, A., Larson, J., & Barkemeyer, J. (2015). A preliminary report of advisor perceptions of advising and of a profession. *NACADA Journal*, *35*(2), 60–70. https://doi.org/10.12930/NACADA-14-020

Allen, J., & Smith, C. (2008). Importance of, responsibility for, and satisfaction with academic advising: A faculty perspective. *Journal of College Student Development, (49)*5, 397–411. https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.0.0033

Anderson, J. A., Reder, L. M., & Simon, H. A. (1997). Situative versus cognitive perspectives: Form versus substance. *Educational Researcher, 26*(1), 18–21. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X026001018

Appleby, D. (2001, February). The advising-teaching connection part II. *The Mentor*. https://dus.psu.edu/mentor/old/articles/appleby2.htm

Arghode, V., Brieger, E. W., & McLean, G. N. (2017). Adult learning theories: Implications for online instruction. *European Journal of Training and Development*, *41*(7), 593–609. https://doi.org/10.1108/EJTD-02-2017-0014

Astin, A. W. (1984). Student involvement: A developmental theory for higher education. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, *25*(4), 297-308. https://www.middlesex.mass.edu/ace/downloads/astininv.pdf

Bandura, A. (1969). *Principles of behavior modification.* Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Bandura, A. (1971). *Social learning theory*. General Learning Press.

Bandura, A. (1977). Self–efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, *84*(2), 191–215. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.84.2.191

Barker, S., & Mamiseishvili, K. (2014). Reconnecting: A phenomenological study of transition within a shared model of academic advising. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice*, *51*(4), 433–445. https://doi.org/10.1515/jsarp-2014-0043

Barnes, B. J., Williams, E. A., & Archer, S. A. (2010). Characteristics that matter most: Doctoral students' perceptions of positive and negative advising attributes. *NACADA Journal*, *30*(1), 34–46. https://doi.org/10.12930/0271-9517-30.1.34

Baxter Magolda, M. B. (2001). *Making their own way: Narratives for transforming higher education to promote self-development.* Stylus.

Bednar, A. K., Cunningham, D., Duffy, T. M., & Perry, J. D. (1991). Theory into practice: How do we link? In G. J. Anglin, (Ed.), *Instructional technology: Past, present, and future.* Libraries Unlimited.

Berg, B. L. (1998). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences.* Allyn and Bacon.

Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (1991). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership.* Jossey-Bass.

Bloom, B. S. (Ed). (1956). *Taxonomy of educational objectives: The classification of educational goals*. Longmans, Green.

Bogdan, R., & Biklen, S. K. (2007). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theories and methods* (5th ed). Pearson.

Bredo, E. (2000). Reconsidering social constructivism: The relevance of George Herbert Mead's interactionism: Opinions and second opinions on controversial issues. In D. C. Phillips, (Ed.), *Constructivism in education* (pp. 127–157). University of Chicago Press.

Brown, B. (2012). *Daring greatly: How the courage to be vulnerable transforms the way we live, love, parent, and lead*. Gotham Books

Bruner, J. S. (1964). The course of cognitive growth. *American Psychologist*, *19*(1), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0044160

Campbell, S. M. (2008). Vision, mission, goals and program objectives for academic advising programs. In V. N. Gordon, W. R. Habley, & T. J. Grites (Eds.), *Academic advising: A comprehensive handbook* (pp. 229–241). Wiley.

Cate, P., & Miller, M. A. (2015). Academic advising within the academy. In P. Folsom, F. Yoder, & J. Joslin (Eds.), *The new advisor guidebook: Mastering the art of academic advising* (pp. 39–52). Jossey-Bass.

Chan, Z. C. Y. (2016). A qualitative study of freshmen's and academic advisors' perspectives of academic advising in nursing. *Nurse Education in Practice*, *18*, 23–29. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nepr.2016.02.010

Chickering, A.W. (1969) *Education and identity*. Jossey-Bass.

Clark, E. (1989). The importance of a comprehensive advising system in improving student retention and graduation rates. *Australian Universities' Review*, *1*, 27. https://archive.org/details/ERIC_EJ400888

Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among five approaches.* Sage.

Crookston, B. B. (1972). *A developmental view of academic advising as teaching*. (EJ050061). ERIC. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ050061

Cross, W. (1991). *Shades of black: Diversity in African-American identity*. Temple University Press.

Dewey, J. (1933). *How we think: A restatement of the relation of reflective thinking to the educative process.* D. C. Heath & Co.

Dick, W., & Carey, L. (1985). *The systematic design of instruction*. Scott, Foresman.

