A Comparison of the Attitudes and Perceptions of University Faculty and Administrators toward Advising Undergraduate and Graduate Students and Student Organizations

Brian E. Myers[1] and James E. Dyer[1]
Department of Agricultural Education and Communication
University of Florida
Gainesville, FL 32611

Abstract

Boyer (1990) clearly expanded the definition of the scholarship of teaching to include such activities as the advisement of students. Even prior to Boyer's work, Crookston (1972), in his groundbreaking and often cited work on advising, clearly stated that advising is a form of teaching. However, most faculty do not see their participation in activities in the teaching and service areas being rewarded by their administration (Boyer, 1990). This perception can have a major impact on the amount of time and effort faculty put toward advising students and student organizations.

This study had four major objectives: to define advising in terms of rewards and time commitments, identify any differences in attitudes/perceptions of faculty and administers toward advising, the perceived competence/preparation level of faculty to advise, and the advising roles faculty and administrators perceive to be most important. A total of 222 respondents from 31 land grant universities participated in the study.

Both faculty and administrators agreed that student advising should be considered in promotion and tenure decisions. However, only 25% of the faculty in this study agreed that student advising is a factor considered by administrators in these decisions. A majority of department administrators indicated that these activities are considered in promotion and tenure.

Introduction / Theoretical Framework

The role of faculty at colleges and universities is constantly being redefined. The cornerstones of teaching, research, and service continue to include a broadening spectrum of activities. Often these activities cause the once distinct lines between these categories to blur. Most faculty want to be a productive member of the academy by fulfilling each of these roles. However, to be successful in obtaining promotion and tenure, faculty must participate in activities that are deemed appropriate and meaningful by administration and colleagues. Because of the broadening and sometimes varying definitions of the three cornerstones, new and sometimes experienced faculty have difficultly prioritizing their time to meet these goals.

Boyer (1990) clearly expanded the definition of the scholarship of teaching to include such activities as the advisement of students. Even prior to Boyer's work, Crookston (1972), in his groundbreaking and often cited work on advising, clearly stated that advising is a form of teaching. However, most faculty do not see their participation in activities in the teaching and service areas being rewarded by their administration (Boyer, 1990). This perception can have a major impact on the amount of time and effort faculty put toward advising students and student organizations. The question is then raised, is the advising of students, both undergraduate and graduate, and student organizations an important activity for faculty members? The answer from previous research has been a resounding, "Yes!" Dillon and Fisher (2000) stated in their evaluation of faculty advising that, "The need and value of faculty advising are clearly documented in study after study" (p. 16).

In addressing faculty motivation to advise students, many faculty do not feel that a faculty member's advising load is considered in promotion and tenure decisions (Dillon and Fisher, 2000). Hancock (1996) suggested that if a faculty member believes that promotion and tenure stems more from instruction and research than advising, faculty will likely be disinclined to participate in advising activities. Also being linked to motivation is a person's self-efficacy in that area in this instance self-efficacy in advising (Bandura, 1997). One method to improve a person's self-efficacy and thereby improving motivation is by providing professional development in that area (Mager, 1992; Petress, 1996). Petress (1996) identified four major factors that affect a faculty member's self perceptions of his or her ability to advise: 1) how advisors interpret their advising role, 2) training and/or guidance that is provided to advisors, 3) expectations of administrators and colleagues for advisors, and 4) recognition and rewards available for competent or exemplary advising.

[1]Associate Professor, Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences

Some may feel that student advising may be better left to staff designated specifically for this task and not faculty members. However, Hemwall and Trachte (1999) found that faculty are appropriate to use as academic advisors.

Advising is the intersection of the teaching and learning experience. Faculty members are in an excellent position to learn why students want to take a course or instructor and to involve the student in the curriculum (Miller and Alberts, 1994). In addition, students feel that personal interaction with faculty has a positive influence on their overall experience at an institution (Kennedy, Gordon, and Gordon, 1995).

Faculty advising is important for all parties involved in the process: the students, the faculty member, and the university. Woodbury (1999) suggested that advising provides an opportunity for teaching and learning to occur that is no less important to a student's success than that which is offered through the traditional curricula and classroom. Nevertheless, in times when university budgets are constantly scrutinized for ways to eliminate spending, administrators are often tempted to cut allocations to advising programs, which are often seen as non-central to the instructional mission of the institution (Glennen et al., 1996). Conversely, the advising of students by faculty members has been found to be an effective avenue by which the institution's mission to provide individualized programs of study for learners can be realized. Therefore, advising of students is truly a key and integral part of each student's educational experience (Fiddler and Alicea, 1996).

