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Research has demonstrated consistently that participation in co-curricular activities benefits students’ retention rates and educational outcomes. However, the applicability of these findings to nontraditional students has not been clear. An understanding of the factors promoting and inhibiting these unique students’ participation is needed prior to determining the applicability of these studies. The present study evaluates these students’ perceptions of involvement in co-curricular activities in order to establish a baseline for future studies.
The participation of nontraditional students in co-curricular activities may be important as research has demonstrated that involvement in these activities promotes retention (Tinto 1993) and has an impact on overall student outcomes upon graduation (Ethington, Smart and Pascarella 1988; Pascarella 1985; Pascarella and Terenzini 1991; Stoecker, Pascarella and Wolfe 1988). However, there have been many questions about whether this research is truly applicable to nontraditional students (or adult students, as they are sometimes referred to) as most of the research has been conducted in regard to traditional-aged college students (Pappas and Loring 1985). As the number of nontraditional students (typically identified as those students who are 25 years of age or older) continues to grow faster than any other college student population (Aslanian and Brickell 1980) and as they account for nearly one-half of the overall student population in the United States (Brazziel, 1989), it is important that this group of students should be better understood. Many additional characteristics may be aligned with the concept of the nontraditional learner, but for the sake of the present research, we focus simply on the age characteristic and not others (e.g., work status, enrollment status, etc.).

Answers to the current research question may benefit institutions that serve significant numbers of nontraditional students whose unique characteristics are not considered or understood fully in terms of student programming; such students may be helped to achieve outcomes comparable to those attained by traditional students who participate in co-curricular activities. However, it is important first to understand the co-curricular participation behaviors of nontraditional students.

**BACKGROUND**

A primary reason for encouraging students to participate in co-curricular activities has been to promote retention; research demonstrates the effectiveness of such involvement (Astin 1993; Tinto 1993). Campuses have sought, with varying success, to address the problems of student departure by implementing intervention strategies targeted specifically at reducing attrition rates. Many colleges attempt to reduce student attrition rates by undertaking initiatives aimed specifically at integrating students into the total academic program. Campus leaders seek to ensure a reciprocal relationship between academic and social integration. If campuses truly want to integrate students into a total academic program, they must work to ensure student engagement (Tinto 1993). Whether this philosophy is applicable for institutions serving nontraditional students remains a question. Despite conflicting findings regarding the applicability of Tinto’s model to nontraditional students (Starks 1987; Walleri and Peglow-Hoch 1988), researchers have consistently noted the importance of “fit” between students and their college environment as a retention factor (Kerka 1995; Stoecker, Pascarella and Wolfe 1988). Thus, despite the varying intentions and aspirations of this group of students, their integration and
continued matriculation at institutions of higher education through co-curricular programs could be beneficial to their success, despite external competing demands.

The importance of promoting retention of college students lies not merely in maintaining their numbers for the sake of retention statistics, but more in providing students with value-added experiences that will benefit them upon their leaving college. Co-curricular participation has been linked to higher educational aspirations, to bachelor’s degree attainment, to graduate school attendance (Pascarella 1985; Stoecker, Pascarella and Wolfe 1988; Pascarella and Terenzini 1991), and even to choice of sex-atypical careers (Ethington, Smart and Pascarella 1988). Research on co-curricular participation has recognized improvements in cognitive development (King and Kitchener 1994), in interpersonal and communication skills (Astin and Panos 1969), in the development of identity (Chickering and Reisser 1993), in desirable affective and attitudinal outcomes (Astin, Parrott, Korn and Sax 1997), and in job-seeking skills and actual employability (Astin 1993; Floerchinger 1988). These findings demonstrate the importance of co-curricular programs in enhancing student retention, and, subsequently, to graduates’ success in life and career and so should encourage campus leaders as they develop co-curricular programs. However, nontraditional students differ in their characteristics, experiences, and learning styles, as well as in their motivations for attending college. These students’ goals also differ, with some seeking a degree; some, solutions to a problem; some, personal enrichment; or a combination of all of these (Pappas and Loring 1985). It is important to understand whether the aforementioned value-added outcomes are consistent in regard to nontraditional students. Even before that, however, research must focus specifically on how nontraditional students perceive the importance of co-curricular participation; what helps or hinders their participation; and the potential benefits of their participation. This research will frame the nature of nontraditional student co-curricular participation for further study. This study will provide baseline information regarding nontraditional students’ perceptions of co-curricular participation, which will guide practitioners in implementing effective programming and developing further research regarding this group of students.

The current study was designed to gauge nontraditional student perception of and participation in co-curricular activities. Responses to the following questions are at the core of this study:

- What were nontraditional students’ views of the role of co-curricular activities in their collegiate experiences?
- What were nontraditional students’ levels of participation in co-curricular activities?
- What were the factors that related to nontraditional students’ participation in co-curricular activities?
- What were the factors that hindered nontraditional students from participating in co-curricular activities?
- What were the students’ perceptions of the impact of their co-curricular participation on their cognitive and affective development?

