



JOURNAL  
OF THE  
INDIANA  
UNIVERSITY  
STUDENT  
PERSONNEL  
ASSOCIATION

1982

INDIANA UNIVERSITY STUDENT PERSONNEL ASSOCIATION

INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Department of College Student Personnel Administration  
School of Education—Room 226  
Bloomington, Indiana 47405

*Journal Committee*

Co-Editors: Rodney P. Kirsch and Janet R. Wright

Committee Members: David Hull and Bill VanAntwerpen

Faculty Advisor: Dr. George D. Kuh

The **Journal of the Indiana University Student Personnel Association** is published by the Indiana University Student Personnel Association, The Department of College Student Personnel Administration, and the Department of Residence Life. Contributions from alumni and friends provide the major source of funding for this publication. We welcome your future contributions.

Please send all information regarding name, address, and position changes to:

IUSPA  
Department of College Student Personnel Administration  
School of Education—Room 226  
Bloomington, Indiana 47405

We welcome comments and suggestions from our readers.

JOURNAL OF THE  
INDIANA UNIVERSITY STUDENT PERSONNEL ASSOCIATION

---

1982 Edition

---

**Contents**

**Editors' Page**

*Rodney P. Kirsch and Janet R. Wright* ..... i

**Robert H. Shaffer**

*edited by Janet R. Wright and Rodney P. Kirsch* ..... 1

**Aggregate Perceptions of "Supportiveness" in a Student Personnel Preparation Program**

*Diane Breeden-Lee, Rodney Kirsch, Kathy Malutich,  
Drew Norris, and Janet Wright* ..... 5

**Indiana University: Two Images**

*Debbie Steiman-Cameron* ..... 13

**Comparison of Job Descriptions Versus Reported Activities of Employees at a University Craft Shop**

*Elizabeth Feemster, Gene Tempel, Debbie Steiman-Cameron,  
Robert Ward, and Virginia Whaley* ..... 16

**News from 226**

*Dr. George Kuh* ..... 22

**Alumni News** ..... 24

**Journal Contributors** ..... 26

## EDITORS' PAGE

It gives us a great deal of pleasure to send you this year's edition of the *Journal of the Indiana University Student Personnel Association*. The 1982 *Journal* is dedicated to Professor Emeritus Robert H. Shaffer, who continues to be a scholar, mentor, and friend to hundreds of I.U. alumni. Our feature article on Dr. Shaffer includes highlights of a conversation with him earlier this spring, which we hope you find entertaining and informative.

Although the format of the 1982 *Journal* resembles last year's edition, there are some notable changes in content. In previous years, articles submitted by students were primarily reviews of literature or a discussion of theoretical constructs applied in practical contexts. The articles this year reflect original research conducted by students in the department. We wish to thank the authors of these articles for their commitment, energy, and fine contribution. We have also been pleased with the alumni news received over the past several months. This news is included in a special section formally reserved for placement information of graduating students. The Fall, 1981 *Alumni Newsletter* included placement of graduates.

A 33% increase in postage over a 12 month period and a 20% increase in publication costs presented major financial challenges this year. It is with sincere gratitude we recognize and thank our alumni and friends for their enthusiastic level of support. There was nearly a 40% increase in the number of alumni contributors this year compared to last year. Your generosity and confidence eliminated financial headaches and allowed us to publish the highest quality product possible within our means. We also wish to thank the Department of Residence Life for their generous contribution to assist with the escalating postage expense.

We wish to especially thank Dr. George Kuh for both his prodding and patience during our efforts. His professional guidance and personal flexibility significantly contributed to the production of the *Journal*.

Rodney P. Kirsch  
Janet R. Wright

Co-Editors

## Robert H. Shaffer

Dr. Shaffer, former chairperson of the Departments of College Student Personnel Administration and Higher Education, retired on June 1, 1981. To thank and recognize a truly remarkable individual, the 1982 edition of the *Journal of the Indiana University Student Personnel Association* is dedicated to Dr. Robert H. Shaffer. He served Indiana University for 39 years as an administrator and professor. His enthusiasm, optimism, and guidance as a scholar, mentor and friend touched the lives of literally thousands of students at Indiana University. As a colleague to both students and professionals, his humor, zeal and vitality were contagious. The editors chose to record some of Dr. Shaffer's thoughts on his professional and personal life, rather than attempt to document his contributions on an international level and his service to professional organizations by listing titles and accomplishments. The excerpts which follow, from an interview with Dr. Shaffer on January 21, 1982, reflect his genuine concern for others, his unselfish dedication to the profession of student personnel, and his unique insights into higher education.

*Dr. Shaffer, how have you adjusted to retirement, or do you even feel retired?*

My first year of retirement is probably the busiest year I have ever had. This is due in part to my poor judgement. Assuming I was going to have all this time, I accepted a lot of speaking engagements. In the fall I had 12 different speaking engagements combined with a lot of doctoral students who needed some guidance to finish (dissertation) work. In addition, I was also writing a couple of chapters for a book.

I am leaving for six weeks this spring to go to Mexico, then my wife and I hope to travel to mainland China this summer to spend three or four weeks.

Now, in regard to retirement, I recommend it to anybody! In fact, I'm trying to organize a retire-now-and-work later plan!

*How did you get involved in student personnel work, and were there any individuals that influenced your decision?*

I entered college to do youth work. The Dean of Men at DePauw University came back from the 1934 NASPA convention and said "Bob, each of us at NASPA agreed to call in some student on the campus and discuss 'deaning' with them. I'm talking to you about being a dean someday." Whether or not my interest in the profession resulted from that conversation, I do not know. Certainly it did not inhibit my decision.

I actually entered the field through vocational guidance. Harry Kittson of the Teachers College-Columbia University appointed me to the editorial board of *Occupations Magazine* and encouraged me to be a vocational counselor. It was through this I got started in the National Vocational Guidance Association (NVGA). While Harry Kittson was encouraging me to get involved with the NVGA, at the same time Gilbert Wrenn encouraged me to get active in the American College Personnel Association (ACPA) by appointing me secretary. When the unification movement which created the American Personnel and Guidance Association (APGA) emerged, my activity in those two associations was the political base which got me elected as the first president of APGA.

*If you had it to do over again, and you could not choose higher education, what career would you choose?*

If I had to pick a career over again, I very frankly wouldn't change anything. I have been at Indiana University for 39 years. For my own professional advancement maybe I should have moved to another institution. It is true that in the future, in order to get the large promotion it may be necessary to change institutions. I sense this is a change in the educational environment. During my era Indiana University was a growth environment, growing from 4,000 to 33,000 students. I could always look forward to advancement, but now with a decline in enrollment, a person could be doing a top-notch job and never be promoted.

*What are the best and worst decisions you made during your career at IU?*

I made a number of bad decisions. Probably, I was not assertive enough at the administrative level to interpret the work of student personnel. I assumed that people knew what a Dean did, and yet the fact is the Trustees and others did not know. I remember once during a minor confrontation with the Board of Trustees, one of the members said "But Bob, you don't have to stir them (students) up!" This occurred when I was arguing that freedom of speech and a very active discussion of issues, in this case the Vietnam War, was good for the campus. The attitude of this board member was that at least one should try to keep the lid on. I started the idea of a Peoples' Park in Dunn Meadow, modeled after Hyde Park in London, without clearance from the Trustees. My idea was that any issue, no matter how controversial or repugnant, could be discussed there. Some people felt this was improper. I, of course, was very proud of it and wrote and spoke about it nationally.

I think the best decision I made was to be absolutely open. This was at some pain many times. Openness meant one made decisions in public, explained the reasons for a decision, and advised people in advance of the decision to be made. Those people who made decisions behind other's backs always lived in a state of fear and guilt.

*You have been both an administrator and professor. How would you compare and contrast the rewards and satisfactions of these roles?*

I enjoyed my administrative role and felt I was relatively successful. Those who felt I was limited thought I devoted too much time to students. This was a criticism in the 1960's when I spent many hours each week at demonstrations and discussions. I was disappointed at the attitude of many students who felt anyone who was a friend of an administrator must either be dumb or a traitor to the student movement. Yet, I often had militants calling me on this campus, warning me something was about to happen, but saying "Look, don't take this personally." I appreciated this relationship.