Donaldson, P., McKinney, L., Lee, M., & Pino, D. (2016). First-year community college students' perceptions of and attitudes toward intrusive academic advising. *NACADA Journal*, *36*(1), 30–42. https://doi.org/10.12930/NACADA-15-012

Drake, J. K. (2011, July–August). The role of academic advising in student retention and persistence. *About Campus*, *16*(3), 8–12. https://doi.org/10.1002/abc.20062

Eble, K. E. (1988). *The craft of teaching: A guide to mastering the professor's art.* Jossey-Bass.

Ellis, K. C. (2014). Academic advising experiences of first-year undecided students: A qualitative study. *NACADA Journal*, *34*(2), 42–50. https://doi.org/10.12930/NACADA-13-001

Erlich, R., & Russ–Eft, D. (2011). Applying social cognitive theory to academic advising to assess student learning outcomes. *NACADA Journal*, *31*(2), 5–15. https://doi.org/10.12930/0271-9517-31.2.5

Ertmer, P. A., & Newby, T. J. (1993). Behaviorism, cognitivism, constructivism: Comparing critical features from an instructional design perspective. *Performance Improvement Quarterly*, *6*(4), 1–27. http://www.csiss.org/SPACE/workshops/2007/UCSB/docs/ertmer_newby1993.pdf

Filson, C., & Whittington, M. S. (2013, December). Engaging undergraduate students through academic advising. *NACTA Journal*, *57*(4), 10–17. https://www.nactateachers.org/attachments/article/2150/6%20Filson%20Dec2013.pdf

Fleming, N. D. & Mills, C. (1992). Not another inventory, rather a catalyst for reflection. *To Improve the Academy, 11,* 137–144. https://vark-learn.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/not_another_inventory.pdf

Freire, P. (1972). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Herder and Herder.

Graham, G. (2015). Behaviorism. In E. N. Zalta (Ed.), *Stanford encyclopedia of philosophy*. https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/behaviorism/

Greeno, J. G., Collins, A. M., & Resnick, L. B. (1997). Cognition and learning. In D. C. Berliner, & R. C. Calfee (Eds.), *Handbook of educational psychology* (pp. 15–46). Macmillan.

Habley, W. (2009). Academic advising as a field of inquiry. *NACADA Journal*, *29*(2), 76–83. https://doi.org/10.12930/0271-9517-29.2.76

Hagstrom, S. J., Skovholt, T. M., & Rivers, D. A. (1997). The advanced undecided college student: A qualitative study. *NACADA Journal, 17*(2), 23–30. https://doi.org/10.12930/0271-9517-17.2.23

Harasim, L. (2012). *Learning theory and online technologies*. Routledge.

Hays, D. G., & Singh, A. A. (2012). *Qualitative inquiry in clinical and educational settings.* The Guilford Press.

Hemwall, M. K., & Trachte, K. C. (Eds). (2003). *Advising and learning: Academic advising from the perspective of small colleges and universities.* National Academic Advising Association.

Hemwall, M. K., & Trachte, K. C. (2005). Academic advising as learning: 10 organizing principles. *NACADA Journal, 25*(2), 74–83. https://doi.org/10.12930/0271-9517-25.2.74

Himes, H., & Schulenberg, J. (2013). Theoretical reflections: Theory and philosophy should always inform practice. *Academic Advising Today*, *36*(3). https://nacada.ksu.edu/Resources/Academic-Advising-Today/View-Articles/Theoretical-Reflections-Theory-and-Philosophy-Should-Always-Inform-Practice.aspx

Hughes, A. (2014). Advising as teaching. In R. L. Miller & J. G. Irons (Eds.). *Academic advising: A handbook for advisors and students (Vol. 1): Models, students, topics, and issues* (pp. 180–189). Society for the Teaching of Psychology.

Hurt, R. L. (2007). Advising as teaching: Establishing outcomes, developing tools, and assessing student learning. *NACADA Journal*, *27*(2), 36–40. https://doi.org/10.12930/0271-9517-27.2.36

Knowles, M. S. (1973). *The adult learner: A neglected species.* Gulf Publishing Company.

Knowles, M. S. (1975). *Self-directed learning.* Association Press.

Knox, S., Schlosser, L. Z., Pruitt, N. T., & Hill, C. E. (2006). A qualitative examination of graduate advising relationships: The advisor perspective. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *34*(4), 489–518. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000006290249

Kohlberg, L. (1981). *Essays on moral development*: *Vol. I. The philosophy of moral development*. Harper & Row.

Kolb, D. A. (1984). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development*. Prentice-Hall.

