

Advising as Servant Leadership: Investigating the Relationship

W. Kohle Paul, Valdosta State University

K. Courtney Smith, Valdosta State University

Brendan J. Dochney, Valdosta State University

Advisors serve in many, often overlooked, roles. We investigated the supposition that McClellan (2007a) espoused between academic advising and servant leadership. Our hypotheses, that measures of servant leadership and developmental advising are correlated and that wisdom is the best predictor of developmental advising behaviors, were supported. We used Winston and Sandor's (1984) Academic Advising Inventory and Barbutto and Wheeler's (2006) Servant Leadership Questionnaire to examine the relationship. Our sample consisted of 223 undergraduates at a mid-sized university in the southeastern United States. Implications for practice include enhancing advisor training and development.

KEYWORDS: *Academic Advising Inventory, advising approaches, advisor training, professional development, Servant Leadership Questionnaire*

Research has consistently shown that academic advisors play an integral part in the retention, persistence, and success of college students. For example, academic advisors are coaches of student success, helping them take an active approach to decision making and performance improvements by using coaching-related activities and procedures (McClellan & Moser, 2011). Academic advisors are also teachers: "The excellent advisor helps the student to understand, and indeed in a certain sense, to create the logic of the student's curriculum" (Lowenstein, 2005, p. 65). Students often turn to advisors when they face academic difficulties. Academic advisors seek out those students and try to help them identify and alleviate their problems through intrusive advising (Varney, 2007). Finally, academic advisors prescribe classes and audit degree requirements.

However, despite the many recognized roles of advisors, their leadership in terms of student growth and development is often overlooked. Hersey and Blanchard (1982) asserted that "leadership is the process of influencing the activities of an individual or a group in efforts toward goal achievement in a given situation" (p. 84). Additionally, Tannenbaum, Weschler, and Massarik (1961) believed leadership to be "interpersonal influence,

exercised in a situation, and directed, through the communication process, toward the attainment of a specified goal or goals" (p. 24). Effective leaders are passionate about their cause, motivate and inspire those around them, and facilitate personal and professional growth in their followers (Kouzes & Posner, 2007). Academic advisors exhibit many of these leadership behaviors. McClellan (2007a) suggested that the advisor-advisee interaction is similar to the servant leader-constituent interaction, corroborating the point by stating that the role of the advisor is to "help students integrate their academic learning with their personal and professional lives" (p. 41). Much like an effective academic advisor, the servant-leader seeks to empower others by helping them develop holistically and provides constituents with the necessary resources to obtain success (Spears, 2004).

The similarities prompted us to investigate the relationship between servant leadership and academic advising at the university in which we work. The practical implications of the relationship between academic advising and servant leadership further the growth and development of academic advisors and the field of academic advising.

Constructs of Servant Leadership and Their Link to Academic Advising

Robert K. Greenleaf published an essay titled *The Servant as Leader* in 1970. The underlying factors that influenced this piece included his family and childhood, his experience in college, his time spent working for AT&T, and his religious faith (Greenleaf, 2003). However, it was not until he read Hesse's *Journey to the East* that he conceptualized the term *servant leadership* (Greenleaf, 1970; Greenleaf, 2003; Spears & Lawrence, 2004). Greenleaf's view of servant leadership encompassed two key aspects: The potential leader must desire to serve others first and only after first serving can the individual feel moved to lead (Crippen, 2005; Greenleaf, 1977). A person displaying qualities of servant leadership sees those whom he or she serves grow, benefit, and succeed. Servant leadership constructs include listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, foresight, conceptualization, stewardship, commitment to the growth

of people, and building community (Crippen, 2005; Greenleaf, 1970, 1977; McClellan, 2007a; Powers & Moore, 2005; Spears, 2004; Spears & Lawrence, 2004).

Listening and Empathy

Spears (2004) suggested that the act of listening is perhaps the most important facet of servant leadership. While listening simply means hearing the speech of another individual, such a simple definition is not sufficient when applied to servant leadership or advising. The ability to listen critically is an important skill utilized by both academic advisors and servant-leaders. Spears (2004) stated that a servant-leader has “a deep commitment to listen intently to others...a servant-leader is an individual who listens receptively” (p. 8). Ryan (1992) noted that effective advisors listen constructively; that is, they seek to listen and understand all aspects of students’ expressed problems.