I don't know how to compare the administrative with the professorial role. A person wins a few and loses a few. You have students who think you are a lousy teacher, and maybe you are; and you have some administrative colleagues who think you are a lousy administrator, and maybe you are. Likewise, you think the same about them sometimes!

The difference today is that you must be more open. It is necessary to go to your top administrator, in my case it was the President, and articulate your activities, successes, and weaknesses to get some reaction. I frankly never did that, except in one case. I went into President Herman Wells and said "Look, I haven't had a chance to see you for about six months to talk about some of these problems. In the meantime, I had to do the things I had to do." President Wells just laughed and said, "Bob, I have my ways of letting people know when I am not satisfied with what they are do-

ing." In effect, he told me to get out. Now that was a very good relationship!

As far as teaching, if a professor shows interest in the student's development, that student responds both with a feeling of challenge as well as some feeling to live up to that interest or perceived potentiality. I always loved teaching. A student who does well is a reward in itself. With reference to students in general, the key as I perceive it is to avoid being paternalistic, which maybe I didn't avoid, but rather hold out to students that we are both professionals, and thereby, colleagues. I hope this philosophy has characterized our relationships in this department where we are all in the same boat in the learning process.

*You have been a mentor to many students here at IU. Do you have any thoughts to share about the mentor role?*

Mentoring, of course, is a new name. It used to be called the "old-boy syndrome." I think mentoring is an outgrowth of our student personnel field. Both Betty Greenleaf and I, maybe improperly, did have a very maternal and paternal relationship to our students because they were "our" people, as we saw them rise in the profession. We tried to keep a close relationship.

I have a feeling that as tough economic situations present a challenge to the traditional beliefs of our student personnel and reorder our priorities, we are going to need to reinforce each other in terms of morale, career decisions, and help each other make changes even in mid-life.

*You have had a chance to travel extensively during your career, and to consult with individuals in many countries. What are the important aspects of consulting?*

Consulting work is a two-edged sword. All the work we did in Afghanistan has just blown up. In fact, it is rather tragic. Anyone who has had an association with the West or Indiana University is not only physically in danger, two students we worked with have been executed, but many students are also out of work or exiled from the country. Dr. Eberle and I are supporting some of these students, helping them get relocated in Europe or in the United States. That's the tragic part.

Now, it's fun to visit Bangkok, Taiwan or Thailand where the contribution you may have made is still there. For example, the student union at National Taiwan Normal University is outstanding even by standards in this country. In Bangkok the student personnel program under the direction of one of our former students would do credit to any university in this country.

In Kenya, Ethiopia, Sudan and Egypt it's fun to visit the students, but in a way discouraging. The students haven't been able to make progress that we would like by our standards. They feel frustrated, and I in turn feel frustrated. How do you help someone who has what we would term a "Western orientation," but the local culture both politically and economically prevents them from making progress that is desirable?

*Traditionally the three functions of the university have been teaching, service and research, and your career has certainly been characterized by service. Do you think this is still emphasized by universities?*

I have never felt there should be a division between the functions of the university. I don't like the method of constructing a dossier for promotion in which these three functions must be divided. During my Assistant Dean tenure, I was advisor to several student groups. I think these types of activities must be viewed as enjoyable, rather than a burden. This is what concerns me so much about the current scene,

where the demand for excellence in research is almost a requirement for promotion. Whether or not you like research to the exclusion of service or spontaneous teaching, when you say, "No, I won't do something because I have to get this damn research done," I'm afraid it is a negative feeling. I am concerned it will hurt some of our young people today. I can't remember doing research under the feeling that I *had* to do research. Any research I did was from interest in the substance, rather than the pressure to publish.

To show how much things have changed, when I was promoted from associate to full professor, I literally did not know my name had been nominated for promotion, nor did I have anything to do with the preparation of the dossier. Today, the individual must initiate the dossier and take a responsibility to see that the appropriate information substantiating one's eligibility for promotion or tenure is displayed.

If it is a fact of life that you will be judged, then you should not be so naive as to assume that nothing can be done about it. I urge every young professional to have a conference a minimum of once a year or more with decision-makers involved with promotion or tenure. For example, if you have to approach a senior colleague in another department who is on the promotion committee to discuss criteria for promotion, then do it.

*If you were writing an autobiography, what accomplishments would you want to mention?*

There are probably four things I would be sure to mention in my autobiography as accomplishments. First, I took a great interest in foreign students. I have been proud of the fact that Indiana University is known throughout the country as a great place for foreign students. American students needed interaction with foreign students for their own benefit. The typical Hoosier is by nature very ethnocentric. Second, I am very proud that two years after my Deanship ended, I was elected Secretary of the Bloomington Faculty Council, a position which normally goes to a faculty member that is held in high regard by other faculty. For a Dean who just two years prior was often the target of many faculty resolutions, I thought they (faculty) recognized I was open and above board, and also had the interest of the university and faculty at heart. Third, I thought as a young person I made a contribution as one of the founders and first Presidents of APGA. Finally, the many contacts that I have been able to maintain with former students is also important. Our Christmas card list is probably much too long at 20 cents a piece for postage!

*If we could rent a space large enough, like the Rose Bowl, and gather all your colleagues, friends and former students, what legacy would you leave them?*

The legacy I hope to leave is that we have a very important field. Any field that is devoted to helping people be better will be in demand. One never need fear the future of this field if one sticks to this objective—that one is sincerely interested in helping others; faculty, students and colleagues alike, be better and achieve their goals. I do feel that administrative structure will change in various places. Don't pin security on a job title or administrative structure. Pin security, rather, on the functions one performs, knowing they are important to the institution and the people served. Finally, I hope that the student personnel field of all fields is characterized by the interest and willingness to help every other colleague be the best professional person they can be. If this spirit prevails, then I don't worry about the future of our field. It will be worthwhile.

## AGGREGATE PERCEPTIONS OF "SUPPORTIVENESS" IN A STUDENT PERSONNEL PREPARATION PROGRAM

*Diane Breeden-Lee  
Rodney Kirsch  
Kathy Malutich  
Drew Norris  
Janet Wright*

*Sanford suggested that when students are confronted with challenges, they should concurrently receive support. Interpersonal relationships, particularly with faculty and peers, appear to be a critical source of this support for graduate students. This study assessed aggregate perceptions of the "supportiveness" of a graduate department by eliciting responses regarding the real and ideal frequency of support interaction. Students were generally satisfied with support from peers, but reported less satisfaction with faculty support.*

Most graduate students experience considerable stress as they adjust to their new student role, face financial pressures, assume new work responsibilities, and cope with academic demands. Tension and anxiety seem to be a natural part of the graduate school experience (Baird, 1969; Katz & Hartnett, 1976; Lange, 1980; Winston, 1976). Sanford (1962) has suggested that students, when confronted with tension-filled challenges, must concurrently receive support to meet such challenges satisfactorily. Interpersonal relationships, particularly with faculty and peers, appear to be a critical source of this support for graduate students (Butler, 1972; Evans, 1980).

Although the cited studies underscore the importance of support, few attempts to characterize the "supportiveness" of graduate departments have been made (Baird, 1969; Katz & Hartnett, 1976). Gathering such information would seem to be an essential first step toward improving the effectiveness of graduate education. This paper reports one attempt to objectively assess support in a college student personnel preparation program. Faculty academic support, faculty nonacademic support, peer academic support, and peer nonacademic support were the four areas chosen for examination.

One method of assessing environments, used successfully with undergraduate departments, involves aggregating student perceptions. Pace (1969) and Moos (1976) using the College and University Environment Scale (CUES) and the University Residence Environmental Scale (URES) respectively, were able to reliably assess perceived sociopsychological climates. Moreover, these aggregate perceptions can be used to describe and distinguish environments. Simply gathering data on students' perceptions of the existing environments, however, did not seem to adequately address the purposes of this study. An ideal standard was needed against which to compare the real support level for a measure of "supportiveness". In other words, the focus of this study was to determine whether the existing level of support adequately satisfied student needs or wants. The authors acknowledge the ambiguity between

needs and wants. It is beyond the scope of this study to distinguish between a need and a want. According to Webster's Collegiate Dictionary (7th ed.), a need is a physiological or psychological prerequisite for the well-being of an organism, while a want is a wish or strong desire for something. The responses concerning ideal support levels may reflect either needs or wants. Therefore, the term need will also include want.