Kuhn, T., & Padak, G. (2008). From the co-editors: Is academic advising a discipline? *NACADA Journal*, *28*(2), 2–4. https://doi.org/10.12930/0271-9517-28.2.2

Leedy, P., & Ormrod, J. (2001). *Practical research: Planning and design* (7th ed.). Merrill Prentice Hall.

Light, R. J. (2001). *Making the most of college.* Harvard University Press.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry.* Sage Publications.

Lowenstein, M. (2005). If advising is teaching, what do advisors teach? *NACADA Journal*, *25*(2), 65–73. https://doi.org/10.12930/0271-9517-25.2.65

Lowenstein, M. (2012). Theoretical reflections: Why a theory of advising? *Academic Advising Today*, *35*(2). http://www.nacada.ksu.edu/Resources/Academic-Advising-Today/View-Articles/Theoretical-Reflections-Why-a-Theory-of-Advising.aspx

Lowenstein, M. (2014, August). *Toward a theory of advising*. The Mentor. https://dus.psu.edu/mentor/2014/08/toward-a-theory-of-advising/

McGill, C. M. (2016). Perspectives in AE – "Cultivating ways of thinking": The developmental teaching perspectives in academic advising. *New Horizons in Adult Education & Human Resource Development, 28*(1), 50–54. https://doi.org/10.1002/nha3.20131

McMillan, J. H., & Schumacher, S. (2010). *Research in education: Evidence-based inquiry* (7th ed.). Pearson

Mezirow, J. (1991). *Transformative dimensions of adult learning.* Jossey–Bass.

Mischel, W. (1968). *Personality and assessment.* Wiley.

Miller, M. A. (2012). *Structuring our conversations: Shifting to four dimensional advising models*. Academic Advising Today. https://www.nacada.ksu.edu/Resources/Clearinghouse/View-Articles/Structuring-Our-Conversations-Shifting-to-Four-Dimensional-Advising-Models.aspx

Moon, J. A. (2004). *A handbook of reflective and experiential learning: Theory and practice.* RoutledgeFalmer.

Museus, S. D., & Ravello, J. N. (2010). Characteristics of academic advising that contribute to racial and ethnic minority student success at predominantly white institutions. *NACADA Journal*, *30*(1), 47–58. https://doi.org/10.12930/0271-9517-30.1.47

Paris, S., & Paris, A. (2001). Classroom application of research on self-regulated learning. *Educational Psychologist*, *36*(2), 89–101. http://sohs.pbs.uam.es/webjesus/motiv_ev_autorr/lects%20extranjeras/autorregulacion.pdf

Perry, W. G. (1970). *Forms of intellectual and ethical development in the college years*. Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Piaget, J. (1936). *Origins of intelligence in the child.* Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Pizzolato, J. E. (2008). Advisor, teacher, partner: Using the learning partnerships model to reshape academic advising. *About Campus*, *13*, 18–25. https://doi.org/10.1002/abc.243

Polson, C., & Cashin, W. (1981). Research priorities for academic advising: Results of survey of NACADA membership. *NACADA Journal*, *1*(1), 34–43. https://doi.org/10.12930/0271-9517-1.1.34

Raelin, J. (2002). "I don't have time to think!" versus the art of reflective practice. *Reflections*, *4*(1), 66–79. https://www.researchgate.net/deref/http%3A%2F%2Fdx.doi.org%2F10.1162%2F152417302320467571

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

Roufs, K. (2015). Theory matters. In P. Folsom, F. Yoder, & J. Joslin (Eds.), *The new advisor guidebook: Mastering the art of academic advising* (2nd ed., pp. 67–82). Jossey-Bass.

Ryan, C. (1992). Advising as teaching. *NACADA Journal*, *12(1)*, 4–8. https://doi.org/10.12930/0271-9517-12.1.4

Sanford, N. (1962). Developmental status of the entering freshman. In N. Sanford (Ed.), *The American college: A psychological and social interpretation of the higher learning* (pp. 253–282). John Wiley & Sons Inc. https://doi.org/10.1037/11181-006

Schlossberg, N. K. (1984). *Counseling adults in transition: Linking practice with theory*. Springer Publishing.

Schlosser, L. Z., Knox, S., Moskovitz, A. R., & Hill, C. E. (2003). A qualitative examination of graduate advising relationships: The advisee perspective. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *50*(2), 178–188. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.50.2.178

Schuh, J. H. (2008). Assessing student learning. In V. N. Gordon, W. R. Habley, & T. J. Grites (Eds.), *Academic advising: A comprehensive handbook* (2nd ed., pp. 356–368). Wiley.