McClellan (2007a) corroborated the importance of key listening skill and included empathy as a vital component of it. Although the term *empathy* is commonly used, many individuals do not fully grasp the concept. Empathy is different than sympathy: It is not merely feeling sorry for a person, but reflects a true understanding and experiencing of feeling the emotions of another person. McClellan (2007a) said that effective advisors, like servant-leaders, are able to facilitate personal growth within their constituents by listening critically and participating in active reflection to understand their constituents’ feelings about their lived experiences.

Healing

McClellan (2007a) stated that individuals most commonly define healing as restoring one back to health again, thus causing many individuals to ponder the reason Greenleaf had identified healing as a characteristic of servant leadership. However, Greenleaf’s interpretation of *healing* differs from the common definition of the word. Greenleaf referred to the ability of servant-leaders to heal themselves and those whom they influence. Spears and Lawrence (2004) described this concept as seeking to make those who are broken whole again.

At first glance the parallels between servant leadership, advising, and healing may not be evident. *Healing* refers to holistic personal development. Holistic development is similar to Covey’s (2004) four components of well-being. One can become whole again by enhancing their physical, mental, emotional, and spiritual well-being (Covey, 2004). Covey believed changes in attitudes and

habits were the best method for enhancing wholeness. Helping students achieve wholeness is a common practice among effective advisors. According to Ryan (1992), an effective advisor aids students in understanding and accepting themselves, often by helping them first understand the skills that they must acquire to reach lifetime career goals (Ryan, 1992). Advisors should also assist advisees toward intellectual and social growth as they explore life and career goals and choose programs and activities that support their goals (O’Banion, 1972/1994/2009). While advisors do not heal students like a physician might, they work with them to establish goals and purpose, which can help confused and lost students find their way toward wholeness.

Awareness

McClellan (2007a) defined awareness as a “pivotal internal characteristic” of servant leadership (p. 45). According to Crippen (2005), to embody the true meaning of awareness, servant-leaders must have both general and self awareness, which results when one continually gains knowledge, including that about one’s self, and uses it to help others. McClellan (2007a) added that servant-leaders not only gain knowledge from information and knowledge about oneself, but they gain an understanding of how to use that information to serve others. A servant-leader empowers other individuals and helps them progress (Howatson-Jones, 2004). In summary, a servant-leader gains awareness to fulfill their leadership duties.

Awareness enhances an advisor’s knowledge of academic policies and procedures as well as the ability to link particular classes to a student’s holistic developmental goals. Advisors’ breadth of knowledge and ability to disseminate the information to their students in the appropriate situations are critical to the relationship between awareness and academic advising (McClellan, 2007a).

Persuasion

Unlike some other types of leaders, servant-leaders persuade their followers rather than force them into making decisions (McClellan, 2007a; Spears, 2004). McClellan (2007a) defined persuasion as the ability of servant-leaders to help their followers make decisions that enhance themselves and others. Through persuasion, individuals are guided along in the decision-making process without losing their autonomy (McClellan, 2007a). Greenleaf used *consensus* when describing persuasion in the servant leadership context (McClellan,

2007a; Spears, 2004): The servant-leader and the follower must reach an agreement about a decision. Similar to servant-leaders, academic advisors assist students in developing the skills necessary for making well-planned decisions (Crookston, 1972/1994/2009). Advisors are students' liaisons on campus, and through their advice, they direct students rather than coerce them into making personal and educational decisions (Ryan, 1992).

Foresight and Conceptualization

Spears (2004) suggested that "foresight is a characteristic that enables the servant-leader to understand the lessons from the past, the realities of the present, and the likely consequence of a decision for the future" (p. 9). Greenleaf (1977) asserted that foresight enables a servant-leader to envision the future. The processes of envisioning the future also entail creating a strategic plan for reaching the intended outcomes of the vision. The notion of aligning vision with planning is the fundamental aspect of conceptualization as "the capacity to develop a big-picture perspective and plan" (McClellan, 2007a, p. 44). Spears (2004) contended that the act of helping an individual "dream great dreams" is also a vital aspect of conceptualization (p. 9).

The amalgamation of foresight and conceptualization characterizes successful academic advising. Academic advisors seek to help students create a plan for their future based on the students' past performances, present endeavors, and future interests (McClellan, 2007a). Ryan (1992) stated that academic advisors should provide their students with a myriad of class, major, and occupation choices based on the students' lived experiences. They should also challenge the students to actively seek out and explore various choices as well as cocreate an educational action plan with them.