While this study was designed to aggregate perceptions of the environment, a review of the literature suggested that certain subgroups in the environment might have differing perceptions.

Evans (1980) pointed out that women rely more on relationships to ease tension and establish role identity than do men, and thus hypothesized that these two subgroups might differ in their perceptions of support. Similarly, differences may be found between students who work in residence halls and those who do not. The subgroup of graduate students who live and work in residence halls may have closer proximity, greater access and more frequent contact with peers. A support network outside their graduate department in the form of other residence life staff may also exist for those involved in residence life. In contrast, graduate students not involved in residence life more frequently live off campus and have less access to an immediate support network. For these reasons, graduate students in residence life might be expected to perceive their support environment as more satisfactory.

Keeping in mind these subgroups, therefore, the study attempted to answer several questions. First, do students receive the degree of faculty and peer support they perceive necessary to cope with the stress of graduate school? Second, does perceived need for support differ between men and women graduate students? Finally, is perceived need for support related to work and residence setting (i.e. residence halls versus other environment)?

## METHOD

### Subjects

Subjects were the population of graduate students enrolled in the two year master degree college student preparation program at Indiana University in the Spring 1981 semester. The subject pool consisted of 56 students: 18 males and 38 females. Of this group, 11 males and 17 females were employed in the residence halls.

### Instrumentation

Ideas for the questionnaire design were drawn from CUES (Pace, 1969), College Characteristic Index (CCI) (Pace & Stern, 1958), and Winston's (1973) adaptation of CUES. These instruments elicit perceptual information on a particular environment. Like Winston's (1973) adaptation, the questionnaire used in this study was constructed to assess the environment of a specific graduate department. Banning (1978) and Moos (1976) have elicited responses on both real and ideal perceptions to obtain information on actual and desired levels. These models provided a basis for incorporating both perceived real and perceived ideal support questions. Ideas for support questions were drawn from Baird (1969), Butler (1972), and Evans (1980).

Questionnaire items assessed four support areas: faculty academic support, peer academic support, faculty nonacademic support and peer nonacademic support.

Academic support scale items included discussion of course materials and curriculum, advice about classes, professional growth activities, clarification of assignments, feedback about academic performance, and disagreement about opinion issues.

Nonacademic support scale items included discussion of pressures of school, career concerns, personal issues, assistantship/practicum problems, interaction outside of class, and recognition as an individual apart from student role.

Each area consisted of seven questions on perceived real support paired with seven corresponding questions on perceived ideal support. Likert scale alternatives of never, seldom, occasionally, often, or very often were used to allow individuals to indicate perceived real and ideal frequency of support interactions. The same questions, with slight rewording, were used for faculty and peers.

The questionnaire also requested demographic information on sex and employment status in the residence halls. Likert scales (low = 1 to high = 5) were used to obtain an indication of the level of challenge experienced in adjusting to role as a graduate student and level of satisfaction with the graduate program.

Two open-ended questions were also included. Banning (1978) stressed the importance of asking respondents for brief written descriptions of environmental influences which may be related to perceptions. Thus, the first question asked subjects to list their sources of support outside of their department and to briefly indicate what issues were discussed with them. The final question requested that respondents pick two or more important support items which produced large discrepancies between real and ideal responses. Respondents were asked to indicate why they felt the discrepancy existed and how the situation might be improved.

For response purposes, the term "professor" was defined as faculty or teaching assistants in the graduate department, and the term "peer" was defined as any student seeking a master degree in the student personnel preparation program.

### Analysis

Scores were derived by assigning a range of 1 = never to 5 = very often to the Likert scale. A series of t-tests were used to analyze discrepancies between real and ideal items. A two-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used to determine significant differences for mean real and/or mean ideal scores of subgroups in the sample. Means were computed for the challenge and satisfaction items. Responses to the open ended questions were reviewed and tallied.

## RESULTS

Sixty-six percent (N=37) of the 56 eligible subjects returned usable data: 26 women and 11 men, 16 of which were in residence halls and 21 not in residence halls.

In Table 1 major findings of the study are summarized. Real mean (RM) and ideal mean (IM) scores, standard deviations ( $\sigma$ ), and t-values are listed for all support questions.

There were significant differences ( $p < .01$ ) between the real and ideal mean scores reported on all seven items assessing faculty nonacademic support. Two support items, faculty initiating interactions with students and students socializing with faculty outside of class, received the lowest real mean scores. Being treated as an in-

dividual apart from one's student role received the highest ideal mean score (4.24). Significant discrepancies were found between real and ideal mean scores on six of seven faculty academic support items. The only item that did not show a significant discrepancy dealt with how comfortable students felt asking for clarification of class assignments. Receiving personalized feedback on academic performance received the highest ideal mean score (4.11).

Peer initiated interaction was the only peer nonacademic support item with a significant discrepancy between real and ideal mean scores ( $p < .01$ ). The only item in the study to receive a higher real than ideal mean score was discussion of career concerns with fellow students. All other questions elicited ideal scores equal to or higher than mean real scores. Three of seven items on the peer academic support scale were significantly discrepant ( $p < .01$ ): (1) opinions on coursework solicited and respected by peers, (2) personalized feedback on academic performance, and (3) peers encouraging professional growth.

Women did not score significantly higher than men on the ideal level of support desired from faculty and peers. However, females had significant discrepancies between real and ideal scores on three items with which men were satisfied: (1) discussing pressures of graduate school with faculty, (2) discussing personal issues with faculty, and (3) faculty directing students to activities encouraging professional growth.

Finally, students working in residence halls did not perceive less discrepancies on real and ideal support items compared with respondents living and working in other environments. However, the overall level of satisfaction with the department reported by students in the residence halls ( $M = 3.6$ ) was significantly higher than the level reported by nonresidence hall subjects ( $M = 2.7$ ).

The aggregate mean level of satisfaction with the department was 3.0 ( $\sigma = 1.31$ ). A mean score of 3.03 ( $\sigma = 1.30$ ) was reported for level of challenge subjects experienced in adjusting to their new roles as graduate students.

On the open-ended questions, all respondents indicated that they received support from outside sources. Friends were cited most often (19 respondents), family and professionals in student personnel (13), resident assistants (12), and others in the work environment (8). When asked to comment on items that were personally important and produced large discrepancies, respondents selected three items seven or more times: (1) opinions on curriculum respected and solicited by professors, (2) professors treat me as an individual apart from my student role, and (3) faculty initiated interactions. In general, students perceived that faculty considered curriculum to be their area of expertise and did not desire student feedback. Suggestions for improvement included establishing channels for regular communication of suggestions on curriculum. Students also felt that they were seen mainly as students, but preferred to be seen as adults or future professionals. Suggestions for improvement included providing more opportunities for social interaction to develop a greater sense of community between students and faculty. Some students assumed responsibility for this discrepancy, indicating their personal reluctance to interact with professors as individuals outside their faculty member role. Overall, students felt faculty did not initiate contact with them due to time constraints stemming from personal and professional commitments and priorities.