**METHODODOLOGY**

Participants were 307 undergraduate students enrolled in a public institution in a lower midwestern city. The institution serves a significant number of nontraditional military personnel and their dependents. The institution’s total enrollment during fall 2001 was approximately 7,400 students, with the average age of full-time students being 26 years and the average age of part-time students being 30 years. Participants were asked via e-mail and other public announcements to respond anonymously to a web-based survey administered by a statewide consortium devoted to the practice and research of student affairs. More than 75 variables were included in questions in the instrument. The mean age of respondents was 28.3 years; 60 percent of respondents were women; 37 percent were first-year students; and 66 percent were white. Overall, student characteristics at this institution were as follows: 54 percent were women, 56 percent were lower-division students (freshmen), 67 percent were white, and the average age was 27 years. Other than a much larger proportion of students in the sample who were sophomores, juniors, or seniors (upperclassmen), the sample was representative of the student body.

The survey instrument was developed based on a literature review of pertinent variables and complexities related to co-curricular participation. In addition, collaboration with the institution’s student personnel officials was instrumental in development of the instrument. Items in the survey focused on barriers that cause or prevent student attrition (Astin 1993; Bean and Metzner 1985; Brawer 1996; Kerka 1995; Stoecker, Pascarella, and Wolfe 1988; Tinto 1993;), as well as on affective and cognitive devel-
development (Astin, Parrott, Korn and Sax 1997; King and Kitchener 1994; Pascarella 1985; Pascarella and Terenzini 1991; Stoeker, Pascarella and Wolfe 1988). Institutional program goals provided by student affairs administrators were translated into measurable instrument items to complete the survey. The instrument was piloted twice, after which corrections and revisions were made, and reviewed by several student affairs faculty, practitioners, and students for validity purposes. The final form was administered using the web-based technique. The instrument had a 0.92 alpha reliability.

**FINDINGS**

**Student Perceptions of the Role of Co-curricular Participation in Their Collegiate Experiences**

More than 70 percent of respondents believed that co-curricular participation was either “very important” or “somewhat important” in their collegiate experiences. The mean level of importance (on a scale of 1 to 3) was 2.01. Using an analysis of variance (ANOVA) to assess this item, the sense of importance was not significantly different by gender (f = 1.13, p = 0.28), lower- or upper-division classification (f = 0.77, p = 0.55), or the number of semesters the student had spent at the institution (f = 0.08, p = 0.153). Using bivariate correlational analyses, respondents’ sense of importance of co-curricular participation also had no significant correlation with miles of commuting distance, high school grades, or college grades.

By race, however, the difference was significant (f = 7.6, p = 0.005). White students assigned a higher level of importance to their co-curricular participation than minority students did. Co-curricular participation also varied significantly by housing arrangement (f = 17.12, p = 0.000): Residential students reported a significantly lower sense of co-curricular importance than off-campus students did. This finding was consistent even when the age and ethnicity of the respondents were held constant. Age also was related to importance (r = 0.29, p = 0.000) in that the older the students, the higher the level of importance they assigned to co-curricular participation. Working on campus was inversely related to respondents’ sense of importance of co-curricular participation (r = −1.41, p = 0.028). As students worked more hours, their perception of the importance of participation in co-curricular activities decreased.

**Student Levels of Participation in Co-curricular Activities**

Respondents indicated high levels of participation in the following co-curricular activities (presented here in decreasing order of mean frequency): (a) out-of-class interaction with faculty (dealing with academic matters) (M = 2.46); (b) participation in clubs and organizations (M = 2.16); (c) participation in campus-wide activities or events (M = 1.95); (d) out-of-class interaction with faculty (dealing with non-academic matters) (M = 1.79); (e) participation in religious organizations (M = 1.48); and (f) participation in student government and political action committees (M = 1.47). (See Table A.1.) Among these six activities, the level of importance students assigned to

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-class interaction with faculty dealing with academic matters</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in clubs and organizations</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in all campus-wide activities or events (concerts, lectures, dances, exhibitions, etc.)</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-class interaction with faculty dealing with non-academic-related (social) matters</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in religious organizations (e.g., interfaith council, campus ministry)</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in student government or political action committees</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in social Greek fraternity or sorority organizations</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in intramurals or other recreational sports</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
co-curricular participation was related to their level of participation. For example, among those students with the highest self-reported level of importance, more than 88 percent also reported the highest levels of participation \((x^2 = 28.04, p = 0.000)\).

Factors Influencing Student Participation in Co-curricular Activities

Students rated the most important factors influencing their participation in co-curricular activities on a scale of one (little or no influence) to three (lots of influence). Again in decreasing order of influence, they were: (a) “to learn something new” \((M = 2.31)\); (b) “to prepare me to get a job of my choice” \((M = 2.24)\); (c) “encouragement from peers or friends” \((M = 2.23)\); (d) “something fun to do” \((M = 2.21)\); and (e) “quality of co-curricular activities” \((M = 2.03)\). (See Table A.2.) Respondents also indicated that the best sources of information about becoming involved in co-curricular activities, in order of preference, were as follows: (a) information from e-mail and Web sites (86 percent); (b) information from friends and students on campus (73%); (c) information posted on campus (58%); and (d) the orientation program in which they participated as college freshmen (42%).