Stewardship and Commitment to the Growth of People

The most salient facet of stewardship is the servant-leader's commitment to serving the needs of constituents (Spears, 2004). Through stewardship, leaders help constituents grow both personally and professionally. McClellan (2007a) purported that servant-leaders' power provides them the opportunity to serve: "Power, therefore, is the means whereby leaders serve. Stewardship is the sense of responsibility leaders have with regard to the use of the power they possess" (p. 47).

Academic advisors also possess a great deal of power over the students they serve, and they

can empower students to become active learners and participants in their educational endeavors. Empowerment, associated with stewardship, plays an integral role in the growth of the student. An effective academic advisors' commitment to help their students is analogous with a servant-leader's deep commitment to the growth of the individuals who work within her or his organization (Spears, 2004). Crookston (1972/1994/2009) suggested that development theory provides the framework through which advisors assist students in becoming aware of their changing self. Through developmental academic advising, the student and advisor collaboratively consider career and professional training options in the context of life as a whole rather than as the center upon which one builds a life (Crookston, 1972/1994/2009). Appleby (2001) agreed that the advising process should focus upon life choices, as well as school and career options, for the further development of the individual as a person and not just as a student.

Building Community

Greenleaf (1977) stated that the capacity for an individual to grow, develop, and love is fostered though a community setting, and higher learning institutions facilitate a community in which students can lead a self-fulfilling life. Using Greenleaf as a guide and the institutional situation, advisors can organize small groups to provide the vital element of community (Powers & Moore, 2005). McClellan (2007a) pointed out that in building community with their students, advisors must provide a caring atmosphere and suggested use of friendship behaviors. Advisors provide a caring climate by preparing for their advising appointments, exhibiting sincerity and empathy, and being well-informed and accurate with the advice they give (Holmes, 2004).

Through the developmental model and shared responsibilities, the advisor-student relationship grows with equality, strengthening the students' environmental and interpersonal interactions. The skills and opportunities gained by students in community may help them value the differences of others (Crookston, 1972/1994/2009).

Purpose of the Study

We set out to test McClellan's (2007a) thesis of a relationship between academic advising and servant leadership. We investigated which factor of servant leadership best predicts academic advising behaviors. We used Winston and Sandor's (1984) *Academic Advising Inventory* (AAI) and Barbutto

and Wheeler's (2006) *Servant Leadership Questionnaire* (SLQ) to study the potential relationship between academic advising and servant leadership. The AAI is a brief survey designed to measure students' perceptions of their advisors' developmental and prescriptive advising behaviors. The SLQ is a brief questionnaire designed to measure individuals' servant leadership behaviors.

Key Constructs of the *Servant Leadership Questionnaire*

Barbuto and Wheeler's (2006) original SLQ contained 11 constructs of servant leadership including calling, listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, growth, and community building. However, through a factor analysis, they reduced the original 11 factors to 5 factors. Barbuto and Wheeler (2006) contended that listening and empathy are important facets for all types of leadership and thus did not warrant consideration as unique constructs for their study. They also removed the constructs of community building and growth because they did not contribute any empirical significance to the questionnaire. They combined servant leadership behaviors labeled under the awareness and foresight constructs into the construct of wisdom, and combined persuasion and conceptualization to create the construct of persuasive mapping. The final constructs in the final version of the SLQ were altruistic calling, emotional healing, wisdom, persuasive mapping, and organizational stewardship.

Altruistic Calling

Individuals with an altruistic calling tend to place the needs of their constituents over their own needs. They also have a desire to influence and make a positive difference in the lives of their constituents (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006).

Emotional Healing

Barbuto and Wheeler (2006) contended that emotional healing involves a leader's deep rooted commitment to helping followers recover from hardship or trauma. Individuals who exhibit the characteristic of emotional healing tend to be empathetic and understanding of others' misfortunes and traumatic experiences.

Wisdom

Barbuto and Wheeler (2006) asserted that wisdom is a combination of environmental awareness and anticipation of consequences. Leaders who exhibit wisdom proficiently interpret environmen-

tal cues and understand their implications; they are very observant and anticipatory.