The study has one identifiable limitation. Information was not requested concern-

TABLE 1  
Aggregate Perceptions of Ideal and Real Support Interactions

|  | Faculty Interaction |          |      |          |         | Peer Interaction |          |      |          |         |
|--|---------------------|----------|------|----------|---------|------------------|----------|------|----------|---------|
|  | RM                  | $\sigma$ | IM   | $\sigma$ | t-value | RM               | $\sigma$ | IM   | $\sigma$ | t-value |
| <b>Nonacademic Support</b>                     |                     |          |      |          |         |                  |          |      |          |         |
| Discuss pressures of school                    | 2.35                | .86      | 2.83 | .92      | -4.05*  | 3.46             | .99      | 3.51 | 1.09     | -.63    |
| Discuss personal issues                        | 2.30                | .88      | 2.83 | .83      | -3.93*  | 3.48             | 1.12     | 3.59 | 1.12     | -1.43   |
| Treated as an individual                       | 3.13                | 1.03     | 4.24 | .55      | -6.13*  | 3.97             | .80      | 4.27 | .99      | -2.23   |
| Faculty/peer initiated interaction             | 2.18                | .88      | 3.24 | .80      | -6.42*  | 3.03             | .80      | 3.51 | .61      | -3.53*  |
| Discuss career concerns                        | 2.91                | .95      | 3.51 | 1.07     | -3.67*  | 3.94             | .78      | 3.78 | .97      | 1.23    |
| Socialize outside class                        | 2.21                | .92      | 3.16 | .69      | -7.06*  | 3.43             | 1.28     | 3.56 | 1.32     | -1.22   |
| Discuss assistantship/practicum                | 2.70                | .81      | 3.29 | .78      | -4.99*  | 3.24             | 1.31     | 3.48 | 1.02     | -1.10   |
| <b>Academic Support</b>                        |                     |          |      |          |         |                  |          |      |          |         |
| Coursework/curriculum opinion respected        | 2.49                | 1.07     | 3.72 | 1.07     | -7.48*  | 3.19             | 1.10     | 3.57 | 1.02     | -3.38*  |
| Receive feedback on performance                | 3.11                | .77      | 4.11 | .70      | -7.78*  | 2.30             | .85      | 3.00 | .91      | -5.26*  |
| Discuss academic material outside class        | 2.89                | .77      | 3.21 | .67      | -2.95*  | 3.43             | 1.24     | 3.62 | 1.06     | -1.19   |
| Receive advice re: class selection             | 2.75                | 1.09     | 3.43 | .99      | -5.24*  | 3.16             | .87      | 3.43 | 1.04     | -1.82   |
| Encouraged to disagree/debate                  | 2.92                | 1.16     | 3.78 | 1.08     | -4.00*  | 3.08             | 1.14     | 3.32 | 1.06     | -2.31   |
| Directed to growth-producing activities        | 3.14                | .82      | 3.57 | .76      | -3.96*  | 3.14             | .82      | 3.57 | .76      | -4.06*  |
| Comfortable asking clarification of assignment | 3.59                | 1.17     | 4.00 | .70      | -1.65   | 3.03             | .80      | 3.03 | .90      | 0.00    |

\* $p < .01$ .  
 $n = 37$

ing first or second year status in the two year graduate program. Since these two subgroups might have perceived the environment differently, these data might have been useful.

### DISCUSSION

With the current emphasis in student personnel programs on the philosophy of student development, Evans (1980) suggested that it is "crucial that we (student personnel faculty) consider the development of our own students" (p. 1). To date, the majority of the theoretical discussions of student development have focused on the growth of undergraduate students. Evans pointed to the importance of extending this focus to include graduate students. The results of this study suggest the concern may be warranted.

One way students cope with the anxiety filled challenges of graduate school is through the development of "healthy, interpersonal relationships" with faculty (Evans, 1980, p. 10). While students in this study reported that the challenges of adjusting to the student role have not been excessive, their needs for support from faculty have not been adequately met. On 13 of 14 faculty support items, students reported significant discrepancies between perceived real and ideal support levels. Further evidence that faculty may not be meeting support needs of students was suggested in responses to the open-ended questions. Students most frequently reported as important and discrepant items relating to faculty support. The fact that some students prefer to see faculty only as a "professor" is supported by Katz and Hartnett (1976). They found that many graduate students prefer to revere faculty members, and do not expect faculty to treat them as equals. Indeed, this idea is partially supported by the results of the present study. While some students indicated a desire to be seen as adults and individuals rather than graduate students, others felt that distance between themselves and faculty is preferable.

A predominant theme, however, was a desire to be respected and treated as individuals by faculty. These results suggest that graduate students desire relationships with faculty that will help them maintain or attain status as adults. For the older, experienced student, a collegial relationship with faculty aids in the maintenance of their adult status (Evans, 1980). For the younger student, respect from faculty aids in their efforts to create a link between themselves and the adult world (Levinson, 1978).

While significant discrepancies on peer items were reported, students' overall needs for peer support were better met than needs for faculty support. This was particularly true on the non-academic items where there was only one discrepant item. This item, the desire to have more peer initiated interactions, implies that students, as future student development professionals, could be more responsive to the support needs of their peers.

Evidence in support of Evans' hypothesis concerning differing needs of student subgroups by sex was inconclusive. The data did not support the hypothesis that ideal scores for women would exceed those for men. However, women's needs for interpersonal relationships with faculty were not as well met as those of men. While men were satisfied with the frequency of interactions with faculty on personal and academic concerns, women were not. Both men and women reported dissatisfaction

with the frequency of faculty initiated contacts. However, the significance level for females ( $P < .01$ ) exceeded that of males ( $p < .05$ ), suggesting that faculty should be alert to possible differences in support needs of male and female students and that women may require more personal attention than men.

Finally, the assumption about differences between real and ideal scores for residence hall and nonresidence hall students was not supported. However, scores on overall satisfaction with the department were significantly different, with residence hall students reporting a higher level of satisfaction than nonresidence hall students. The fact that 12 of 16 residence hall subjects reported using their residence life staff as a major source of support appears to substantiate the belief that an additional support system exists for residence life subjects, and may contribute to their higher level of satisfaction.

### IMPLICATIONS

The results of this study have important implications for college student personnel preparation programs. Pantages and Creedon (1978) reported the quality of relationships between students and faculty was of central importance to student satisfaction and was a contributing factor to retention. Therefore, faculty must recognize that fostering meaningful relationships with students is crucial. Further, they must acknowledge and respond to students' desire for support, recognizing that for certain subgroups support needs may differ. Katz and Hartnett (1976) surmised that graduate students enter advanced degree programs with certain expectations for relationships with faculty. While undergraduates almost universally expected distance between themselves and faculty, graduate students expected this distance to be reduced. The expectations of entering students, whether realistic or unrealistic, probably influenced their reported needs for support.

Students' reported needs concerning faculty initiated interactions indicated students look to faculty to initially assume the responsibility for meeting student support needs. However, in their discussion of discrepant items, students recognized that this responsibility rests in part with them. For student personnel programs, methods for improvement may include better use of existing channels for student input on curriculum matters through the student organization curriculum committee. More frequent opportunities for informal social interaction between faculty and students could also be provided by the social committee. As a student organization advised by departmental faculty, an organization such as the Indiana University Student Personnel Association is the logical vehicle for initiating a cooperative relationship between students and faculty. Once this relationship is established, students and faculty can work together to answer the following questions: Are students' needs or wants realistic? Where do these needs originate? Who is responsible for insuring that students receive the support they desire, need or want to make their graduate experience more satisfying?

The results of this study suggest the need for additional investigation of Evans' hypothesis concerning the differing needs or wants of student subgroups. Further research on graduate student needs may also illuminate development in graduate students, about which relatively little is known.

Although this study focused exclusively on support discrepancies in the Indiana

University student personnel preparation program, it is likely that support discrepancies may be evidenced in other student personnel graduate training programs. Furthermore, students in graduate departments of other disciplines have experienced similar unmet support needs (Katz & Hartnett, 1976; Winston, 1976). Research attempts to replicate or expand on the results of this study in other programs could determine whether graduate student needs for support are universal.

#### REFERENCES

- Baird, L. L. A study of the role relations of graduate students. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 1969, 60, 15-21.
- Banning, J. (Ed.) *Campus ecology: A perspective for student affairs*. Cincinnati: NASPA, 1978.
- Butler, H. F. Student role stress. *The American Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 1972, 21, 146-150.
- Evans, N. J. *Psychosocial development of graduate students in college student personnel preparation programs: AfB (P, E) analysis*. Unpublished manuscript, Indiana University, 1980.
- Katz, J., & Hartnett, L. T. *Scholars in the making*. Cambridge, MA.: Ballinger Publishing Company, 1976.
- Lange, S. An anxiety support model for graduate education. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 1980, 21, 146-150.
- Levinson, D. *The seasons of a man's life*. New York: Ballantine Books, 1978.
- Moos, R. *The human context: Environmental determinants of behavior*. New York: Wiley, 1976.
- Murray, H. A. *Explorations in personality*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1938.
- Pace, C. R. *College and university environment scales: Technical manual (2nd ed.)*. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1969.
- Pace, C. R., & Stern, G. G. An approach to the measurement of psychological characteristics of college environments. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 1958, 49, 269-277.
- Pantages, T. J., & Creedon, C. E. Studies of college attrition: 1950-1975. *Review of Educational Research*, 1978, 48, 49-101.
- Sanford, N. (Ed.) *The American college*. New York: Wiley, 1962.
- Winston, R. B., Jr. Graduate school environments: Expectations and perceptions. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 1976, 17, 43-49.