Schulenberg, J. K. & Lindhorst, M. J. (2008). Advising is advising: Toward defining the practice and scholarship of academic advising. *NACADA Journal*, *28*(1), 43–53. https://doi.org/10.12930/0271-9517-28.1.43

Self, C. (2008). Advising delivery: Professional advisors, counselors, and other staff. In V. N. Gordon, W. R. Habley, & T. J. Grites (Eds.), *Academic advising: A comprehensive handbook* (2nd ed., pp. 267–268). Wiley.

Silva, I. L. (2018). How learning theories can be applied in accounting education. *Millennium*, *2*(7), 13–20. https://doi.org/10.29352/mill0207.01.00181

Skinner, B. F. (1938). *The behavior of organisms.* Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Smith, J. S. (2002). First-year student perceptions of academic advisement: A qualitative study and reality check. *NACADA Journal*, *22*(2), 39–49. https://doi.org/10.12930/0271-9517-22.2.39

Swecker, H. K., Fifolt, M., & Searby, L. (2013). Academic advising and first-generation college students: A quantitative study on student retention. *NACADA Journal*, *33*(1), 46–53. https://doi.org/10.12930/NACADA-13-192

Thomas, C. (2017). Academic advising and institutional success. *Academic Advising Today*, *40*(1). https://www.nacada.ksu.edu/Resources/Academic-Advising-Today/View-Articles/Academic-Advising-and-Institutional-Success.aspx

Tinto, V. (1993). *Leaving college: Rethinking the causes and cures of student attrition* (2nd ed.). The University of Chicago Press.

Tolman, E. C. (1948). Cognitive maps in rats and men. *Psychological Review*, *55*(4), 189–208. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0061626

Troxel, W. G. (2008). Assessing the effectiveness of the advising program. In V. N. Gordon, W. R. Habley, & T. J. Grites (Eds.), *Academic advising: A comprehensive handbook* (2nd ed., p. 386–395). Wiley.

Tyler, R. W. (1949). *Basic principles of curriculum and instruction.* University of Chicago Press.

The University of Maine at Machias (1986). *Academic advising – Definition* [Policy manual]. https://machias.edu/academics/faculty-handbook/section-iv-academic-pol/academic-adv-def/

Vygotsky, L. (1962). *Language and thought.* MIT Press.

Walker, R. V., Zelin, A. I., Behrman, C., & Strnad, R. (2017). Qualitative analysis of student perceptions: “Some advisors care. Some don’t.” *NACADA Journal*, *37*(2), 44–54. https://doi.org/10.12930/NACADA-15-027

Watson, J. B. (1913). Psychology as the behaviorist views it. *Psychological Review*, *20*(2), 158–177. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0074428

White, E., & Schulenberg, J. (2012, January–February). Academic advising – A focus on learning. *About Campus: Enriching the Student Learning Experience*, *16*(6), 11–17. https://doi.org/10.1002/abc.20082

Williams, C. (2007). Research methods. *Journal of Business & Economics Research*, *5*(3), 65–72. https://doi.org/10.19030/jber.v5i3.2532

Xyst, K. (2016). Constructivism, Dewey, and academic advising. *NACADA Journal*, *36*(2), 11–19. https://doi.org/10.12930/NACADA-14-027

Yilmaz, K. (2008). Constructivism: Its theoretical underpinnings, variations, and implications for classroom instruction. *Educational Horizons*, *86*(3), 161–172. https://www.jstor.org/stable/42923724

Yilmaz, K. (2011). The cognitive perspective on learning: Its theoretical underpinnings and implications for classroom practices. *The Clearing House: A Journal of Educational Strategies, Issues and Ideas*, *84*(5), 204–212. https://doi.org/10.1080/00098655.2011.568989

Young–Jones, A. D., Burt, T. D., Dixon, S., & Hawthorne, M. J. (2018). Academic advising: Does it really impact student success. *Quality Assurance in Education: An International Perspective*, *21*(1), 7–19. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1004439

Zimmerman, B. J. (2001). Theories of self–regulated learning and academic achievement: An overview and analysis. In B. J. Zimmerman & D. H. Schunk (Eds.), *Self–regulated learning and academic achievement: Theoretical perspectives* (pp. 1–37). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

APPENDIX A: NACADA GUIDELINES FOR RECRUITING PARTICIPANTS

Note: NACADA requires researchers to follow the protocol outlined below in order to have the Research Committee of NACADA send an email to members for the purpose of recruiting participants for research studies.