Persuasive Mapping

Through persuasive mapping, Barbuto and Wheeler (2006) suggested that leaders are adept at persuading, rather than coercing, their constituents to action. Persuasive mapping includes a leader's ability to visualize the future for the organization and constituents.

Organizational Stewardship

Organizational stewardship describes the extent to which leaders prepare their organization to make a positive contribution to society through community development, programs, and outreach (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006). Leaders expressing organizational stewardship strive to improve the community on multiple measures.

Hypotheses

The constructs of servant leadership, identified by Greenleaf (1977), including listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, foresight, conceptualization, stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, and building community, play an integral role in academic advising and are imperative to the advisor-advisee relationship (McClellan, 2007a). Crookston (1972/1994/2009) asserted that developmental advising is focused on the development and growth of students' problem-solving, decision-making, and evaluation skills. King (2005) stated, "Developmental academic advising recognizes the importance of interactions between the student and the campus environment, it focuses on the whole person, and it works with the student at that person's own life stage of development." Based on Greenleaf's formulation of servant leadership and Crookston's and King's conceptualizations of developmental advising, we believe a significant positive relationship exists between developmental academic advising and servant leadership.

Once we found the proposition supported, we determined which factor of servant leadership is the best predictor of developmental academic-advising practice. The construct of awareness refers to a servant-leader's willingness to seek out knowledge and use it to help others (Crippen, 2005). Awareness is a salient part of Barbuto and Wheeler's (2006) operationalization of wisdom, which incorporates servant-leaders' quest for knowledge and their ability to share that knowledge for the betterment of their constituents. Like effective servant-leaders, academic advisors also

seek to gain awareness of their environment and share it with their students. Research has shown that advisors' knowledge of degree requirements and institutional policies and procedures consistently ranks at the top of students' list of factors influencing their college experience (Noel-Levitz, 2010). Therefore, based on the importance and similarities between awareness in servant leadership and academic advising as well as Barbuto and Wheeler's (2006) operationalization of wisdom, we considered wisdom to be the construct of servant leadership that characterizes the concepts and qualities of developmental advising. The hypotheses are summarized as follows:

- H1. AAI developmental advising behavior scores will be positively and significantly related to SLQ behavior scores.
- H2. The most significant predictor of AAI developmental advising behavior scores will be wisdom behavior scores.

Methods

Participants

We identified all the classes across campus that contained similar demographics as the undergraduate population. Using a purposive sampling technique (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2009), we selected 5 of the 20 identified classes as our sample. The participants consisted of 223 undergraduates from a midsize university in the southeastern United States. The participant demographic breakdown for gender was 69.1% female and 30.9% male; the entire undergraduate population is 58.4% female and 41.6% male. By class, participants consisted of 27.3% freshmen, 26.5% sophomores, 20.2% juniors, and 26.0% seniors, which are data similar to that of the general population at 28.0% freshmen, 22.4% sophomores, 21.8% juniors, and 27.0% seniors. The participants indicated that they were (2.2% declined to respond) 48.4% White, 39.0% Black, 5.4% multiracial, 3.6% Hispanic, and 1.3% Asian; the racial/ethnic make-up of the general population is 59.3% White, 30.6% Black, 3.3% Hispanic, 2.5% multiracial, 2.4% unknown, 1.3% Asian, 0.3% Native American, and 0.2% Pacific Islander. The five most frequently reported majors included psychology, 27.4%; nursing, 13.9%; biology, 10.3%; criminal justice, 8.5%; and early childhood education, 4.5% for the sample. The top five majors of the total undergraduate population are biology, 8.3%; nursing, 8.2%; early childhood education, 6.0%; psychology, 5.6%; and criminal justice, 4.4%.

Instruments

Academic Advising Inventory. We measured academic advisors' developmental and prescriptive advising characteristics using Part I of Winston and Sandor's (1984) AAI. The scale consisted of 14 questions designed to measure developmental-prescriptive advising (DPA) behaviors ($\alpha = .78$). The subscales used to measure DPA behaviors were personalizing education (PE) ($\alpha = .81$), academic decision making (ADM) ($\alpha = .66$), and selecting courses (SC) ($\alpha = .42$). The PE subscale focuses on the holistic educational development of the student through measures of career and vocational planning, extracurricular activities, personal concerns, goal setting, and identification and utilization of on campus resources (Winston & Sandor, 2002, p. 11). The ADM subscale provides information on student academic progress as well as student interests and abilities concerning academic concentrations (Winston & Sandor, 2002, p. 11). The SC subscale addresses the process of planning and scheduling classes (Winston & Sandor, 2002). Each of the 14 questions contained two statements with 4-point Likert-type scales with the range from *very true* (1) to *slightly true* (4). Participants chose which of the two statements for each question best portrayed the behaviors exhibited by their academic advisor. After choosing the most applicable statement, the participants marked the level of trueness via the Likert-type scale, that reflects the behavior of their advisor.