In addition to the educational benefits for the student, advising provides a financial benefit to the university. Tinto (1993) found that more students leave college before completing a degree than stay and graduate. One reason for this high attrition rate is student dissatisfaction with a university. A frequent source of this dissatisfaction stems from the student's advising experience (Corts et al., 2000). The financial impact of student attrition can be staggering. At one major Midwestern university, the loss due to student attrition was estimated at $11 million (Dyer et al., 1996). Glennen et al. (1996) concluded that proper academic advising can improve the fiscal stability of institutions by increasing graduation rates. However, despite these positive effects of faculty advising, it continues to be perceived by many as having low status and thus, low priority, particularly for faculty whose efforts in this area are not generally rewarded (Miville and Sedlacek, 1995).

Gordon (1992) noted several advantages of a faculty advising system, but also noted that many faculty are unclear as to the specific roles of advising. Whereas advising can include several different facets, O'Banion (1972) outlined various skills, knowledge, and attitudes that are required for quality academic advising in his model. Even though the college student population has changed dramatically since the 1970's when the O'Banion model was presented, it has been found to still be effective with only slight modifications (Burton and Wellington, 1998). However, to acquire these attributes, several researchers (Fiddler and Alicea, 1996; Gordon, 1992; Petress, 1996) found that well-planned professional development activities are needed.

These important professional development opportunities on advising are often not available to faculty. There is commonly a mistaken belief that faculty can learn all they need to know about advising students through their own experiences as a student (Selke and Wong, 1993). Habley and Morales reported that only about one-third of colleges and universities provide any type of professional development activities for advisors (Gordon and Habley, 2000). Of those that do provide assistance, less than one-fourth require faculty involved in advising to participate in these activities. In addition, Habley and Morales also noted that most of the professional development assistance provided focuses solely on the communication of factual information from advisor to student, with little time devoted to the development of advising concepts and relationship skills that have been found to be critical in developmental advising (Crookston, 1972; Frost, 1993; Gordon, 1992; Gordon and Habley, 2000).

In designing a professional development program for advisors, Habley (1997) envisioned a three-category approach. The first would focus on concept components such as providing a definition of advising, student expectations, and outline of advisor and student responsibilities. Included in this component are legal issues regarding advising. Showell (1998) noted that the level of legal awareness needed by academic advisors has increased substantially in the past generation. Some of the major legal issues involved in advising are defamation, negligence, privacy, and students with disabilities. The second category would include informational components such as rules and regulations, program and course offerings, and referral sources and services. The final category would discuss relationship components. These would include questioning, discussion, and communication skills. It is important in this professional development, that emphasis is placed on the transference of teaching knowledge and skills to the advising setting (Ryan, 1992). Thereby showing faculty that quality advising does not entail the acquisition of completely new skills, just the utilization of current skills in a different situation. By emphasizing this transfer of current skills, this can possibly assist faculty in perceiving their role as advisors differently (Ryan, 1992).

The theoretical framework for this study lies in Bandura's social-cognitive theory as adapted by Mager (1992). Mager noted that four conditions must be present in order for a person to successfully perform a task: skill, opportunity, a supportive

environment, and self-efficacy. The university setting can provide the first three conditions. The fourth component, self-efficacy, is supplied by the faculty member. Mager noted that a person's self-efficacy can be improved through the completion of tasks that allow a person to practice a certain skill. As adapted to this study, if faculty members feel as though they are adequately prepared to advise students, their levels of self-efficacy increase and the adviser feels comfortable in that role. By contrast, if the adviser feels inadequately prepared, likely this lower level of self-efficacy will manifest itself in less favorable attitudes toward advising, and eventually in lower performance of task.

Purpose and Objectives

The purpose of this study was to compare the attitudes, needs, and level of competence in advising as perceived by faculty and department administrators of colleges of agriculture at the land grant institutions in the United States. The objectives of the study, stated as questions, were as follows:

1. How do faculty and administrators define advising in terms of rewards and time commitments?
2. Are there differences in attitudes / perceptions of faculty and administrators toward student advising?
3. How do faculty and administrators perceive the competence / preparation level of faculty to advise students?
4. What advising roles do faculty and administrators perceive to be most important?