#### INDIANA UNIVERSITY: TWO IMAGES

Debbie Steiman-Cameron

*This article examines two Indiana University publications used to attract prospective students: one specific to minorities, the other directed to a general population. Different images are portrayed depending on the target population. Discrepancies between the expected and experienced environment may lead to student dissatisfaction, with important implications for student affairs personnel.*

College attendance has generally been considered an informed process rather than simply a random phenomenon (Feldman & Newcomb, 1973). Clark (1968) theorized that the college selection process may be either direct or indirect. He defined direct selection as the recruiting and selecting process that takes place through admission policies, while indirect selection occurs through images held by outsiders which give rise to student self-selection. Images may be created by accident (i.e. the formation of a reputation) or by the intentions and actions of the university through recruitment information, policy formation, requirements, regulations, rules of conduct, curriculum or other means. This paper will focus on two pamphlets Indiana University (I.U.) sends to prospective students. The pamphlets are printed in two forms, one for general use and one aimed at minority students. At face value, these two pamphlets look quite similar, but after careful examination the pamphlets clearly suggest two different images of the same institution.

Both pamphlets are printed on 9 x 19½ inch medium heavy weight paper, and are divided into five panels. The front of one pamphlet is red with black print outlined in white and is titled "Indiana University". The front page of the other pamphlet is white with red print outlined in black. It is titled "Indiana University for Prospective Minority Students". As both pamphlets are unfolded, the first four panels are a mixture of pictures and writing. The fifth panel is a tear off card to send for more information. Two panels on the back list different fields and concentrations available to I.U. students. Another panel on the pamphlet entitled "Indiana University" is blank while the corresponding panel on the other pamphlet contains a combination of words and pictures.

The only picture the two pamphlets have in common is a group picture of eight students. Most striking about this picture is the fact that the students appear to come from all different segments of college life. The students are conversing in a semicircle. From left to right, there is: a white female in "preppie" attire; a white male also dressed in a "preppie" manner; a white female in casual but nice clothing; a black male also nicely but casually dressed; another white male dressed in "preppie" style; a black male in tee shirt and jeans; and a white male and female also in tee shirt and jeans. The pamphlet for minority students has three scenic campus pictures, one of which is a picture of the LaCasa/Latino Center; the remainder of the pictures show students who are obvious minorities. The pamphlet intended for general use has four scenic pictures of the campus, two pictures portraying academic activities (i.e. students studying), and two pictures of cultural events. Although the general pam-

phlet has a picture with black students, the minority-oriented pamphlet does not have any whites as the center of focus with the exception of the group picture of eight students present in both.

The front two panels of the minority pamphlet deal with different activities around campus in which minority students presumably would be interested. The opening words of the pamphlets are "For more than 1,500 minority students at Indiana University 'what's happening' on campus comes together at the Black Culture Center, International House and LaCasa/Latino Center." Academic and supportive services are discussed in relation to the minority student. An excellent example of the subtle differences between the two is the manner in which the Career Center and the Study Skills Center are described in the pamphlets. The minority pamphlet states "The Career Center provides assistance in career planning through individual counseling and small group workshops. Study skills agencies offer tutoring and meet a variety of student needs including goal setting, motivation, test taking, note taking, vocabulary improvement, paper writing, concentration, memory skills, time management and speed reading. Placement offices inform students of job opportunities and trends within their special field." According to Cross, minority students are more likely than nonminority students to come to college deficient in study habits and skills, and thus are more likely to benefit from the assistance of these centers (Barna, et al, 1978). The general pamphlet, on the other hand, gives only a sketchy description of these services. "Individual counseling and special freshmen seminars, guidance by faculty advisors, and career workshops help students create an academic program geared to their personal goals."

Although the general pamphlet places more emphasis on academic activities, it gives the impression that while I.U. is a large school there is still something for everyone. "Students attend Indiana University for a multitude of reasons. Some enjoy the excitement and variety of a large university; others prefer the small college environment which also exists within I.U." The image presented is that I.U. is composed of many diverse units which together form Indiana University. In contrast, the minority pamphlet discusses the cultural and campus life at Indiana University in a manner geared directly to anticipated minority student interests. "Over 250 activities and organizations are available at I.U. Bloomington including the Office of Minority Affairs, Black Student Union, Association Estudiantil Puertoriquena, Black-American Law Student Association, Latino Law Student Association, Latinos Unidos, and the Minority Journalists Organization." Thus, through the use of pictures and text, this pamphlet implies that an active cultural as well as academic life for minority students is available on the campus.

The most distinctive difference between the two pamphlets is a section on the back of the minority pamphlet not included in the general pamphlet. The minority pamphlet has pictures and personal statements by five minority students. The personal comments vary from "... I've found I've been welcome" to "... your abilities and talents are as good as anyone else's."

Since Indiana University has a pamphlet aimed directly at minority students, it could be assumed that I.U. is attempting to increase its appeal to this type of student. In some respects, the institution has reinterpreted its image to make I.U. appear a place where minority students would be comfortable and excel academically. The pamphlet attempts to create the image that the University is very minority-conscious.

It also suggests that I.U. may be trying to compete with colleges designed for minority students, and is capable of meeting this objective. This type of image manipulation has potential to affect the prospective student. New minority students are likely to expect the entire University staff and other students to be sensitive to minority concerns. The students' preconceived notions could manifest themselves in at least two ways. The students may be disappointed when they realize their expectations about the University have not been met. They could become very dissatisfied, and their behavior might be that of uninvolved and unhappiness. A second possibility is that the students' expectations and preconceived perceptions will create for them what they think should exist (Stern, 1970). Students of this second type may become active in the different groups the minority pamphlet describes. They may be more likely to establish friendships, and may be happier and more content with an environment they perceive congruent with their expectations.

The two images created by the university through its publications are evidence of the marketing approach to recruit new students. This approach may have important implications for student affairs professionals. Those students whose expectations are not met by the environment are likely to become dissatisfied. This dissatisfaction may lead to such things as discipline problems, poor academic performance, and higher than average attrition rates for this student group. Admissions officers should consider the implications of their literature and recruitment techniques. Other student affairs professionals in the university such as advisors and orientation staff must be prepared to better deal with the challenges of these dissatisfied students. In a time of experienced and projected enrollment declines, it is not sufficient to merely attract students. Attention must be given to the institution's ability to retain the new students and to provide students with a developmentally powerful yet satisfying growth environment.

## REFERENCES

- Barna, A., Haws, J. R., & Knefelkamp, L. New students: Challenge to student affairs. In L. Knefelkamp, C. Widick, & C. A. Parker (Eds.), *Applying new developmental findings* (No. 4). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978.
- Clark, R. B. College image and student selection. In K. Yamamoto (Ed.), *The college student and his culture*. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1968.
- Feldman, K. A., & Newcomb, T. M. *The impact of college on students (vol. 1)*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973.
- Indiana University*. Indiana University Publications/Printing.
- Indiana University for Prospective Minority Students*. Indiana University Publications/Printing.
- Stern, G. G. *People in context: Measuring person-environment congruence in education and industry*. New York: Wiley, 1970.

## COMPARISON OF JOB DESCRIPTIONS VERSUS REPORTED ACTIVITIES OF EMPLOYEES AT A UNIVERSITY CRAFT SHOP

Elizabeth Feemster  
Debbie Steiman-Cameron  
Gene Tempel  
Bob Ward  
Virginia Whaley

*This study examined whether written job descriptions accurately reflect the activities of employees in an organization, applying Weick's social psychological theory of organizations. Results partially supported Weick's contention that individuals are constantly engaged in "sense-making" activities. Traditional methods such as organization charts and job descriptions may inadequately depict organizational operations.*

### INTRODUCTION

Traditionally, organizations have been described using organizational charts, graphic representations of reporting lines, policy manuals, job descriptions, goal statements, and other written documents. Moos (1976) described the evolution of organizational theory as a scientific management approach attempting to depict the division of labor and the vertical chain of command on an organizational chart. This theory fell short of describing the way in which organizations worked because the classical organizational structure was challenged by informal social networks that existed outside of the organizational flow charts. Consequently, the human relations theory emerged which viewed the organization from the perspective of social norms, social sanctions, and group influences on productivity.