Servant Leadership Questionnaire. We also measured academic advisors' servant leadership behaviors using Barbuto and Wheeler's (2006) SLQ. The 23-item questionnaire contained five subscales: altruistic calling (AC) ($\alpha = .82$), emotional healing (EH) ($\alpha = .91$), wisdom (WIS) ($\alpha = .92$), persuasive mapping (PM) ($\alpha = .87$), and organizational stewardship (OS) ($\alpha = .89$). To rate their advisor's performance on the different dimensions identified in the questionnaire, participants used a 5-point Likert-type scale with options ranging from *strongly disagree* (1) to *strongly agree* (5).

Procedure

We used the seat analysis tool (SAT) offered through the Office of Strategic Research and Analysis at the studied institution to target classes that contained similar demographic characteristics (gender, major, ethnicity, and class breakdown) as the undergraduate population. The SAT revealed 20 different classes across campus encompassing approximately 1,000 students with similar demographics as the undergraduate student population.

We contacted the professors of each class, via e-mail and telephone, about the possibility of asking their students to be part of the study. Of the professor's contacted, five agreed to let us contact the students and agreed to give extra credit to those who participated. Instead of taking up class time to complete the survey, we gave the surveys to the students during the first class meeting of the week and returned for the second class meeting of the week to pick up the completed questionnaires. We asked each participant if he or she had been advised during the Fall 2010 advising period. We excluded participants who indicated that they had not been advised; they received an alternative extra-credit assignment from their professor.

For those participants who had been advised, we explained the steps to complete the survey, which were also written at the beginning of the instrument. The standardization of the data collection procedure helped reduce the risk of an instrumentation threat to internal validity. We collected data immediately after the Fall 2010 advising period ended so participants' advising experiences would be fresh and the likelihood of participant maturation would be minimal.

We handed out 256 surveys to the five participating classes. Of the 235 returned, 223 were usable because 12 participants incorrectly completed it. The high return rate (92%) is likely due to extra credit opportunities offered by each professor for completion of the survey.

Analysis

We analyzed the results using SPSS-17. We conducted analysis of Part I of the AAI by coding the response on each question with the corresponding numerical value listed in the AAI user's manual (Winston & Sandor, 2002). We added each number corresponding to the response on each question to obtain the DPA score. We calculated each subscale score, (PE questions 1, 3-5, 8-10, 13; ADM questions 6, 7, 11, 14; SC questions 2, 12) by summing up the numerical values corresponding with each question contained within each subscale. DPA scores could range from 14-112. We labeled those in the 14-56 range as prescriptive and scores in the 57-112 range as developmental. PE scores could range from 8-64. We labeled those scores ranging from 8-32 as prescriptive and those ranging from 33-64 as developmental. ADM scores could range from 4-32. We labeled ADM scores ranging from 4-17 as prescriptive and those ranging from 18-32 as developmental. SC scores could range from 2-16. We labeled SC scores ranging from

2-8 as prescriptive and those ranging from 9-16 as developmental.

We analyzed the SLQ by coding the Likert-type scale with the corresponding numerical values (1-*strongly agree*, 2-*disagree*, 3-*neither agree nor disagree*, 4-*agree*, 5-*strongly agree*) and calculated the average rater response for each subscale: AC items 3, 8, 11, 18; EH items 4, 9, 14, 19; WIS items 1, 6, 12, 16, 22; PM items 2, 7, 13, 17, 21; OS items 5, 10, 15, 20. High (at or near 5) average rater responses scores on each subscale correlated with the exhibition of advisors' servant-leadership behaviors.