Methods

This national study used a descriptive survey research design. A researcher-designed instrument was constructed to assess the attitudes, needs, and perceptions of faculty members toward advising. Respondents were mailed an attitudinal questionnaire that used a four-point scale (1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3= Agree, 4 = Strongly Agree) to assess their attitudes. A four-point scale was chosen to compel the respondent to express an opinion about the statement. Dillman (2000) noted that it is appropriate to pose attitudinal questions without giving the option of a neutral opinion or no opinion at all. In addition, each question was designed to be general enough that all faculty would have adequate knowledge on the subject to form an opinion. Demographic questions were asked using open-ended and short-answer options.

The instrument was evaluated for face and content validity by a panel of experts consisting of faculty, administrators, and graduate students at two land grant universities. The instrument was pilot tested using individuals similar to those in the sample. Reliability for the individual constructs of "Value of Advising," "Attitudes / Perceptions Toward Advising," and "Perceived Knowledge and Preparation for Advising" was determined using Cronbach's alpha. Reliability coefficients for each of these constructs were calculated at .68, .68, and .88, respectfully.

The population for the study was teaching faculty and departmental administrators in colleges of agriculture at each of the 1862 land-grant universities in the United States. Data were gathered from a purposive sample of five faculty and three department heads from these colleges. The associate dean for academic programs at each institution provided administrator and faculty names. Thirty-one institutions agreed to participate in this study resulting in a total sample size of 248 faculty and administrators. This sampling method was used as an accurate population frame of all faculty at the 1862 land-grant universities in the United States was not available. No guidelines were provided to the college administrators for selecting the faculty and department administrators for participation in this study. Whereas, this is a purposive sample and the findings are not generalizable, this was deemed to be of little concern.

In an attempt to get as much input as possible, a total of six respondent contacts were made (Dillman, 2000). These included a pre-study electronic mail contact, instrument mailings, and reminders via both electronic and land mail. A total of 222 respondents from the 31 universities returned questionnaires for a 90% response rate.

Data were analyzed using SPSS software. Item frequencies, standard deviations, and means were calculated, as well as the grand mean for each construct. Although by definition scale responses produce ordinal data, results were treated as interval data for analysis and interpretation purposes. This procedure is commonly accepted in social science research, especially if data are categorized into equal intervals as was done in this study (Clason and Dormody, 1994).

Results

Several demographic measures were reported by respondents. Faculty reported a mean of 42.6 undergraduate student advisees and 3.1 graduate student advisees. It was reported that on average, faculty in the study met with undergraduate students just under two times per semester, and with graduate students just under 12 times during that same period of time. Demographic measures were also collected from departmental administrator respondents. They reported a mean of 21.1 undergraduate student advisees and 3.7 graduate student advisees per advisor. It was reported by administrators that, on average, faculty met with undergraduate students two times per semester and graduate students just over 12 times.

The first objective sought to determine how faculty and administrators define advising in terms of rewards and time commitments. Most faculty

respondents indicated that advising students should be a component of promotion and tenure (91.5%) and teaching FTE (90.8%). However, less than 25% of the respondents indicated that advising is currently valued in promotion and tenure decisions (see Table 1). Similarly, over 68% indicated that advising student organizations should be a factor in promotion and tenure, yet only 15% reported that it is currently considered.

Most department administrator respondents indicated that advising students should be a component of promotion and tenure (91.0%) and teaching FTE (92.3%). Also, 58% of the respondents indicated that advising is currently valued in promotion and tenure decisions. In regards to advising student organizations, over 60% indicated that it should be a factor in promotion and tenure, yet only 31% reported that it is currently considered.