Weick (1979) went beyond the human relations concept to view individuals as an integral part of the organization. In Weick's view, informal networks, social relationships and people *are* the organization. Despite all attempts to describe an organization on paper, an organization is not defined until it is "acted out." In Weick's scheme, each individual's behavior shapes the organization. Power does not come down from the "top," but rather the individuals are the power in the organization.

### PURPOSE

The purpose of this paper is to examine whether the written job descriptions accurately depict the activities of employees in the Indiana University Memorial Union (IMU) Craft Shop, applying Weick's theory of organization. The study developed out of an interest in the general question of whether written documents provide an accurate profile of the organization and organizational functioning. Because this general question encompassed too much material for this study, the authors chose to examine the question from one perspective: job descriptions. One measure of determining whether the Craft Shop operates the way it describes itself as functioning is to compare the activities of the employees to their written job descriptions.

Weick outlined a four-stage process through which organizations are constantly engaged in "sense-making." The four stages are ecological change, enactment, selection, and retention, defined by Weick as follows: Ecological change—no change takes place in the organization until something or someone disrupts the regular activity in some (even very small) way; Enactment—the employees notice the change and isolate it for further consideration; Selection—they comment on, talk about, or respond to the change, trying to make sense of it; and Retention—they determine useful information, make mental notes of rules, and store items for future use. According to Weick, this process is constantly taking place, perhaps in small ways that are not noticeable to the traditional observer of organizations. But just as the small dots of color come together to form the image on a television screen, so too the results of this process, recycled many times, come together to make the organization what it is. "Retention involves relatively straightforward storage of the products of successful sense-making, products that we call *enacted environments*" (Weick, 1979, p. 131). These products are the activities; they are the organization.

In Weick's theory, organizations are "complex, fluid, and collective" entities which are constantly changing and adjusting as they make sense of what is taking place. If this concept is true, then written job descriptions cannot accurately describe an organization because as soon as they are written they will be out-of-date. The activities which employees perform should be different from those prescribed for them in a written job description. The older and more detailed this job description, the less it should correspond to the activities in which employees are engaged; the longer individuals have been with an organization, the less their activities should correspond with their written job descriptions.

### METHOD

The sample used in this study was drawn from the entire population of employees who work at the IMU Craft Shop. The IMU Craft Shop offers a wide variety of services: coursework to learn a craft skill; a studio and equipment to practice a craft; craft supplies to sell to customers; and a gallery for individuals to exhibit and sell their craft works.

At the present time, the Craft Shop employs fifty people consisting mostly of part-time workers. The specific sample chosen for this study consisted of eight employees. The following workers, listed by position and length of employment, were selected: supervisor, 4½ years; resident potter and instructor, 3 years; resident weaver and instructor, 4 months; stained glass instructor, 6 or 7 years; work study, 1½ years; work study, 11 months; Youth Employment Training Program (Y.E.T.P.) employee, 1 month; and Comprehensive Employment Training Act (C.E.T.A.) employee, 3 weeks.

The method used to gather information was an interview process. Each of the eight employees were asked the following questions:

- (1) What is your position?
- (2) Are you employed part time or full time?
- (3) How long have you worked for the Craft Shop?
- (4) Who do you supervise?
- (5) What is a typical day at the Craft Shop for you?

- (6) What do you do outside of the Craft Shop that pertains to your job?
- (7) What do you do to prepare for the entire day?
- (8) What do you see as the major goal of the Craft Shop?
- (9) How do you see your job as contributing to this goal?

The question "What is a typical day at the Craft Shop for you?" (#5) was the primary focus of the questioning. The responses to this question were compared with actual job descriptions of each employee. The questions dealing with the goal of the Craft Shop (#8 and #9) examined whether actual work activities were compatible with employee perceptions of the major Craft Shop goals.

The interviews were arranged by telephone or personal contact at the Craft Shop. Interviews were conducted on a casual, informal one-to-one basis. The interviewer recorded responses to questions during the interview sessions. The employees were not specifically told about the comparison of their written job description to their actual job activities, hopefully reducing skewed responses. The interviewer did not have access to written job descriptions of the employees prior to the interviews.

The data in this study was analyzed using a compare-and-contrast method. The responses to the questions, according to job position, were initially compared and contrasted in an outline form. The next step was to compare and contrast these outlines to the actual job descriptions of each employee. Finally, the responses to the questions were analyzed, looking for differences and similarities in the activities of the employees as well as their perceived goal statements. Particular emphasis was placed on position and length of employment, examining differences and similarities that might be present due to these two variables.

### RESULTS

Of the eight Craft Shop employees interviewed, only two reported their job as full time; the supervisor, who works 40-70 hours per week, and the resident potter/instructor. The resident weaver/instructor works part time. Length of employment for all employees ranges from three or four weeks (C.E.T.A. and Y.E.T.P.) up to six or seven years (stained glass instructor).

Seven of the eight employees reported goals for the Craft Shop similar to the written goal found in a Craft Shop brochure—basically a service for students and community; a no-pressure, no-grade situation for people to enjoy and explore crafts. Only one employee, a work study student with a background as a salesperson, reported a goal that was more business-oriented, i.e. making money.

Without exception, all reported a high degree of job satisfaction and found the Craft Shop a good place to work. Only one employee reported slight frustration. Also without exception, all expressed some interest in the field of art.

Within each job category, most respondents reported similar activities. There were, however, a few notable exceptions. One of the residents reported a wide variety of activities associated with the job, while the other resident reported a more narrow range of activities principally associated with teaching. Only one of the residents and only one of the work study students reported word-of-mouth advertising as part of their contribution to the Craft Shop goals. Of the two work study employees, the more experienced one reported supervising no one, while the other reported supervising duties when more senior employees were not present at the shop. Only one of

the work study employees reported working with the cash register; the other indicated sales as part of the work activities, but not working with the register.

The supervisor's job description did not mention maintenance or upkeep duties; however, this was reported as one of the most important daily supervisory activities. Similarly, there was no mention of supervisory responsibility for the fourteen secretarial and maintenance personnel. Furthermore, the job description did not specify that the supervisor was responsible for making money or realizing profit from the Craft Shop, yet the supervisor reported planning to spend much time developing ways to make money in the Craft Shop.

Three instructors were interviewed, two of whom were resident artists at the Craft Shop. The only job description for the instructors was found in the Instructor Handbook. This made it difficult to compare self-reported activities to a written description, since the Instructor Handbook page titled "Job Description" is actually a list of desired characteristics for instructors and benefits available to them. Therefore, no significant conclusions could be drawn from this area.

### DISCUSSION

While the results in some areas of the study are inconclusive because written job descriptions for several positions were nonexistent, several patterns emerged which are worth noting.

The written job description of the supervisor of the Craft Shop was the oldest, dating back two and one-half years. The supervisor had also spent more actual time at the Craft Shop than any of the present employees, having been employed full time for four and one-half years. The self-reported activities of the supervisor differed noticeably from the written job description. The greatest discrepancy was that the job description lists the position as "Supervisor" of the Craft Shop. However, this employee, other employees of the Craft Shop, and the supervisors in the IMU administration all referred to this person as the "Director". The Assistant Program Director of the IMU was questioned about the title discrepancy, and explained that director-level positions must report to a dean in the University's job classification system. The supervisor is listed as such since the position reports to an assistant director. However, the IMU Assistant Program Director indicated that everyone called the supervisor "Director". This is an excellent example of Weick's premise that individuals make their own environment. Despite the University's attempt to relegate the position to the supervisory level, all Craft Shop employees, the IMU administration, and this supervisor have chosen to use the term "Director". Perhaps this has taken place because the "Director" delegates responsibilities rather than simply supervising day-to-day activities.

Related to the duties of the instructors, two items were worth noting. One specific duty listed was that all instructors must arrive 15 minutes before class. In scheduling the interviews, it was noted that all instructors mentioned that they were available in the Craft Shop before class. Mentioned by the supervisor and listed in the Instructor Handbook was the responsibility to submit a syllabus one month before classes begin. None of the instructors mentioned this as one of their activities.