Results

We conducted a Pearson product-moment correlation to determine the relationship between developmental advising and servant leadership. Each factor of servant leadership was positively and significantly correlated with DPA scores (see Table 1). We conducted a standard multiple-regression analysis to determine which construct of servant leadership was the most significant predictor of DPA scores. The model contained five independent variables and one dependent variable. The five independent variables included AC, EH, WIS, PM, and OS. The dependent variable was DPA score. The analysis of the full model containing all five predictors showed statistical significance: $F(5, 222) = 30.34, p < .001$; $R = .64$; $R^2 = .41$. Based on standardized beta weights, the best predictor of DPA scores was WIS (see Table 2).

Discussion and Implications for Practice

McClellan (2007a) demonstrated the theoretical and philosophical relevance of the interplay between academic advising and servant leadership. We believe, based on the literature, that the models of developmental advising and servant leadership are similar. Our initial hypothesis was supported: We found a significant positive relationship between advisors' developmental advising and their servant-leadership behaviors. In particular, WIS showed the strongest correlation with DPA scores, followed by PM, OS, EH, and AC, respectively. Our study also provides empirical evidence to support McClellan's (2007a) thesis that servant leadership and academic advising share many similar constructs.

Our second hypothesis was also supported: The results of the multiple regression analysis concluded that the best predictor of DPA scores was WIS (wisdom). PM was also a significant predictor of developmental advising behaviors. The combi-

Table 1. Intercorrelation values of developmental-prescriptive advising behavior scores and servant leadership behavior scores ($N = 223$)

Scale	DPA	AC	EH	WIS	PM	OS
DPA	1.00					
AC	.44**	1.00				
EH	.47**	.49**	1.00			
WIS	.61**	.63**	.67**	1.00		
PM	.60**	.62**	.64**	.81** ^a	1.00	
OS	.52**	.64**	.63**	.74**	.79** ^a	1.00

Note. DPA = developmental-prescriptive advising; AC = altruistic calling; EH = emotional healing; WIS = wisdom; PM = persuasive mapping; OS = organizational stewardship

^aVariance inflation factor < 5, Tolerance statistic > .2 (Field, 2009)

** $p < .01$

Table 2. Summary of regression analysis for servant leadership scores predicting developmental-prescriptive advising scores ($N = 223$)

Construct	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	<i>t</i>
Altruistic Calling (AC)	.346	.694	.036	.499
Emotional Healing (EH)	.643	.733	.064	.877
Wisdom (WIS)	2.86	.899	.315	3.18*
Persuasive Mapping (PM)	3.06	1.09	.293	2.80*
Organizational Stewardship (OS)	-.090	.959	-.009	-.094

Note. $R^2 = .41$, $F(5, 222) = 30.34$, $p < .001$; $R = .64$; * $p < .01$

nation of all five predictors accounted for 41% of the variance in DPA scores.

The constructs of WIS and PM were likely significant predictors of developmental advising behaviors because the operationalization of both is similar to the facets that students rate as the most important of their advising experience. WIS encompasses servant-leaders' ability to remain critically aware of and anticipate consequences based on their changing environment. This type of behavior is consistent with an academic advisor who remains critically aware of environmental changes within the institution and anticipates consequences, based on the changes, that could affect students. PM encompasses servant-leaders' ability to persuade their constituents and visualize future events for their organization. This coincides with the academic advisor who does not coerce a student to take particular classes or pick a particular major but offers compelling reasons for choosing the particular classes and major aligned with the student's future educational and professional endeavors.

The importance of the relationship between developmental advising and servant leadership are threefold. First, servant leadership workshops, webinars, focus groups, and other learning oppor-

tunities could enhance advisor training and development programs, which typically offer developmental advising topics (Noel-Levitz, 2006). Because effective advising has been positively linked to student retention and persistence (Light, 2001; McArthur, 2005; Poisel & Stinard, 2005; Tinto, 2004), professional development opportunities are important, particularly those composed of material covering the concepts of wisdom and persuasive mapping. According to our model, these constructs may best enhance advisor developmental-advising behaviors. We suggest wisdom and persuasion mapping may be more easy to encompass and operationalize as advisor development opportunities than the simultaneous incorporation of every facet of servant leadership.

Second, servant leadership development provides advisors the opportunity to grow as leaders. The vast majority of college and university administrators, such as deans, provosts, and advising directors, consists of former college and university faculty and staff members. Higher education institutions should start focusing on the individual leadership development as soon as possible regardless of a person's hierarchical standing within the institution (Hewison, 2009; Lacey-Haun & Whitehead, 2009).

