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 (σ), 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-

TABLE 1

Aggregate Perceptions of Ideal and Real Support Interactions

	Faculty Interaction					Peer Interaction				
	RM	σ	IM	σ	t-value	RM	σ	IM	σ	t-value
Nonacademic Support										
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
Academic Support										
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

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 classassignments. 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 (σ = 1.31). A mean score of 3.03 (σ = 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-

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, womens' 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-