Guidelines for distribution approval for member surveys to be used in scholarly inquiry within the field of academic advising

NACADA encourages member research within the field of academic advising. As such NACADA approves all research surveys distributed to association members prior to survey development and distribution. The formal approval process for distribution of scholarly inquiry (research) surveys is outlined below. Applicants are highly encouraged to apply for consideration at least six months prior to intended survey distribution date.

1. A priori requirements

1. At least one researcher (preferably the Principal Investigator) must have been a NACADA member for at least two years at the time the proposal is submitted. (If no-one on the research team meets this condition, the researcher could consider asking a current NACADA member to join the project.)
2. The research project must have been submitted for approval of the PI's IRB or equivalent. Preference during screening will be given to grant applications with completed IRB approvals on file with NACADA.
3. The researcher must agree, in writing, to submit an article based on the survey results to the *NACADA Journal* (that has first-right-of-refusal) within 18 months of conducting the survey; if this condition is not met, the related college / university will be prohibited from submitting survey proposals for a period of two years.

2. Proposal elements

1. Resume or c.v. for each investigator
2. Clear, succinct statement of the research problem and its importance (not to exceed 500 words).
3. Copy of the survey instrument
4. IRB documents from the researcher's home institution

5. Signed agreement to items 1.2 and 1.3
6. Description of the NACADA members to be surveyed; for example, does the researcher wish to survey new advisors? Advisors who work with undecided students? Or simply a general survey of the members?
7. Desired sample size
8. Preferred survey dates
9. Survey software to be used

3. Submission & review process

1. All materials must be submitted electronically in PDF format to nacada@ksu.edu with the subject line "application for NACADA approved survey".
2. NACADA's Executive Office will accept proposals for member surveys during two time periods each year: **January 15 to March 15** and **July 15 to September 15**.
3. At the close of each period, the Executive Office will forward complete proposals to a subcommittee of the Research Committee; incomplete proposals will not be considered further. The subcommittee will have 30 days to evaluate the proposals and make a recommendation as to their acceptance; the final decision will rest with Executive Office staff.
4. Approved surveys must be carried out within eight months of approval.

4. Other considerations

1. While links to NACADA reviewed and approved surveys are e-mailed to target groups within the association's membership, NACADA does not guarantee responses from those receiving the e-mailed link.
2. No NACADA member is asked to complete more than three surveys annually.
3. Proposals that are rejected during the review process may be resubmitted in a subsequent period following the revision directions provided by the review committee and/or Executive Office. A full proposal with edits must be submitted during each submission period.
4. Evaluation criteria
    i. Is the survey methodologically sound?
    ii. Does it address an area of significance to NACADA and its membership?
    iii. Can the study be completed and an article submitted within 18 months?
    iv. Is the proposal clear and well written?

    Additional notes:

- Every year the NACADA Executive Office receives numerous requests to send surveys to members. To help avoid survey "burn out," only four reviewed and approved scholarly inquiry (research) surveys are sent to all members of a Region or Commission during an academic year.
- Each year NACADA receives proposals for presentations based upon results of a member survey. NACADA members surveys must be approved, using the guidelines listed above, PRIOR to submission of a presentation proposal. Failure to secure NACADA approval of a member survey prior to submission of a conference proposal based upon the survey's results is grounds for cancellation of a proposal/conference session.

Questions? Contact information for the Research Committee Chair is available on the **Research Committee webpage**.

APPENDIX B: DIRECT CONTACT WITH ADVISING

ADMINISTRATORS TO RECRUIT PARTICIPANTS

Note: This communication below would be sent via email directly to academic advising administrators only if my request with NACADA for assistance with participant recruitment is denied.

Dear Academic Advising Administrator:

You are being invited to participate in a research study conducted by Ashleigh Crowe and supervised by Dr. Melissa Nail from the Department of Teaching and Learning's Curriculum and Instruction (CIMT) doctoral program at Indiana State University. This phenomenological study aims to gather the perspectives of advisor and advising administrators as they consider framing academic advising as teaching. In particular, the focus of the research will be the exploration of how advisors and advising administrators use learning paradigms to frame their advising practice and programs. This document will help you decide if you want to participate in this research by providing you information about the study and what you are asked to do.

This study asks you to participate in a 60-90 minute phone or Skype interview, with the possibility of a 15-30 minute follow-up phone interview if necessary. As the participant, you will elect which interview method, phone or Skype, will be conducted, as well as the time and date of the interview. All interviews will be recorded using a voice recorder application. You have been asked to participate in this research because you currently serve as an academic advising administrator for an undergraduate advising program.