Table 1. Definition of Advising in Terms of Rewards and Time Commitments

Statement	Faculty		Dept Admin	
	Agree[a] %	Disagree[b] %	Agree[a] %	Disagree[b] %
Student advising should be a component of faculty compensation.	92.9	7.8	85.5	14.5
Student advising should be a component of promotion and tenure review.	91.5	10.7	91.0	9.1
The number of students advised should be a component of teaching FTE.	90.8	2.1	92.3	7.7
The advising of student organizations should be a component of teaching FTE.	75.9	24.1	70.5	29.5
Quality advising is valued in my department.	73.4	26.6	91.0	9.0
The quality of student advising, as determined by student advising evaluations, should be a component of faculty pay scale.	73.5	26.5	69.7	30.3
Advising student organizations should be a component of promotion and tenure review.	67.6	32.4	60.2	39.7
Faculty are provided enough time to adequately advise students.	36.9	63.1	49.4	50.6
Student advising is currently a valued component of promotion and tenure review.	24.5	75.5	57.7	42.3
Advising student organizations is currently a valued component of promotion and tenure review.	15.3	84.7	31.2	68.8

Note: Faculty n =141; Department Administration n = 78
[a] Frequency of respondents who marked agree and strongly agree.
[b] Frequency of respondents who marked disagree and strongly disagree.

Table 2. Attitudes / Perceptions toward Advising

Statement	Faculty		Dept Admin	
	Agree[a] %	Disagree[b] %	Agree[a] %	Disagree[b] %
Advising graduate students is a good use of faculty time.	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Advising students is an effective way to build rapport.	98.6	1.4	100.0	0.0
Advising plays an important role in retaining students.	98.6	1.4	98.8	1.3
Advising undergraduate students is a good use of faculty time.	93.6	6.4	97.4	2.6
Advising plays an important role in recruiting students.	91.3	8.6	89.8	10.3
Advising graduate students is a scholarly activity.	91.3	8.7	91.0	9.0
Students are more likely to change majors when they have negative advising experiences.	90.6	8.7	94.8	5.2
Advising student organizations is a good use of faculty time.	86.8	13.1	89.7	10.3
University faculty should be responsible for advising students regardless of pay.	70.5	29.5	73.3	26.7
Advising students should be an expectation of all faculty.	62.4	37.6	75.7	24.4
Only faculty with teaching appointments should advise undergraduate students.	62.8	37.1	44.9	55.1
Advising undergraduate students is a scholarly activity.	60.9	39.1	60.3	39.7
Students should utilize advising sessions with faculty on a walk-in basis.	43.1	56.9	28.0	72.0
Only faculty with teaching appointments should advise student organizations.	22.7	77.3	11.5	88.5
Only faculty with teaching appointments should advise graduate students.	12.9	87.1	6.4	93.6

Note: Faculty n =141; Department Administration n = 78
[a] Frequency of respondents who marked agree and strongly agree.
[b] Frequency of respondents who marked disagree and strongly disagree.

Faculty disagreed (M = 2.05) that advising students was a consideration in promotion and tenure decisions. Conversely, department administrators felt that advising was a component (M = 2.62). Departmental administrators agreed (M = 2.51) that faculty were given enough time to advise students. Meanwhile, faculty disagreed with this statement (M = 2.29).

The second objective sought to describe attitudes/perceptions of faculty toward advising. All faculty respondents (100%) indicated that advising graduate students was a good use of time (see Table 2). Ninety-three percent agreed with a similar statement dealing with undergraduate students. Only a slight majority (62.8%) of faculty agreed that only faculty with teaching appointments should advise undergraduate students. However, a much stronger majority (87.1%) disagreed that only faculty with teaching appointments should advise graduate students. A similar trend was found regarding the perception of advising as a scholarly activity. Only a slight majority (60.9%) agreed that advising undergraduate students was scholarly. A majority (91.3%) viewed advising graduate students as a scholarly activity.

Like faculty, all department administrators (100%) agreed that advising

graduate students was a good use of faculty time. They also agreed (97.4%) that advising undergraduate students was a good use of faculty time as well. A slight majority (55.1%) disagreed that only faculty with teaching appointments should advise undergraduate students, yet a vast majority (93.6%) disagreed that only faculty with teaching appointments should advise graduate students. Likewise, a majority of administrators (60.3%) viewed advising undergraduate students as a scholarly activity, while an even larger percentage (91.0%) regarded advising graduate students as scholarly.

Faculty on average felt that only faculty with teaching appointments should advise undergraduate students (M = 2.73). However, departmental administrators disagreed (M = 2.36) with the statement that only faculty with teaching appointments should advise undergraduates.