Factors Impeding Student Participation in Co-curricular Activities

Just as certain factors were deemed to be conducive to participation in co-curricular activities, the researchers felt that identifying those factors detrimental to nontraditional students’ participation would provide further insights into those students’ lifestyles. Respondents rated the most significant factors in preventing them from taking part in co-curricular activities as: (a) “my off-campus work commitments” \((M = 2.43)\); (b) “my family commitment” \((M = 2.37)\); (c) “my academic life is too demanding” \((M = 2.30)\); (d) “lack of overall student support for co-curricular activities” \((M = 1.89)\); and (e) “my personal or social interests are not the same as on-campus social organizations or events” \((M = 1.86)\). (See Table A.3.) The lowest-rated items were related to students’ inability to provide input on the variety of co-curricular activities \((M = 1.82)\) and the number of available co-curricular activities \((M = 1.61)\).

Potential Impact on Cognitive and Affective Development

The final data collected for the study related to participants’ perception of their educational gains as a result of their involvement in co-curricular activities. Respondents reported that co-curricular participation made them more well-rounded individuals \((M = 2.54)\); helped them become better students academically \((M = 2.45)\); opened their minds to diverse opinions and lifestyles \((M = 2.41)\); increased their commitment to the university \((M = 2.31)\); and changed their academic outlook or occupational choice \((M = 2.14)\).

Table A.2
Factors Influencing Participation in Co-curricular Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To learn something new</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To prepare me to get a job of my choice</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouragement from peers or friends</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Something fun to do</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To socialize or make new friends</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of co-curricular activities</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To develop my leadership skills</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To develop my communications or public speaking skills</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety of co-curricular activities</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouragement from the teaching faculty</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To develop my health and physical fitness</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be of service to campus community</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouragement from parents or relatives</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantity of co-curricular activities</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouragement from staff or administrators</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To increase my self-esteem</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS FOR PRACTICE

This study was prompted by the need to understand the perceptions of nontraditional students regarding their co-curricular participation and the factors that were influential in their decision to participate in such activities. Despite the significant amount of literature related to the importance of student involvement in co-curricular activities and its potential impact on retention and the promotion of other educational gains (Astin 1993; Howard 1986; Nash, Rosson and Schoemer 1973; Pascarella and Terenzini 1991), little research exists regarding nontraditional students and their perceptions of co-curricular activities. More specifically, there is a dearth of research on nontraditional students' level of desire to participate in co-curricular activities, factors detrimental to their decision to participate, and their perception of the benefits of participating.

Many of this study's findings substantiate present literature regarding traditional students' involvement in co-curricular activities. Students understood the value of participation in co-curricular activities to their overall collegiate experience. This parallels the work of many researchers (Astin 1993; Chickering and Reisser 1993; King and Kitchener 1994; Pascarella and Terenzini 1991) who suggest that participation in co-curricular activities has an impact on the collegiate experience and student development. Despite respondents' overall identification of the importance of participation in co-curricular activities, non-white students rated participation in such activities at a lower level of importance. Much of the research (Astin 1993; Pascarella and Terenzini 1991; Tinto 1993) shows that participation in co-curricular activities is conducive to student persistence. Regrettably, non-white students historically have had lower persistence and graduation rates (Aragon 2000; Sanchez 2000); this may be of particular importance to this institution given that more than 30 percent of its student population is non-white (i.e., 20 percent is African American; 8 percent is Hispanic; and 6 percent is Native American). This finding may be one of the factors that contributes to these students' lower levels of participation in co-curricular activities. Conducting a needs assessment of the non-white nontraditional population could help determine the types of programs in which these students would be more likely to participate, thus potentially increasing their levels of satisfaction and retention. Such an assessment could yield additional important information about specific populations' (e.g., Native American, Hispanic, African American) interests within the non-white category.

This study also suggests that off-campus work, academic demands, and lack of interest and feelings of comfort in participating in existing co-curricular activities are barriers to nontraditional students' participation. Thus, a needs assessment could also be beneficial in determining how to overcome these barriers. This information, as well as more in-depth assessments, could be utilized to schedule co-curricular activities at times more conducive to nontraditional students' participation. Student affairs professionals could develop childcare services and family-oriented events to

---

Table A.3
Factors Hindering Participation in Co-curricular Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My off-campus work commitments</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>0.806</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My family commitments</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>0.759</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My academic life is too demanding</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>0.712</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of overall student support for co-curricular activities</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>0.851</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My personal or social interests are not the same as on-campus social organizations or events</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>0.770</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of co-curricular activities</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>0.797</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety of co-curricular activities</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>0.774</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuting time is a problem</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>0.796</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No encouragement from the teaching faculty in emphasizing co-curricular participation</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>0.740</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantity of co-curricular activities</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>0.736</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opportunity to give input into the selection of activities</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>0.754</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
further promote the involvement of this population of students. Finally, administrators should consider techniques to provide more on-campus work opportunities, perhaps by providing more financial aid or through fundraising efforts focused specifically on supporting nontraditional students.