Third, servant leadership development could help ground leadership theory in advising pedagogy and add additional insight and value to the conceptual, informational, relational, technological, and personal components of advisor training and development (King, 2000; McClellan, 2007b; Nutt, 2003). The holistic growth of advisors through servant leadership development would provide advisors additional worldviews to inform their own perceptions of their purpose in higher education. Academic advisors would not only see themselves as teachers, coaches, counselors, and prescribers of classes but also as leaders of student development.

Limitations and Future Research

We conducted our study at a single university in the southeastern United States and employed a purposive sampling technique. Therefore, we recommend that others conduct multiple replications of our study in different geographical locations to strengthen the generalizeability of the results. Participants received extra credit for their participation in the study, and participants' lack of interest in the study and their commitment to gain extra credit may have affected their responses. We explained how to complete the surveys to each participant when we distributed the surveys to each participating class; however, we were not present when the participants completed the surveys and thus we were unable to answer participants' questions regarding survey structure and understanding of the items. We suggest administering the surveys during class time so participants could ask questions and receive feedback. Also, the SLQ is typically used in the organizational setting. We could not find a servant leadership instrument geared strictly toward college students' perceptions of their advisor's servant leadership behaviors.

The use of servant leadership development to enhance advisor training and development should be further investigated. Future research should focus on the impact that servant leadership development has on advisor training and development, student success, and institutional growth. In our study, the best predictors of developmental advising characteristics were wisdom and persuasive mapping, and therefore, future research should also explore the relationship and impact of these specific constructs on academic advising and advisor training and development. If advisor servant leadership behaviors are to be used in advisor assessment, research, and training and development, then the creation and validation of an advisor

servant-leadership behaviors instrument should be further explored.

References

- Appleby, D. (2001, February). The teaching-advising connection. *The Mentor: An Academic Advising Journal*, 3. Retrieved from <http://dus.psu.edu/mentor/appleby1.htm>
- Barbuto, J. E., & Wheeler, D. W. (2006). Scale development and construct clarification of servant leadership. *Group & Organization Management*, 31(3), 300–26.
- Covey, S. R. (2004). *The 7 habits of highly effective people*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Crippen, C. (2005). Servant leadership as an effective model for educational leadership and management: First to serve, then to lead. *Management in Education*, 18(5), 11–16.
- Crookston, B. B. (2009). A developmental view of academic advising as teaching. *NACADA Journal*, 29(1), 78–82. (Reprinted from *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 13, 1972, pp. 12–17; *NACADA Journal*, 14[2], 1994, pp. 5–9)
- Field, A. (2009). *Discovering statistics using SPSS* (3rd ed.). London, UK: Sage.
- Fraenkel, J. R., & Wallen, N. E. (2009). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (7th ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Greenleaf, R. K. (1970). *The servant as leader*. Indianapolis, IN: Greenleaf Center.
- Greenleaf, R. K. (1977). *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness* (25th Anniversary Ed.). New York, NY: Paulist.
- Greenleaf, R. K. (2003). *The servant-leader within*. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press.
- Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. (1982). *Management of organizational behavior: Utilizing human resources* (4th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Hewison, A. (2009). Do we expect too much of our leaders? *Journal of Nursing Management*, 17(8), 913–16. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2834.2009.01057.x
- Holmes, C. E. (2004). *Handle with care: The significance of caring in academic advising* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from the ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (DAI)
- Howatson-Jones, I. L. (2004). The servant leader. *Nursing Management*, 11(3), 20–24.
- King, M. C. (2000). Designing effective training for academic advisors. In V. G. Gordon & W. R. Habley (Eds.), *Academic advising: a comprehensive handbook*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