The third objective sought to describe faculty preparation to advise students. In general, faculty perceived themselves to be competent and/or prepared to advise individual students on academic career decisions, but indicated a need for assistance in advising student organizations and in advising students on personal matters (see Table 3). However, many faculty (44.7%) have received no training on academic and professional matters. A vast majority (81.6%) have no training on advising students on personal matters. In spite of this lack of training, 91.4% of faculty agreed that their expertise in advising students was adequate.

Over 97% of the faculty reported they were "competent" or "very competent" in advising pertaining to degree and program requirements. Yet only 46% were able to mark the same categories for their level of competence on dealing with personal issues (see Table 4). Furthermore, just over 44% reported they were "competent" or "very competent" on financial assistance opportunities for students.

Department administrators reported that 36.8% have received no training on how to advise students on academic and professional matters (see Table 3). Furthermore, 82.9% of administrators reported that their faculty had received no training on advising students on personal matters. A majority of department administrators (66.7%) stated that they did not feel that faculty were competent on the legal issues surrounding advising. Another weak area found was that of using on-line advising tools. Only 56.6% of administrators felt that faculty were competent in using such tools. The greatest agreement (92.2%) was found on the statement that faculty are competent in course scheduling (see Table 4). Overall department administrators agreed (68.5%) that faculty expertise in advising students is adequate.

In most instances, departmental administrators' assessment of the competence of their faculty in these areas of advising was similar to that of the faculty themselves. The vast majority (92.1%) of administrators reported that they felt that faculty were "competent" or "very competent" in degree and program requirements. The lowest level was reported in the area of dealing with personal issues. A surprising 85.3% felt that faculty were "not at all competent" or only "somewhat competent" in dealing with this area.

The fourth objective of the study sought to determine what advising roles faculty perceive to be most important. Index scores of respondent rankings were used to determine an overall ranking of advising roles.

As noted in Table 5, faculty respondents considered three roles of advisers to be most important for student advising: helping students meet degree/program requirements, course scheduling, and career counseling. Assisting with student organizations, and preparing students for activities/competitions were ranked lowest.

Department administrators were very similar in their ranking of advisor roles. Respondents listed helping students meet degree and program requirements and course scheduling as most important for working with undergraduate students. Working with students on research and meeting degree and program requirements was

Table 3. Perceived Knowledge and Preparation for Advising

Statement	Faculty		Dept Admin	
	Agree[a] %	Disagree[b] %	Agree[a] %	Disagree[b] %
Comfortable in communicating one-on-one with students.	99.3	0.7	96.0	3.9
Competent in assisting students in planning schedules.	97.8	2.1	96.1	3.9
Know where to find information on academic policies.	96.4	3.6	88.2	11.8
Aware of campus resources to assist students who are in academic difficulty.	93.5	6.4	73.7	26.3
Competent in counseling students on making career choices.	93.5	6.5	94.8	5.3
Current level of expertise in advising students is adequate.	91.4	8.6	68.5	31.6
Competent in using on-line advising tools.	81.9	18.1	56.6	43.4
Competent in advising student organizations.	81.1	18.8	75.0	25.0
Competent in counseling students on personal matters.	66.4	33.6	43.2	56.8
Received training in how to advise students on academic and professional matters.	55.3	44.7	61.8	36.8
Competent in knowledge of legal issues concerning advising.	44.6	55.4	33.3	66.7
Received training on how to counsel students on personal matters.	18.4	81.6	17.1	82.9
Received training on how to advise student organizations.	12.1	87.9	14.5	85.5

Note: Faculty n =141; Department Administration n = 78
[a] Frequency of respondents who marked agree and strongly agree.
[b] Frequency of respondents who marked disagree and strongly disagree.