The job descriptions of the instructors were apparently deliberately general. The supervisor reported that once the instructors are informed about the nature of the

students and the special approach required, "they operate more independently than the other personnel." One resident/instructor who had been employed for three years reported: "I've made the position myself." This person mentioned a wide range of activities, well beyond those related to teaching. On the other hand, the second resident/instructor reported activities closely associated with teaching. It should be noted that this resident/instructor had only been employed for four months.

When asked for job descriptions for the residents, the supervisor wrote and submitted a list of special privileges that are granted to residents. Perhaps the lack of elaborate written job descriptions for instructors and residents is in itself meaningful. Given the freedom offered by the very general nature of these descriptions and enough time in the position, the residents and instructors can actually develop activities that best fit their sense-making processes.

Two work study students and two public paid employees (C.E.T.A. and Y.E.T.P.) were also interviewed. These employees reported the shortest tenure in the Craft Shop. The written description of their duties were significantly newer than any of the other job descriptions. The work study students reported having worked at the Craft Shop one and one-half years and almost one year, respectively. The two public paid employees reported tenure of three weeks and one month. Although the work study students were on the job longer, they only work ten hours per week. The two public paid employees work 32 hours and 20 hours per week respectively.

The job descriptions for these public paid and work study employees were more specific than the others. They were written by the supervisor when requested for this study. A fairly close match between written job descriptions and self-reported activities would be expected, since both the descriptions and employees were relatively new. Indeed, this is what was found. However, this may not be surprising since presumably the supervisor had the opportunity to observe the activities of these employees and write the description accordingly. Perhaps a follow-up study conducted at a later date would be informative in this area.

The questions related to the goal of the Craft Shop revealed some interesting though perhaps inconclusive observations. One of the Craft Shop brochures contains a written goal statement: "It is a place to learn, to practice, or to brush up on your craft skills." When asked what the goal of the Craft Shop was, all but one of the respondents including the supervisor, made statements which reflected this written goal. However, although the supervisor reported the goal of the Craft Shop in terms related to the written statement, numerous references were made by the supervisor to the fact that the Craft Shop needs to make money in order to show a profit. Another person reported that the goal of the Craft Shop is simply to make money.

The job descriptions of the two public paid employees included selling consignments and promoting courses and memberships. While both employees reported selling consignments, neither reported promoting courses and memberships as part of their duties. Perhaps this indicates that making a profit is an evolving goal of the Craft Shop and has not been incorporated totally into these employees' activities through the sense-making process even though it has been written down in a job description.

One reason for the relatively close match between written job descriptions and reported activities, and the written and reported goals in the Craft Shop might be the

result of an open communication system. The work study and C.E.T.A. employees were supplied with "to do" sheets by the supervisor; the supervisor seemed to be available and visible to the employees; and the employees reported helping each other.

The supervisor also communicated with the instructors. However, this communication was not as regular and continuous as the daily communication with other employees, and was consistent with the freedom provided instructors and residents by their job descriptions.

It is possible that more consistent communications between the public paid employees and work study employees might be responsible for the relatively close fit between the written job descriptions and goals, and self-reported activities and goals. This is supported by one of Weick's observations: "If an organization updates itself on a *daily* basis then it's possible for the organization to maintain a close fit with its surroundings" (Weick, 1979, p. 247).

The interesting differences found between the written job description of the supervisor and the self-reported activities could also be attributed to the quality of the communications system. Perhaps there is a lack of communication between the Craft Shop, the IMU administration and the University hierarchy which has kept the administration from updating itself on a daily basis. The administration may be operating as Weick found typical, that is, moving along "in a stable, equilibrium condition until they experience some trouble, in which case there is a search for some major changes or cure that will reestablish the equilibrium" (Weick, 1979, p. 247).

In general, this study found that there appeared to be an inverse relationship between both the length of service of employees and the amount of time their job descriptions had existed, and the accuracy with which written job descriptions reflected their self-reported activities. Additionally, the study supported Weick's contention that constant and open communication may be significant in helping an organization maintain a fit with its environment.

Further research in this area is needed. The findings, if supported by further studies, have serious implications for organizations which spend a great deal of time and energy developing elaborate job descriptions, organizational charts, and goal statements in hopes of better understanding themselves. Under this traditional approach, an organization may be tempted to relax into the security of believing that it understands itself and is in control of its destiny. If the implications of this study can be supported, organizations may better direct efforts for description and clear understanding to more nontraditional approaches such as Weick's (1979) theory. For example, organizations might spend more resources on developing communication systems which allow constant updating. These should prove more effective in keeping persons in organizations knowledgeable about each others' activities.

## REFERENCES

- Moos, R. *The human context: Environmental determinants of behavior*. New York: Wiley, 1976.
- Weick, K.E. *The social psychology of organizing*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1979.

## NEWS FROM 226

Journalists are fond of defining what is newsworthy as phenomena that are unpredictable or surprising. Therefore, "dog bites man" is not news; however, incidents in which "man bites dog" are worth reporting. While most of the news this spring is not particularly surprising or unpredictable, I think you will agree that the articles and contributions by currently enrolled students to this edition of the *Journal* are interesting. The interview with Professor Emeritus Robert Shaffer is remindful of his exuberance for life as well as his love for students and the student affairs profession. Plans are being finalized to provide a lasting tribute to Dr. Shaffer's contributions to the Indiana University College Student Personnel Administration program. You will learn more about that in a few weeks. Bob is looking forward to visiting with alumni and friends at both the ACPA and NASPA meetings.

The Elizabeth A. Greenleaf Outstanding Alumnus/a Award will be announced during the alumni reception at one of the spring meetings. At ACPA, the reception is scheduled for March 18 from 6:00 pm-8:00 pm in the Greco Room at the Detroit Plaza. On April 1, 1982, at 5:00 pm, a reception will be held as part of the NAWDAC meeting in Indianapolis. Plans for an IU Social Hour at NASPA are being finalized. Signs will be posted in the Sheraton-Boston to indicate time and place. Because last minute changes are sometimes made by convention staff, please check the convention program when you get to these meetings to make certain of the location and time of the receptions. We don't want to miss you!

We had planned to feature lengthy portrayals of the newest additions to the Indiana University CSPA and Higher Education Administration programs, Nancy Evans and John Bean. Space limitations resulting from the skyrocketing costs of printing have precluded these pieces. While the following paragraphs do not do either faculty member justice, a snapshot rather than a portfolio will have to do for now.

Nancy Evans joined the faculty as a visiting assistant professor in the fall of 1980. Her professional work prior to coming to IU was summarized in the fall, 1980, edition of the *Journal*. In addition to her research interests, Nancy's departmental efforts to date have focused primarily on practicum coordination and teaching several required courses. She has developed a comprehensive manual to assist both practicum students and site supervisors increase the quality of the practicum experience. Her interest in the development of graduate students as both persons and professionals has made her a popular advisor and friend to many in a short time. She has extended her personal interests in students' development through a longitudinal research project on student personnel graduate student development at several institutions including IU. This spring, Nancy will be presenting programs at both ACPA and NAWDAC and looks forward to meeting with alumni and friends of the program.

As reported in last fall's *Newsletter*, John Bean recently joined the higher education faculty as an assistant professor. He holds the B.A. from Beloit College and M.A., M.F.A., and Ph.D. degrees from the University of Iowa. After completing his degree at Iowa in 1978, he joined the Office of Institutional Planning and Research at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln where he also taught part-time in the

Department of Educational Administration. John's research interests include college student attrition and faculty productivity and he has developed synthetic causal models to better understand these phenomena. His work is held in such high esteem by his colleagues across the country that he was appointed to the editorial board of *Research in Higher Education*, a rare honor to someone relatively new to the profession. Professor Bean will assist in one of the CSPA workshops held in June. On a personal note, John also plays a mean fiddle, guitar, and numerous other instruments. Needless to say, he has added a different dimension to our programs!