This study’s findings regarding the role of co-curricular activities in supporting traditional-aged students’ future job exploration and success in careers are similar to those of the literature (Astin 1993; Floerchinger 1988; Williams and Winston 1985). For example, study participants stated that one of the most important reasons for participation in out-of-class activities was to enhance their opportunities for career development opportunities \( (M = 2.24) \). Student development professionals would do well to work closely with those in academic affairs to develop collaborative co-curricular programs related to increasing students’ job awareness and preparation. Because nontraditional students typically are commuter students who visit campus only to take classes and then leave having had little or no interaction with anyone outside of their classroom peers and instructional faculty, it is important to develop creative solutions to address students’ needs in this area. Such an effort might involve the assignment of one counselor from the career center to a particular academic area of expertise. The counselor could use her knowledge of the academic area to develop more creative co-curricular activities that would provide students with opportunities to extend their career explorations.

The type of co-curricular participation rated highest in the current study was interaction with faculty regarding academic matters, followed by participation in clubs and organizations. Overlap in these activities as a result of faculty sponsorship of these clubs and organizations may have resulted in more extensive opportunities for gaining information about academic and career exploration. This finding is particularly important because research has demonstrated that interaction with faculty outside of the classroom contributes to students’ educational gains, including retention and graduation (Astin 1993). Student personnel administrators may wish to share the findings of this research, as
well as the findings of other research on nontraditional students, to inform faculty of their unique characteristics so that they, too, can provide effective programming.

Given students’ increasing utilization of technology in their pursuit of higher education (Benedict 1996), it was not surprising to learn that students access information about co-curricular activities through e-mail and other electronic means of communication. Thus, student personnel administrators may want to consider more and better marketing of co-curricular programs via electronic media, whether through electronic mailings, posting of events on the institution’s Web site, or through listservs for special interest groups. In addition, educating students as to the importance of their participation in co-curricular (even as to the existence of such) opportunities, events, and activities through various means of communication (e.g., computers as well as traditional face-to-face orientation programs) may result in a higher level of co-curricular participation. As the current study’s findings suggest, students who regard their participation in co-curricular activities as important (particularly in relation to perceived outcomes) are likely to be engaged in them.

Finally, respondents indicated that they perceived the benefits of participation in co-curricular activities as including their own transformation into well-rounded individuals who would perform better in classes and whose diversity sensitivity would likewise improve. Whether this actually occurs has not been tested, though it is clear that nontraditional students do appreciate the potential benefits of participation in the co-curriculum. Practitioners and scholars should continue to conduct research to determine whether these outcomes are indeed achieved, even as they continue to develop programs for nontraditional students.

LIMITATIONS AND IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Despite its significant contributions to the nontraditional student co-curricular participation literature, this study has several limitations. First, although the sample size was adequate in relation to overall institutional enrollment, it was made up only of students who volunteered to complete the instrument. Furthermore, the Internet was the only means whereby students could complete this study; some students may not have participated because of either their inability or their unwillingness to access and/or utilize a computer. Overall, the study’s lack of randomization limits the applicability of its findings.

A further limitation of this study relates to the institution where it was undertaken. Given the institution’s substantially large proportion of nontraditional students, the study’s findings are not generalizable to all institutions of higher education. The implications for institutions with lesser proportions of nontraditional students likely would be somewhat different. Adjusting the organizational structure of more “typical” campuses specifically for the benefit of nontraditional students might not be as effective, either for the students or in terms of achieving student affairs program goals.

Replicating this study on other campuses with differing missions and student profiles would support the discovery of further implications for practice. Modifying the study to include a qualitative research methodology would allow more thorough exploration of nontraditional students’ perceptions of co-curricular programs.