- King, M. C. (2005). *Developmental academic advising*. Retrieved from http://www.nacada.ksu.edu/clearinghouse/advisingissues/dev_adv.htm
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2007). *The leadership challenge* (4th ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Lacey-Haun, L. C., & Whitehead, T. D. (2009). Leading change through an international faculty development programme. *Journal of Nursing Management*, 17(8), 917–930. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2834.2008.00955.x
- Light, R. J. (2001). *Making the most of college: Students speak their minds*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Lowenstein, M. (2005). If advising is teaching, what do advisors teach? *NACADA Journal*, 25(2), 65–73.
- McArthur, R. C. (2005). Faculty-based advising: An important factor in community college retention. *Community College Review*, 32(4), 1–19.
- McClellan, J. L. (2007a). The advisor as servant: The theoretical and philosophical relevance of servant leadership. *NACADA Journal*, 27(2), 41–49.
- McClellan, J. L. (2007b). *Content components for advisor training: Revisited*. Retrieved from <http://www.nacada.ksu.edu/Clearinghouse/AdvisingIssues/Training-Revisited.htm>
- McClellan, J. L., & Moser, C. (2011). *A practical approach to advising as coaching*. Retrieved from <http://www.nacada.ksu.edu/Clearinghouse/AdvisingIssues/advising-as-coaching.htm#over>
- Noel-Levitz (2006). *2006 Advising needs report: Summary of findings from National Advising Needs Survey*. Retrieved February 1, 2011, from http://www.gcccd.edu/research/thinktank/Reports/Advising_Needs_Report_2006.pdf
- Noel-Levitz (2010). *2010 National student satisfaction and priorities report*. Retrieved from https://www.noellevitz.com/documents/shared/Papers_and_Research/2010/SSI_public%20report%20A_0910%20indd.pdf
- Nutt, C. L. (2003). Creating advisor-training and development programs. In *Advisor training: Exemplary practices in the development of advisor skills* (Monograph No. 9) (pp. 9–11). Manhattan, KS: National Academic Advising Association.
- O'Banion, T. (2009). 1994 (1972): An academic advising model, *NACADA Journal*, 29(1), 83–89. (Reprinted from *Junior College Journal*, 42, 1972, pp. 62, 63, 66–69; *NACADA Journal*, 1994, 14[2], pp. 10–16)
- Poisel, M. A., & Stinard, C. A. (2005). Networks for transfer success. *Journal of Applied Research in the Community College*, 12(2), 137–44.
- Powers, J. B., & Moore, J. W. (2005). Servant leadership and the art of teaching. *The International Journal of Servant Leadership*, 1(1), 123–53.
- Ryan, C. C. (1992). Advising as teaching. *NACADA Journal*, 12(1), 4–8.
- Spears, L. C. (2004). Practicing servant leadership. *Leader to Leader*, 34, 7–11.
- Spears, L. C., & Lawrence, M. (2004). *Practicing servant-leadership: Succeeding through trust, bravery, and forgiveness*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- SPSS Version 17 [computer software]. IBM.
- Tannenbaum, R., Weschler, I. R., & Massarik, F. (1961). *Leadership and organization: A behavioral science approach*. New York, NY: McGraw Hill.
- Tinto, V. (2004). *Student retention and graduation: Facing the truth, living with the consequences* (Occasional Paper 1). Washington, DC: The Pell Institution for the Study of Opportunity in Education.
- Varney, J. (2007). Intrusive advising. *Academic Advising Today*, 30(3). Retrieved from http://www.nacada.ksu.edu/AAT/NW30_3.htm
- Winston, R. B., & Sandor, J. A. (1984). *Academic advising inventory*. Athens, GA: Student Development Associates.
- Winston, R. B., & Sandor, J. A. (2002). *Evaluating academic advising: Manual for the academic advising inventory*. Athens, GA: Student Development Associates.

Authors' Notes

After serving as an academic advisor and the Graduate Assistant Advisor Training Coordinator for the OASIS Center for Advising at Valdosta State University, W. Kohle Paul has accepted a position as Coordinator of Student Success and Retention at Georgia Perimeter College Dunwoody campus. He is working toward a doctorate in higher education leadership at Valdosta State University. His main research area focuses on investigating the applicability of servant leadership as an effective model for advising and advisor development. He is currently developing an academic advisor servant-leadership behavior scale as a follow-up to this piece and as part of his dissertation. He can be reached at kohlepaul@gmail.com.

K. Courtney Smith served as a graduate assis-

tant advisor for the OASIS Center for Advising at Valdosta State University while working on this research project. She graduated in July 2011 with an MS in clinical-counseling psychology. She now works as a regional manager for Special Olympics Georgia.

Brendan J. Dochney served as a graduate assistant advisor for the OASIS Center for Advising at Valdosta State University while working on this research project. He graduated in May 2011 with a MS in clinical-counseling psychology. He now works as an activity therapist at Georgia Regional Hospital in Savannah.