

From the Coeditors

We are pleased to share important contributions to the scholarship of advising in this issue. The first two pieces focused on academic advising as a profession. The issue opens with an article that explored ethical practice in academic advising, while the second investigated motives for career persistence among females in the primary advisor role. The next three pieces, although vastly different, shared in revealing just how impactful advisor communication can be. We are excited to close this issue with an article that so clearly illustrated the continued lines of research and application of perspectives from personality and social psychology on academic advising.

In the opening article, utilizing constructivist grounded theory, Puroway proposed a model of ethical practice, including ethical encounter and response, capturing how advisors deal with ethical dilemmas. Such scholarship on ethical practice is a crucial step in the professionalization of our field. In the second article, again through the lens of constructivist paradigm, Solon, McGill, and Jensen explored the motivations contributing to career persistence among females in the role of primary advisor. Interviews with female primary role advisors revealed that meaningful and rewarding relationships with students, supportive colleagues, and supervisors; opportunities for professional development and self-care; and the potential for work-life balance contributed to these advisors' persistence in advising positions that often have high turnover. NACADA (2016) membership demographics indicated that more than 70% of members identified as female. Thus, we believe this article may also be of great interest to our readers.

The issue continues with a study by Payne, Vandecar-Burdin, and Cigularova who surveyed faculty and advisor attitudes about articulation agreements pertaining to transfer students. Survey results indicated overall favorable attitudes about these agreements. However, compared to faculty, professional advisors indicated more familiarity with how the agreements work and who to contact with questions about the transfer process. Payne et al. also noted the importance of two types of communication: with students and across institutions. In addition to illuminating the importance of communication, their study of attitudes about agreements between university and community colleges reminds us of the rich potential of another

type of partnership—the research partnership. Research collaborations between community college and university scholars, advising practitioners and research scholars, emerging and experienced researchers, and global collaborations all hold enormous promise in advancing the scholarship of advising (Troxel, 2019).

This issue includes two more studies in which the importance of advisor communication emerged. In a quantitative study replicating and expanding the work of Kyte et al. (2020) published in the *Journal*, Buchanan, Brown, Chirco, Klein, and Purgason advanced our understanding of advisor language choices and micromessaging. They found that small changes in language choice and micromessages positively influenced student outcomes, with a stronger effect noted for first-generation students and students of color. Their study and the previous work of Kyte et al. (2020) highlighted just how much an advisor's words matter. In a broader sense, the importance of advisor personalized communications with students also emerged in the next article by Talbott. In this qualitative study, Talbott interviewed academic advisors who were subject matter experts on career changers as well as surveyed graduate students engaged in career change. The interview and survey findings revealed that out of many available resources for academic and career advising, career changers most frequently relied on personal communication with advisors and new student orientation programming, once again illuminating the importance of advising communication.

We conclude this issue with a quantitative study by Robinson and Shi who explored the relationship among the noncognitive factors of attribution perspective, shame resilience, and academic identity status in relation to outcomes for probationary students in academic recovery courses. Their findings pointed to the potential for positive attribution perspective and shame resiliency in relation to students' trying to recover academically and the role advisors might play in facilitating the development of these noncognitive factors. More than 10 years ago, previous *Journal* editors published a special issue on *Perspectives from Personality and Social Psychology on Academic Advising* (Robbins & Shaffer, 2011), and this study by Robinson and Shi demonstrated just how far this line of research has progressed and developed since. Thus, in so many ways, this

issue advances the empirical and theoretical work captured in the rich history of this *Journal* while speaking to the future development of the profession, its practices, and the needs of student populations we serve.

Karen Mottarella & Lisa M. Rubin

References

- Kyte, S. B., Collins, E., & Deil-Amen, R. (2020). Mindset messaging: Fostering student support and confidence through micro-messaging in advisor communication. *NACADA Journal*, 40(1), 36–48. <https://doi.org/10.12930/NACADA-19-08>
- NACADA. (2016). *NACADA member demographic information, as of February 29, 2016*.
- Robbins, R., & Shaffer, L. (2011). From the co-editors: Perspectives from personality and social psychology on academic advising. *NACADA Journal*, 31(2), 3–4. <https://doi.org/10.12930/0271-9517-31.2.2>
- Troxel, W. G. (2019). Scholarly advising and the scholarship of advising. *NACADA Journal*, 39(2), 52–59. <https://doi.org/10.12930/NACADA-19-203>