Table 4. Perceived Advising Competence Level

Area of Advising	Not at all Competent		Somewhat Competent		Competent		Very Competent	
	Faculty %	Admin %	Faculty %	Admin %	Faculty %	Admin %	Faculty %	Admin %
Degree / Program Requirements	0.0	0.0	1.4	7.9	14.9	39.5	83.7	52.6
Course Scheduling	0.7	0.0	3.6	7.9	18.6	46.1	77.1	46.1
Career Counseling	0.7	0.0	16.3	19.7	48.2	69.7	34.8	10.5
Industry / Job Market Demands	0.0	0.0	17.0	18.7	55.3	65.3	27.7	16.0
Student Organization Advising	13.5	5.3	20.6	41.3	41.1	44.0	24.8	9.3
Activities / Competitions	9.2	5.3	32.6	45.3	40.4	41.3	17.7	8.0
Financial Assistance Opportunities	14.2	11.8	41.1	56.6	30.5	27.6	14.2	3.9
Personal Issues	14.4	24.0	39.6	61.3	36.7	14.7	9.4	0.0

Note: Faculty n =141; Department Administration n = 78

noted as most important when working with graduate students. Working with student organizations and assisting students in preparation for activities and competitions were ranked as least important.

Conclusions/Implications / Recommendations

The first objective of this study sought to compare faculty and department administrators' definition of advising in terms of rewards and time commitments. Both faculty and administrators agreed that student advising should be considered in promotion and tenure decisions. However, only 25% of the faculty in this study agreed that student advising is a factor considered by administrators in these decisions. A majority of department administrators indicated that these activities are considered in promotion and tenure.

Further discrepancies surfaced in this area as well. Most department administrators (91%) agreed that quality advising is valued by the department. Yet only 73% of the faculty concurred with this statement. Both groups did agree that faculty are not provided adequate time to advise students.

The second objective examined differences in attitudes and perceptions of advising held by faculty and department administrators. Both groups held very similar attitudes about most advising issues. However, one difference did appear. The majority (63%) of faculty felt that only faculty with teaching appointments should advise undergraduate students. Only 45% of the department administrators held this same opinion.

The third objective sought to compare how faculty and administrators perceive the competence/preparation level of faculty to advise. The lack of training on advising did not seem to affect the perceived competence level of faculty to advise. Faculty in general (91%) reported that they felt that their expertise in advising was adequate. A lower percentage (69%) of department administrator felt the same way.

The final objective of this study examined the level of importance placed on various advising roles by faculty and administrators. In general, both faculty and department administrators agreed on the ranking of importance of the advising roles included in this study. Both groups felt that knowing and working with degree/program requirements was the most important advising role in advising undergraduate students. Working with research was ranked as most important by both groups when advising graduate students.

The finding that faculty do not feel that student advising is consider in promotion and tenure decisions concurs with the findings of Dillon and Fisher (2000). As stated by Hancock (1996), this view that advising is not rewarded in promotion and tenure can lead faculty to be disinclined to exert much time and effort into these activities. This should be of concern to administration, as reported by Corts et al. (2000) and supported by the participants in this study that

Table 5. Faculty Ranking of Importance of Adviser Roles

Item	Undergraduate				Graduate			
	Faculty		Dept Admin		Faculty		Dept Admin	
	Rank	Index Score[a]	Rank	Index Score[a]	Rank	Index Score[a]	Rank	Index Score[a]
Degree/Program Requirements	1	1130	1	640	2	1100	2	640
Course Scheduling	2	1022	2	590	4	830	4	485
Career Counseling	3	950	3	539	3	953	3	600
Industry/Job Market Demands	4	707	4	376	5	742	5	418
Personal Issues	5	614	6	341	6	627	6	363
Scholarship/Financial Aid Counseling	6	597	5	352	7	598	7	309
Student Organization Advising	7	488	7	258	9	293	9	163
Activities/Competitions	8	479	8	230	8	477	8	237
Other	9	40	9	9	10	61	10	20
Research	x[b]	x[b]	x[b]	x[b]	1	1170	1	662

Note: Faculty n =141; Department Administration n = 78

[a] An index score was calculated by reverse coding respondent ranking (e.g., 1 = 8 pts, 2 = 7 pts, etc.) and summing total points received by each item.

[b] Not an option in this category

advising plays an important role in retaining students. Further study is needed to gain a better understanding of the role of advising in promotion and tenure decision making. Furthermore, the cause for the discrepancy in perception on this issue should be investigated.

The finding that faculty feel that their expertise in advising is adequate and a substantially smaller percentage of department administrators feel that way may have a connection to the lack of training received in this area. These findings concerning the amount of training compare to those of Habley and Morales (Gordon and Habley, 2000) Selke and Wong (1993) stated that faculty are mistaken to believe that they can learn all that is needed for quality advising through experience only. Petress (1996) also noted that professional development is needed to prepare advisors for the important task of advising undergraduate and graduate students as well as student organizations. Further study is needed to more accurately assess the advising ability of faculty in colleges of agriculture. Additional research is needed to better understand the type of training received by faculty and what additional professional development opportunities should be provided.