CONCLUSION

Nontraditional students enter higher education with a vast array of needs, expectations, and goals. Despite the existence of studies that have focused on these students’ retention and graduation based on their participation in co-curricular activities (Astin 1993; Pascarella 1985; Pascarella and Terenzini 1991; Stoecker, Pascarella and Wolfe, 1988; Tinto 1993), little research has been devoted to the specific co-curricular participation behaviors of these students. More specifically, no research has attempted to pinpoint the factors influencing nontraditional students’ participation in co-curricular activities. The current study attempted to provide baseline data on these students. By understanding these factors, practitioners will be able to more adequately develop programs that promote student retention and positive educational outcomes. As nontraditional students become increasingly involved in student affairs programming, further research can be developed to assess the benefits of their co-curricular involvement in these areas.
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This study explored the policy process related to official institutional academic advising statement policy at two higher education institutions in the United States. As indicated by recent press, institutions are turning to such formalized advising policy as a means to facilitate their advising operations, which historically have been ill-perceived in the United States. A main conclusion was that policy implementation not only seems to take on unique characteristics at the institutional level, but that it also evolves within the loosely coupled framework of American colleges and universities themselves. Several recommendations for institutions seeking to implement official institutional academic advising statement policy are outlined.
Developmental advising has been defined as "a systematic process based on a close student-advisor relationship intended to aid students in achieving educational, career, and personal goals through the utilization of the full range of institutional and community resources" (Ender, Winston and Miller 1984, p. 19). It was established in part in the 1970s to help counter historical dissatisfaction with academic advising on American college and university campuses (Habley 2000; Polson and Jurich 1979). However, developmental academic advising itself has been hailed as being more rigorous in theory than in practice (Strommer 1994; Turtle 2000). One reason for this disconnect may be confusion over the nature of the developmental advising relationship (Creeden 1990; see also Guinn and Mitchell 1986; Larsen and Brown 1983; McAnulty, O’Connor and Sklare 1987). It has been proposed that the lack of adequate advising policy at the institutional level may provoke such confusion (Grites 1979).

Over the past 25 years, the percentage of colleges and universities having formal institutional-level advising policy has remained relatively low. Institutional statements of academic advising address the following aspects of the advising program: the philosophy of advising, goals for advising, responsibilities of advisors, responsibilities of advisees, delivery strategies, training of advisors, evaluation of advisors, and rewards for advisors (Habley 2000). According to Habley (2000), only one-quarter of surveyed institutions in 1979 indicated they had published statements on academic advising. The percentage increased to 63 percent by 1985 but has remained relatively stable since, with the percentages in 1998 and 2003 at 61 and 65 percent, respectively (Habley 2000, 2004). Even among those institutions that recently indicated that they have published statements on advising, the majority did not have comprehensive statements (Habley 2004). Thus, despite studies that seem to indicate that the implementation of institutional advising statements may serve to facilitate the academic advising relationship, the use of such statements apparently has stalled.

While proposed merits of official institutional statements of advising have been outlined, it is likely that the implementation of such policy would not be successful apart from deference to institutional culture. Kuh and Whitt (1988) point out that institutional policies and practices are “culture driven and culture bound” (p. 100) and thus may not be transferable from one institution to the next. Indeed, advising and policy scholars alike have emphasized that consideration of institutional culture aids effective implementation of policy (Chaffee and Tierney 1988; Deal and Kennedy 1982; Denison 1990; Habley and Morales 1998a, 1998b; King 2003; Marcoulides and Heck 1993; Mills 1998; Pardee 2000; Tierney 1988).
importance of institutional culture to academic advising may have been emphasized first by Habley (1983), who stated, “The development of a successful advising program...hinges on the identification of the organizational context and the development of a structure that takes into account the delivery systems and the policies and procedures of the institution” (p. 536). Pardee (2000) further emphasized this notion nearly two decades later, suggesting that the use of faculty-delivered models of advising may be limited by the promotion and tenure policies of institutions if they tend to emphasize research and publication. Indeed, research findings have suggested a relationship between academic advising and institutional culture. For example, based on data from the fifth national survey of academic advising practices conducted by the American College Testing program (ACT), Habley (1997) pointed to an inverse relationship between the use of faculty-delivered models of advising and institutional size. He cited data that indicated that faculty-delivered models of advising accounted for 75 percent of the models at campuses with enrollments of fewer than 1,000 students but only for 9 percent of the models at campuses with enrollments of 20,000 or more.

Overall, seven organizational models for academic advising have been identified (King 2003; Pardee 2000). These models originated in the work of Habley (1983) and Habley and McCauley (1987) and have been grouped into three classifications depending upon their degree of centralization (Pardee 2000). In decentralized models, students are advised by faculty or staff in their academic departments (King 2003; Pardee 2000). In contrast, in centralized models, all advising services are provided to students by an administrative unit, such as an advising center, with a director and staff in one central location (King 2003; Pardee 2000). Finally, shared models of advising, which are becoming more commonplace, involve both faculty and a central administrative unit in the delivery of advising services (King 2003; Pardee 2000). The structure of shared models differs by how faculty or staff and the central administrative unit share the delivery of advising services (Pardee 2000). Following are brief descriptions of the seven organizational advising models (as elaborated upon by Pardee [2000] and King [2003]); note that the models are grouped according to their respective classifications.

**MODELS**

**Decentralized**

- **Faculty Only.** In this model, faculty are solely responsible for advising students. Students are assigned advisors on the basis of whether they have declared a major in a faculty member’s department of study. If students are undeclared or undecided as to their majors, they may be advised by faculty in the liberal arts or by faculty with lighter advising loads.
- **Satellite.** Advising services are provided to students in advising offices located in academic sub-units (e.g., schools or colleges) of an institution. Students may be advised for a time by the advising offices, after which time responsibility for advising is transferred to faculty members within that subunit.

**Centralized**

- **Self-Contained.** Faculty members are not involved in this model of advising, in which a central administrative unit provides advising services to students from the time of their matriculation until their departure.