Four workshops will be offered this summer as part of the annual CSPA Summer Student Personnel Institute. Between June 2-4, 1982, Dr. John Schuh, Director of Residence Life, will coordinate the *Trends in Residence Hall Work* seminar. Guest presenters include Dr. Robert Rodgers, Ohio State University; Dr. Donald Gehring, University of Louisville; and Dr. Charles Schroeder, St. Louis University. *The Planning Process* in institutions of higher education is the theme of another workshop to be held June 13-15, 1982. I will be assisted in the workshop by Dr. David Clark from Indiana University, author of several monographs on the planning process, and John Bean. Nancy Evans will direct the *Women in Administration and Counseling* workshop, June 15-17. A number of women in administrative positions from Indiana University as well as other institutions will serve as consultants. The annual Interfraternity Institute will be held July 11-16 and will be coordinated again by Dr. Herbert Smith, Assistant Dean of Students. Feel free to call or write should you desire further information about any of these professional development opportunities.

While a number of persons should be recognized for their contributions to this edition of the *Journal*, Rod Kirsch and Janet Wright deserve special mention. Without their perseverance and unselfish contributions of time and energy, this edition could not have been prepared and delivered to you. They represent the character and quality of student affairs preparation at Indiana University. You will be proud to welcome them and their graduating colleagues to the student affairs profession.

We are grateful for the loyalty and support alumni and friends of the program have provided over the years. Please let us know how we can work together to improve the quality of the preparation program and keep you well informed. I look forward to seeing you somewhere in the spring!

George Kuh

## ALUMNI NEWS

Anzalone, Edmond F. '74 has been a personnel supervisor with Union Fidelity Corporation since 1980. Union Fidelity is an insurance company located in Trevore, Penn.

Brodzinski, Frederick R. '72 recently joined the Higher Education Development Group, a consulting firm specializing in student affairs/student services. He is a senior partner with the firm, and also serves as Dean of Students at Ramapo College of New Jersey.

Burrows, Dan '73 is currently the dean of career and special programs for the Loop College in Chicago. He is living in Hazelcrest, Ill. with his wife and daughter.

Crist, Mary Jane Jackson '69 is assistant dean of students at the University of Arizona and directs the University of Arizona's Phoenix office. Crist also serves as a field representative for the development office in major fund solicitation and corporate relations, and is currently working on an Ed.D. in Educational Administration and Supervision at Arizona State University.

Devore, Jan '78 is assistant dean of students at Millikin University in Decatur, Illinois. Her responsibilities include overall supervision of the residence hall system, advising sororities, student senate, and Alpha Lambda Delta honorary.

Glatzel, Mary Jo '80 is an admissions counselor at the University of California, Santa Cruz.

Golden, Roy D. '81 is a freshmen advisor at Miami University in Oxford, Ohio. His responsibilities include supervision of a male freshmen hall; he also serves as academic advisor to the residence of his hall.

Greenfield, Margee '79 is area coordinator at Northern Arizona University in Flagstaff. She was just accepted into the higher education administration doctoral program. Prior to service at Northern Arizona, she served as a residence hall director at the University of Kansas.

McGinnis, Judith McLaughlin '76 has been an account executive with New England Telephone Company for the past three years. She resides in Weston, Mass.

McInerney, Sara '81 is staff assistant for student programs and sorority affairs at Wittenburg University in Springfield, Ohio. Her duties include sororities, orientation, special programs, and honorary advisement.

Petersen, Stephen H. '69 is vice-president for student affairs at Central Missouri State University. He is a member of the board of trustees of AFS International/Intercultural Programs, a member of the editorial board of the *Journal of College and University Housing*, and an officer of the American College Personnel Association.

Polak, Stephanie Servidio '78 is assistant director of housing at Rider College in Lawrenceville, New Jersey.

Reinhardt, Christine M. '75 is a certified public accountant with Laventhol and Horwath in Harrisburg, Penn. She worked as a financial aids counselor at the Capitol Campus of the Pennsylvania State University before enrolling on a part-time basis in the accounting program at Pennsylvania State.

Richards, Sarah Elizabeth Marks '68 has moved from dean of women at Albion College in Michigan to dean of students of Caminade University in Honolulu. Since 1980 she has held the position of executive director of the Hawaii State Foundation on Culture and the Arts. Her civic activities include board member of the Honolulu Symphony Society Junior League, and treasurer of the Consortium of Pacific Arts and Cultures.

Rifkin, Paul '76 completed his Ph.D. in July, 1981 and is a member of the University of Wisconsin-LaCrosse college student personnel faculty in addition to holding residence life responsibilities.

Scheffel, Susan '69 of Ossining, N.Y. is the coordinator of the Adult Career Guidance Center which is part of the Putnam/Northern Westchester Board of Cooperative Educational Services. The center provides career counseling services to those interested in changing careers, returning to school, acquiring effective job hunting skills or returning to work after an extended absence.

Solberg, Roger L. '77 is union director at Wagner College in Staten Island, N.Y.

Steinway, Harry '71 is in his eighth year of employment with St. Mary's College of Maryland where he serves as associate dean of students. Steinway and his wife, Beth, the director of residence life at St. Mary's College, had their first child in March 1981.

Tomaino, Samuel J. '76 is employed as a computer programmer for the Central Jersey Bank and Trust Co. of Freehold, New Jersey, and sends greetings to his 1974-1976 I.U. friends.

Trager, Adrian '72 is a social worker at the Jewish Family Service of Broward County in Miami, Florida.

Verkuilen, Michael J. '79 is an investment executive with Moseley, Hallgarten, Estabrook and Weeden, Inc. in Chicago.

Wegryn, Linda E. '81 is a residential energy auditor with Energy Conservation Analysis, Inc. in Indianapolis, Indiana.

## JOURNAL CONTRIBUTORS

*The editors wish to acknowledge the generosity of the following alumni for their support to publish the 1982 Journal of the Indiana University Student Personnel Association. The long list of contributors illustrates the strength and loyalty of our "I.U. Family." Donors whose gifts were recorded at the Indiana University Foundation after February 8, 1982 will be included in the fall issue of the Alumni Newsletter.*

|                             |                                |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Edmond F. Anzalone '74      | Marc A. Kaplan '78             |
| Frank Ardaiole '75          | Sharon L. Kimbel '80           |
| Bob Arrowsmith '65          | Karen E. Kristoferson '77      |
| Kathy Arrowsmith '72        | Kathy Malutich '81             |
| Nancy L. Ball '74           | Helen L. Mamarchev '73         |
| Grace Bareikis '79          | David H. McClintock '68        |
| Patricia S. Baugher '70     | Marylu K. McEwen '70           |
| B. J. Bischoff '80          | Judith McLaughlin McGinnis '76 |
| Carol Bischoff '69          | Sara McInerney '81             |
| Bill Boer '79               | Tom Miller '72                 |
| Laurie Bell Boer '79        | Deborah Wilson Morphet '79     |
| Janice D. Bradley '80       | Steve Moses '69                |
| Russ K. Bradley '80         | Richard J. Nelson '70          |
| Diane Breeden-Lee '81       | Carol M. Nesslein '78          |
| Frederick R. Brodzinski '72 | David Nestor '75               |
| Dan Burrows '73             | Stephen H. Petersen '69        |
| Alan S. Chesen '73          | Loralee Pohl '70               |
| Mary Jane Jackson Crist '69 | Stephanie Servidio Polak '78   |
| Jan Cromie '77              | Christine M. Reinhardt '75     |
| James W. Crouch '72         | Sarah E. Marks Richards '68    |
| Jan Devore '78              | Paul Rifkin '76                |
| Raymond P. Echols '70       | Paul Robins '75                |
| Stuart J. Fitzpatrick '80   | Richard Schuster '73           |
| Kirk B. Friedman '81        | Roger L. Solberg '77           |
| Mary Jo Glatzel '80         | Louis Stamatakos '51           |
| Roy D. Golden '81           | Harry Steinway '71             |
| Brenda Gordon '65           | Michele Stipanovich '81        |
| Margee Greenfield '79       | Samuel J. Tomaino '76          |
| Jill D. Hazelwood '80       | Adrian Trager '72              |
| John Heneisen '68           | Michael Verkuilen '79          |
| Joanne Hirschhorn '81       | B. E. Waterman '70             |
| Deb Hunter '77              | Joseph Weaver '73              |
| Richard D. Hvale '80        | Linda E. Wegryn '81            |
| Diana L. Ikenberry '79      | Byron D. Zizos '80             |

IUSPA  
Education 226  
Indiana University  
Bloomington, Indiana 47405