If you are interested in participating, please contact Ashleigh Crowe (me) at 812-878-5600 or via email at acrowe3@sycamores.indstate.edu. Questions can be directed to me and/or my faculty supervisor, Dr. Melissa Nail, at 812-237-2848 or via email at Melissa.Nail@indstate.edu.

Sincerely,

Ashleigh Crowe

APPENDIX C: INTERVIEW QUESTIONS: ACADEMIC ADVISOR PARTICIPANTS

Note: First confirm that informed consent has been received and stored electronically and that the participant has a copy of the completed informed consent. Remind the participant that they are permitted to decline to answer any of the following questions or withdraw from the study during the interview.

Name of Participant:_____
Interview Type: _____
Pseudonym Chosen (optional):_____
Date:_____

My study is phenomenological, meaning that I am trying to understand the lived experiences of academic advisors, in regard to how they may frame advising as teaching. My research questions which pertain to your population is:

1. What are academic advisors' perceptions on the framing of academic advising as a form of teaching?
    a. How are learning theory paradigms utilized by academic advisors?
    b. How are other paradigms utilized by academic advisors?

Before I begin recording our interview, you have the opportunity to choose a pseudonym for this study in order to protect your anonymity. What name would you like to use?

Start recording here:

First, I'd like to get to know a little about you professionally.

2. Describe your experience with academic advising in higher education.
    a. How many years of experience do you have as a professional advisor?
    b. How many professional advising positions have you held?
    c. Which (if any) professional organizations are you a member of?
    d. What led you to the field of academic advising?
3. Describe what a typical advising session looks like for you.
    a. Length of time?
    b. How frequently do you see each advisee?
    c. What are some of the broad topics likely to be discussed?
    d. What student demographics do you serve?

Now, let's talk about academic advising as a form of teaching.

4. What are your thoughts on considering advising as a type of teaching?
    a. How did you come to frame advising in this way?
5. Are there any learning theories you use to inform your advising practice?
    a. What examples or stories would you like to share regarding how you use these theories in your practice?
    b. How did you come to use these learning theories in your work?
6. Are there any other theories you use to inform your advising practice?
    a. How did you come to use these theories in your work?
7. What are your methods for staying well-informed about best practices in academic advising?
8. Is there anything else you would like to share with me about this topic?

Thank you so much for your willingness to participate in my study and for taking time out of your day to talk with me. After I have reviewed this interview recording and transcribed the data, I may reach out to you for a follow-up phone call to clarify any points which might be unclear to me. If a follow-up phone call is necessary, you can expect to hear from me in approximately two weeks.

APPENDIX D: INTERVIEW QUESTIONS: ADVISING ADMINISTRATOR PARTICIPANTS

Note: First confirm that informed consent has been received and stored electronically and that the participant has a copy of the completed informed consent. Remind the participant that they are permitted to decline to answer any of the following questions or withdraw from the study during the interview.

Name of Participant:_____
Interview Type: _____
Pseudonym Chosen (optional):_____
Date:_____

My study is phenomenological, meaning that I am trying to understand the lived experiences of academic advisors, in regard to how they may frame advising as teaching. My research questions which pertain to your population is:

1. What are academic advising administrators' perceptions on the framing of academic advising as a form of teaching?

    c. How are learning theory paradigms utilized by academic advising administrators?

    d. How are other paradigms utilized by academic advising administrators?

Before I begin recording our interview, you have the opportunity to choose a pseudonym for this study in order to protect your anonymity. What name would you like to use?

Start recording here:

First, I'd like to get to know a little about you professionally.

2. Describe your experience with academic advising in higher education.
    a. How many years of experience do you have as a professional advisor?
    b. How many professional advising positions have you held?
    c. Which (if any) professional organizations are you a member of?
    d. What led you to the field of academic advising?
3. Describe what a typical advising session looks like within your program?
    a. Length of time?
    b. How frequently do advisors see their advisees?
    c. What are some of the broad topics likely to be discussed?

Now, let's talk about academic advising as a form of teaching.

4. What are your thoughts on considering advising as a type of teaching?
    a. How did you come to frame advising in this way?
5. Are there any learning theories you use to frame your advising program?
    a. How did you come to use these learning theories in your work?
6. Are there any other theories you use to frame your advising program?
    a. How did you come to use these theories in your work?
7. What are your methods for staying well-informed about best practices in academic advising?
8. In what ways do you keep your advisors well-informed about best practices in academic advising?
9. Is there anything else you would like to share with me about this topic?