**Shared**

- **Supplementary.** In this model, faculty advising of students is supplemented by staff in a central advising unit, which also provides training and support to faculty advisors. However, faculty advisors ultimately have authority over decisions about a student’s program.
- **Split.** The initial advising of students in this model is split between faculty members and the staff of an advising office. Faculty members may advise students who have declared majors while undecided or undeclared students—as well as other students (e.g., student athletes, underprepared students, preprofessional students)—are advised by staff in the advising office.
- **Dual.** Faculty members and staff in an advising office share responsibility for advising students approximately on a 50-50 basis. Faculty advise students on matters relating to their programs of study while staff in the advising office provide guidance regarding other academic matters, such as registration procedures and general education coursework. Typically, advising office staff also advise undecided or undeclared students.
Total Intake. Initial advising of all students is handled by a central advising unit, which also may have certain campus-wide responsibilities (e.g., coordination of advising, administration of curriculum and instruction). After certain conditions have been met, however, responsibility for advising is transferred to advisors within the academic subunit of students’ majors. Advisors typically are faculty members, full-time professional advisors, or peer advisors.

**METHOD**

How is official institutional academic advising policy that aims to facilitate developmental advising implemented in institutions of varying cultures? The current research sought first to discover the culture of each institution as well as each institution’s approach to advising. Further, the researcher sought to identify particular steps the institutions were taking to implement official advising statement policy. As a result, the research took the form of a policy study—or, specifically, a study of implementation processes (Rossman and Rallis 1998; Williams et al. 1982).

**Sample**

Through a purposive sampling technique, the research methodology incorporated case studies of two institutions that met various criteria (Huberman and Miles 2001; Lincoln and Guba 1985; Miles and Huberman 1994; Patton 1990). For instance, as indicated by Miles and Huberman (1994), the conceptual nature of the cases was a deciding factor. First, cases were chosen based upon their ties to developmental advising and official advising statement policy using the following general qualifications: (1) they had incorporated elements of institutional statements on academic advising into their operation, and (2) they had systems of academic advising that either were explicitly labeled as developmental or were clearly aligned with the tenets of developmental advising. The sample institutions also had been recognized by the National Academic Advising Association (NACADA) for their mission statements on academic advising. Second, institutions perceived to have varying cultures were included in the study. Institutions were specifically chosen based on the literature that indicates that the various categories of higher education institutions—for example, liberal arts colleges and comprehensive universities—have distinct cultures (Altbach 2001; Budd 1996; Clark 1987; Hartley 2003; Kerr 2001; Youn 1992, 2005). Physical location was an additional factor in the selection of cases (Miles and Huberman 1994). Ultimately, it was determined that institutions in the Northeast that reflected the conceptual criteria would be selected.

State U¹ was a comprehensive institution, and Communal College was a liberal arts institution. A few characteristics (derived from the IPEDS Cool database²) further describe the two cases.

**State U**
- **Control:** Public, four-year or above
- **Carnegie classification:** Masters Colleges and Universities I
- **Total enrollment:** 10,974
- **Graduation rate (within 6 years for bachelor’s-degree-seeking students):** 34%

**Communal College**
- **Control:** Private not-for-profit, four-year or above
- **Carnegie classification:** Baccalaureate Colleges–Liberal Arts
- **Total enrollment:** 1,569
- **Graduation rate (within 6 years for bachelor’s-degree-seeking students):** 75%

**Data Collection**

Data were collected via semi-structured interviews, document analysis, and instrumentation. Based on a previously piloted protocol, interviews were one-on-one interactions with institutional decision makers, campus administrators, faculty and professional advisors, and an undergraduate student. These types of individuals were those most likely to have had exposure to elements of advising statement policy at the different institutions. According to Van Maanen (1979), “[The] researcher’s account of the studied scene should be built on the information provided by the most knowledgeable (and candid) members of the scene” (p. 545). In order to further ensure that participants were “information rich” (Patton 1990), only individuals who had been employed by the institution for more than two years were interviewed; one student interviewee was a senior. Selecting interview participants via a snowball technique...

¹ Pseudonyms have been used in place of actual institution names.
² Cohort year 1999 (graduation rates) and 2005 figures last reported.
technique in which the primary informant(s) at each institution (e.g., the Chief Academic Office, or CAO) was asked to help locate other key informants also helped to ensure that participants were information rich. Snowball sampling is one of the ways by which to achieve theoretical sampling, which involves selecting participants most likely to reflect analytical criteria in which the researcher is interested (Warren 2002). Overall, approximately twelve one-hour interviews were conducted at each of the two institutions. In accordance with the literature that stresses that the number and length of interviews should evolve with the research rather than be determined a priori, the researcher allowed the interview process to evolve as the study progressed (Hutchinson and Skodol Wilson 1992; Taylor and Bogdan 1998).