The findings of this study are significant to college of agriculture faculty in that many of these individuals are called upon to advise undergraduate and graduate students as well as student organizations. An understanding of the attitudes and perceptions of both faculty and department administrators can be used to begin a dialogue that can address any apparent discrepancies between the two groups.

Literature Cited

Bandura, A. 1997. Self-efficacy. Harvard Mental Health Letter, 13(9): 4(3).

Boyer, E. L. 1990. Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate. Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Burton, J., and K. Wellington. 1998. The O'Banion model of academic advising: An integrative approach. NACADA Journal, 18(2): 13-20.

Clason, D. L., and T .J. Dormody. 1994. Analyzing data measured by individual Likert-type items. Journal of Agricultural Education, 35(4): 31-35.

Corts, D. P., J. W. Lounsbury, and R. A. Saudargas. 2000. Assessing undergraduate satisfaction with an academic department: a method and case study. College Student Journal, 34(3): 399-408.

Crookston, B. B. 1972. A developmental view of academic advising as teaching. Journal of College Student Personnel, 13: 12-17.

Dillman, D. A. 2000. Mail and Internet surveys: The tailored design method (2nd ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Dillon, R. K., and B. J. Fisher. 2000. Faculty as part of the advising equation: An inquiry into faculty viewpoints on advising. NACADA Journal, 20(1): 16-22.

Dyer, J. E., R. Lacey, and E. W. Osborne. 1996. Attitudes of University of Illinois College of Agriculture freshman toward agriculture. Journal of Agricultural Education, 37(3): 43-51.

Fiddler, M. B., and M. Alicea. 1996. Use of a collective narrative process to articulate practice-based advising competencies. NACADA Journal, 16(1): 14-20.

Frost, S. H. 1993. Developmental advising: Practices and attitudes of faculty advisors. NACADA Journal, 13(2): 15-19.

Glennen, R. E., P. J. Farren, and F.N. Vowell. 1996. How advising and retention of students improves fiscal stability. NACADA Journal, 16(1): 38-41.

Gordon, V. N. 1992. Handbook of academic advising. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press.

Gordon, V. N., and W. R. Habley. 2000. Academic advising: A comprehensive handbook. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Habley, W. R. 1997. Organizational models and institutional advising practices. NACADA Journal, 17(2): 39-44.

Hancock, D. R. 1996. Enhancing faculty motivation to advise students: An application of expectancy theory. NACADA Journal, 16(2), 11-15.

Hemwall, M. K., and K. C. Trachte. 1999. Learning at the core: Toward a new understanding of academic advising. NACADA Journal, 19(1): 5-10.

Kennedy, G. J., R. L. Gordon, and V. N. Gordon. 1995. Changes in social and academic integration in freshman of high and average ability: Implications for retention. NACADA Journal, 15(2): 9-18.

Mager, R. F. 1992. No self-efficacy, no performance. Training, 29(4): 32-36.

Miller, M. A., and B. Alberts. 1994. Developmental advising: Where teaching and learning intersect. NACADA Journal, 14(2): 43-45.

Miville, M. L., and W. E. Sedlacek. 1995. An assessment of centralized versus faculty advising in a college of engineering. NACADA Journal, 15(2): 20-25.

O'Banion, T. 1972. An academic advising model. Junior College Journal, 42(6): 62, 64, and 66-69.

Petress, K. C. 1996. The multiple roles of an undergraduate's academic advisor. Education, 117: 91.

Ryan, C. C. 1992. Advising as teaching. NACADA Journal, 12(1): 4-8.

Selke, M. J., and T. D. Wong. 1993. The mentoring-empowered model: Professional role functions in graduate student advisement. NACADA Journal, 13(2): 21-26.

Showell, J. A. 1998. Some legal implications in academic advising. NACADA Journal, 18(2): 40-46.

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

Woodbury, J. 1999. Advising with a strong assessment component helps students achieve their educational goals. NACADA Journal, 19(2): 10-16.