Thank you so much for your willingness to participate in my study and for taking time out of your day to talk with me. After I have reviewed this interview recording and transcribed the data, I may reach out to you for a follow-up phone call to clarify any points which might be unclear to me. If a follow-up phone call is necessary, you can expect to hear from me in approximately two weeks.

APPENDIX E: CHECKLIST FOR DOCUMENT REVIEW

Note: The document review for this study will only consider documents published on the institution's website which relate to academic advising. The search engine available on the institution's website will be utilized to locate relevant documents.

Institution:_____

Document Reviewed: _____

Date Reviewed:_____

1. Does the institution have a statement in their undergraduate course catalog regarding the main goals of academic advising?
   ___ Yes ___ No
   Notes:

2. Does the institution outline the advisor's responsibilities to the undergraduate student related to academic advising?
   ___ Yes ___ No
   Notes:

3. Does the institution outline the undergraduate student's responsibilities related to academic advising?
   ___ Yes ___ No
   Notes:

4. Does the institution outline learning objectives for academic advising?
   ___ Yes ___ No

Notes:

5. Does the advising center have a statement regarding the main goals of academic advising?
   ___ Yes ___ No
   Notes:

6. Does the advising center outline learning objectives for academic advising?
   ___ Yes ___ No
   Notes:

7. Does the advising center outline the advisor's responsibilities to the undergraduate student related to academic advising?
   ___ Yes ___ No
   Notes:

8. Does the advising center outline the undergraduate student's responsibilities related to academic advising?
   ___ Yes ___ No
   Notes:

APPENDIX F: ACADEMIC ADVISOR INFORMED CONSENT FORM

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH STUDY

Title of Research Study: A Phenomenological Study of Academic Advisors' and Advising Administrators' Perceptions on the Framing of Advising as Teaching

You are being invited to participate in a research study conducted by Ashleigh Crowe and supervised by Dr. Melissa Nail from the Department of Teaching and Learning's Curriculum and Instruction (CIMT) doctoral program at Indiana State University. This phenomenological study aims to gather the perspectives of advisor and advising administrators as they consider framing academic advising as teaching. In particular, the focus of the research will be the exploration of how advisors and advising administrators use learning paradigms to frame their advising practice and programs. This document will help you decide if you want to participate in this research by providing you information about the study and what you are asked to do.

Some reasons you might want to participate in this research include an opportunity to share your experiences as an academic advisor, apply and/or expand your understanding of how learning paradigms can be applied to academic advising in higher education, and contribute to the scholarly literature on academic advising. Some reasons you might not want to participate in this research include apprehension related to confidentiality, uncertainty about the topic's relevance, or insufficient time available to participate.

This study asks you to participate in a 60-90 Skype or phone interview, with the possibility of a 15-30 minute follow-up phone interview if necessary. As the participant, you will elect which interview method, phone or Skype, will be conducted, as well as the time and date of the interview. All interviews will be recorded using a voice recorder application. You have been asked to participate in this research because you currently serve as a professional academic advisor for undergraduate students.

The choice to participate or not is yours; participation is entirely voluntary. You can decline to participate in the phone or Skype interviews or withdraw from the study at any time. Additionally, every effort will be made to protect your confidentiality. Electronic audio recordings will be stored on a password–protected flash drive, which will be stored in a locked drawer in my home office. You will have the option to choose a pseudonym for all interview transcripts. Your name, specific position title, and institution will not be disclosed. Electronic interview transcripts will be stored on a password–protected laptop, in a password–protected file. Participants will have up to 7 days after being contacted for member checking (an opportunity to review the researcher's analysis for accuracy) to withdraw from this study.

The anticipated risks or costs associated with your participation in this study are minimal. It is unlikely that you will benefit directly by participating in this study, but the research results may benefit both the field of academic advising and practitioners within the field by contributing to the growing body of literature related to using learning paradigms to frame the practice of academic advising in higher education. As a participant, the results of this study will be shared with you.

If you have any questions, please contact Ashleigh Crowe (me) at 812-878-5600 or via email at acrowe3@sycamores.indstate.edu. You may also contact my faculty supervisor, Dr. Melissa Nail, at 812-237-2848 or via email at Melissa.Nail@indstate.edu.

If you have any questions about your rights as a research subject or if you feel you have been placed at risk, you may contact the Indiana State University Institutional Review Board (IRB) by mail at Indiana State University, Office of Sponsored Programs, Terre Haute, IN 47809, by phone at (812) 237-3088 or by email at irb@indstate.edu.

I understand the procedures described above. My questions have been answered to my satisfaction, and I agree to participate in this study. I have been given a copy of this form.