Document analysis can increase the power of an evaluative effort when used in combination with other data-gathering techniques (Garman 1982). In order to choose documents from which the most would be learned, a purposive sampling technique was utilized (Merriam 1988). Specifically, document analysis dealt with sources3 that were most likely to provide information both on advising statement policy at the institutions and on the culture of the institutions (Chaffee and Tierney 1988; Dunham 1969; Habley 2000; Kuh and Whitt 1988; Terenzini 1993; Whitt 2001). For example, regarding institutional culture, Whitt (2001) wrote that “the context in which each college or university exists, including its history, geography, student body, and so forth, are reflected in its documents; its planning documents, viewbooks, mission statements, and handbooks are, in some ways, unique...” (p.452). Documents were tracked via a working hypothesis of institutional culture, developmental advising, and advising statement policy. According to Garman (1982), document tracking "results from the evaluator's reconstruction of events, sequences, and causal connections about the programs, decisions, and people in which he or she is interested" (pp.3–4).

The Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument (OCAI), which was developed by Kim Cameron to help measure organizational culture, was also administered to all participants. The research utilized the four-segment version of the OCAI, which Frew (1996) indicated has been used to measure the organizational culture of higher education institutions in various studies in the United States (see Cameron and Ettington 1988; Cameron and Freeman 1991; Fjortoft and Smart 1994; Smart and Hamm 1993; Smart and St. John 1996; Zammuto and Krakower 1991). The OCAI evolved from a similar instrument also developed by Kim Cameron—the Institutional Performance Survey (IPS)—in which participants answer questions about various cultural scenarios (Cameron and Ettington 1988; Frew 1996; K. Cameron, 2004). The IPS is based on models4 that Cameron and Freeman (1991) argue can be used to identify organizational culture types because

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dominant Attributes</th>
<th>Leader Style</th>
<th>Bonding</th>
<th>Strategic Emphases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clan</td>
<td>Cohesiveness, participation, teamwork, sense of family</td>
<td>Mentor, facilitator, parent figure</td>
<td>Loyalty, tradition, interpersonal cohesion</td>
<td>Toward developing human resources, commitment, morale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adhocracy</td>
<td>Creativity, entrepreneurship, adaptability, dynamism</td>
<td>Entrepreneur, innovator, risk taker</td>
<td>Entrepreneurship, flexibility, risk</td>
<td>Toward innovation, growth, new resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchy</td>
<td>Order, rules and regulations, uniformity, efficiency</td>
<td>Coordinator, organizer, administrator</td>
<td>Rules, policies and procedures, clear expectations</td>
<td>Toward stability, predictability, smooth operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market</td>
<td>Competitiveness, goal achievement, environment exchange</td>
<td>Decisive, production and achievement-oriented</td>
<td>Goal orientation, production, competition</td>
<td>Toward competitive advantage and market superiority</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Sources included: institutional Web sites; clippings from local and student newspapers; institutional newsletters, flyers, bulletins, and memos; institutional policy statements; minutes of institutional meetings; written statements on institutional philosophy, mission, or purpose; institutional histories; admissions materials (e.g., university viewbooks); college guides; undergraduate handbooks; articles, books, and/or reports on the institutions; and standard operating procedures. The elements of institutional academic advising statement policy present within institutions were also specifically reviewed.

3 The IPS is based on the Jungian framework of psychological archetypes and Quinn and Rohrbach’s (1981) competing values model of organizational effectiveness (Krakower and Niwa 1985; Frew 1996).
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1 Adopted from Cameron and Freeman (1991)
they organize the “different patterns of shared values, assumptions, and interpretations that typify organizations” (Cameron and Freeman 1991, p. 26). Building on the work of Cameron and Freeman (1991), the OCAI helps researchers gauge whether one of four culture types dominates an organization or the attributes of several characterize it. (See Table B.1 for descriptions of the four culture types and their specific attributes.)

Studies of private organizations as well as higher education institutions indicate the reliability of the OCAI (Cameron and Quinn 1999; see also, Quinn 1988; Zammuto and Krakower 1991). Even Krakower and Niwa (1985), who judged the OCAI’s concurrent validity (i.e., the relationship between the OCAI and other instruments gauging culture) to be inadequate, are joined by other researchers in affirming the OCAI’s construct validity (see Cameron and Freeman 1991; Krakower and Niwa 1985; Zammuto and Krakower 1991;).

Data Analysis

Data collection as well as analysis fell within the framework of narrative analysis, which stresses the interpretation of data for a particular audience (Riessman 2002). Narrative analysis seems particularly well suited to case study research (Czarniawska 1998). As in the current research, more than one case should be involved in order to show variation (Riessman 2002). Narrative accounts also seem to fit well with the interpretive approach taken toward aspects of organization studies, such as culture (Czarniawska 1998). According to Riessman (2002), narrative accounts are sequential, thematic, and structured. The most basic form requires three elements that must be connected by a plot: an original state of affairs, an action or event, and the consequent state of affairs (Czarniawska 1988). A narrative—an educational one, in particular—also may contain an “explicitly formulated point” (Czarniawska 1998, p. 3).