_____	_____
Subject's Name (printed)	Researcher's Name (printed)
_____	_____
Subject's Signature & Date	Researcher's Signature & Date

APPENDIX G: ADVISING ADMINISTRATOR INFORMED CONSENT FORM

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH STUDY

Title of Research Study: A Phenomenological Study of Academic Advisors' and Advising Administrators' Perceptions on the Framing of Advising as Teaching

You are being invited to participate in a research study conducted by Ashleigh Crowe and supervised by Dr. Melissa Nail from the Department of Teaching and Learning's Curriculum and Instruction (CIMT) doctoral program at Indiana State University. This phenomenological study aims to gather the perspectives of advisor and advising administrators as they consider framing academic advising as teaching. In particular, the focus of the research will be the exploration of how advisors and advising administrators use learning paradigms to frame their advising practice and programs. This document will help you decide if you want to participate in this research by providing you information about the study and what you are asked to do.

Some reasons you might want to participate in this research include an opportunity to share your experiences as an academic advisor, apply and/or expand your understanding of how learning paradigms can be applied to academic advising in higher education, and contribute to the scholarly literature on academic advising. Some reasons you might not want to participate in this research include apprehension related to confidentiality, uncertainty about the topic's relevance, or insufficient time available to participate.

This study asks you to participate in a 60-90 minute phone or Skype interview, with the possibility of a 15-30 minute follow-up phone interview if necessary. As the participant, you will elect which interview method, phone or Skype, will be conducted, as well as the time and date of the interview. All interviews will be recorded using a voice recorder application. You have been asked to participate in this research because you currently serve as an academic advising administrator for an undergraduate advising program.

The choice to participate or not is yours; participation is entirely voluntary. You can decline to participate in the phone or Skype interviews or withdraw at any time. Additionally, every effort will be made to protect your confidentiality. Electronic audio recordings will be stored on a password–protected flash drive, which will be stored in a locked drawer in my home office. You will have the option to be assigned a pseudonym for all interview transcripts. Your name, specific position title, and institution will not be disclosed. Electronic interview transcripts will be stored on a password–protected laptop, in a password–protected file. Participants will have up to 7 days after being contacted for member checking (an opportunity to review the researcher's analysis for accuracy) to withdraw from the study.

The anticipated risks or costs associated with your participation in this study are minimal. It is unlikely that you will benefit directly by participating in this study, but the research results may benefit both the field of academic advising and practitioners within the field by contributing to the growing body of literature related to using learning paradigms to frame the practice of academic advising in higher education. As a participant, the results of this study will be shared with you.

If you have any questions, please contact Ashleigh Crowe (me) at 812-878-5600 or via email at acrowe3@sycamores.indstate.edu. You may also contact my faculty supervisor, Dr. Melissa Nail, at 812-237-2848 or via email at Melissa.Nail@indstate.edu.

If you have any questions about your rights as a research subject or if you feel you have been placed at risk, you may contact the Indiana State University Institutional Review Board (IRB) by mail at Indiana State University, Office of Sponsored Programs, Terre Haute, IN 47809, by phone at (812) 237-3088 or by email at irb@indstate.edu.

I understand the procedures described above. My questions have been answered to my satisfaction, and I agree to participate in this study. I have been given a copy of this form.

_____	_____
Subject's Name (printed)	Researcher's Name (printed)
_____	_____
Subject's Signature & Date	Researcher's Signature & Date

APPENDIX H: EMAIL TO PARTICIPANTS WITH INSTRUCTIONS

FOR COMPLETING INFORMED CONSENT

Note: The communication below would be sent via email directly to participants with instructions for completing the informed consent document prior to us scheduling our interview(s).

Dear Participant:

Thank you for agreeing to participant in a research study conducted by Ashleigh Crowe (me) and supervised by Dr. Melissa Nail from the Department of Teaching and Learning's Curriculum and Instruction (CIMT) doctoral program at Indiana State University. This study asks you to participate in a 60-90 minute phone or Skype interview, with the possibility of a 15-30 minute follow-up phone interview if necessary. Attached you will find an Informed Consent document. Before we can schedule and conduct our interview(s), please review the attached document. If you elect to participate in this study, please print, complete, scan, and email back your Informed Consent document to me directly at acrowe3@sycamores.indstate.edu. Once I have received your completed Informed Consent document, we will schedule a time to conduct our interview(s).

Any questions you may have can be directed to me and/or my faculty supervisor, Dr. Melissa Nail at 812-237-2848 or via email at Melissa.Nail@indstate.edu.

Sincerely,

Ashleigh Crowe