Interview and document data were analyzed both for the actual content of what was stated or printed and for the meaning underlying the content. Interview data, for example, were analyzed within the context of the three main functions of language (Riessman 2002). While the ideational function touches upon the actual content meaning of what is said, the interpersonal function captures how the shifting roles of speaker and listener may affect that meaning; the textual function refers to the fact that how something is said (i.e., semantics) also may affect the meaning (Riessman 2002). Latent and manifest content analysis were employed in document analysis. Manifest content analysis involves describing obvious, visible, or surface elements of communication whereas latent content analysis focuses on tone or implied feeling in order to get at underlying meaning (Downe-Wamboldt 1991). Not only should occurrences of the unit of analysis (i.e., words, phrases, sentences) be described, but the meaning, context, intentions, and consequences behind the occurrences also should be detailed (Downe-Wamboldt 1991). Taking such a comprehensive approach to the analysis of both interview and document data helped the researcher better assess the cultures of State U and Communal College. Geertz (1973) suggests that the analysis of culture involves making guesses about meaning and drawing explanatory conclusions from those guesses deemed to be the best. Cameron and Freeman’s model and the four-segment OCAI further assisted the researcher in making informed guesses about institutional culture.

“I’m…not clear if students really know what advising is. Sometimes I hear students say, ‘I’m not really sure what I can come to you with.’”

Various steps were taken in the data analysis stage to ensure the truth claims of the research. For example, “member checks” (Riessman 2002; Rossman and Rallis 1998) involved the sharing of findings with at least one key informant from each of the two sample institutions. Peer debriefing with non-involved professionals also was conducted (Lincoln and Guba 1985). Rossman and Rallis (1998) indicate that “using a colleague or peer as a critical friend…strengthens the value of what you conclude and report” (p. 45).

FINDINGS

State U

Adjectives such as dynamic, innovative, entrepreneurial, public, multipurpose, adaptive, expanding, inchoate, and fragmented describe the adhocracy culture of State U
(Cameron & Freeman 1991; Clark 1987). This ethos has served to shape advising statement policy at the institution. The research uncovered a desire for a formal unified approach to advising at State U—particularly at a higher, university-wide level—to counteract the "silos" that currently exist. One State U faculty advisor explained it thus:

I think sometimes things happen in vacuums... We all have our little silos, and we kind of do what's comfortable and what we know, but the communication across campus has been identified as a big problem. And that's why we're all trying to change it or at least get involved in the process.

At the same time, the rich character of the university suggests a need to work out the specifics of any institution-wide policy on a more local level. One State U administrator said,

Some departments are relatively small in comparison to others. So... for instance, mandating that everybody have a set period of time for advising, where all students have an opportunity for a half an hour appointment per semester, would be extremely difficult for some departments whereas they might do better with some group advising. So...I'm not of the mind that we need to dictate specifics, but I think we need to give some overall guidelines.

With regard to students and their apparent confusion about the advising relationship, one State U administrator suggested, "I think that the student needs to learn what an advisor is and how to use the advisor. And we probably are going to have to teach them that." Likewise, a State U faculty advisor explained, "It's not clearly communicated what the responsibilities of the student are." An official institution-wide policy statement on academic advising therefore could be helpful to State U. At State U, the structural model for advising was the Split Model: students are advised initially either by departmental advisors or by advisors in an advising center (Pardee 2000). Students who reach a certain point (e.g., declaration of major) in...
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the advisement period with professional advisors also are referred to faculty advisors (Pardee 2000). At State U, the professional center typically advised undeclared students, students admitted on a conditional basis, and declared students from a couple of specific programs; advisors in students’ “home” departments provided initial advising. In fact, it was found that at State U, each school or college handled the details of advising (e.g., where students are initially advised, who advises them) somewhat differently. Perhaps for this reason, the authority of State U’s main professional advising center had been questioned. Moreover some faculty members were believed to perceive the advising center as a service unit and as separate from their work in the academic units. Referring to the advising center, one State U faculty advisor remarked, “That’s a staff function, not a faculty function.”

Especially without incentives for advising, State U may face some challenges in implementing institution-wide advising statement policy. As a comprehensive institution, State U is in somewhat of a “mixed state” (Clark 1987). Even with high priority given to teaching and service, greater emphasis is being placed on other priorities, such as research endeavors and prestige. Some therefore believe that rewards for advising could prove effective. Referring to the current lack of rewards for advising, one State U administrator said emphatically, “That’s clearly one of the issues. It shows us where our priorities are.” State U also faces such common challenges as faculty unions and limited funding. The character of State U indicates that a universal policy could be valuable nonetheless. Such a policy might help clarify the nature of the advising relationship for various stakeholders, including the wide range of student types and faculty members.

State U’s progressive attitude toward formal, institution-wide advising statement policy likely will prove a valuable resource. Sooner than most institutions, State U got involved in the formation of institutional advising statement policy; in the process, it motivated others, to include leaders from the state system for higher education. Interest in an institution-wide advising policy at State U was sparked by the development of similar policy in the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS). The CAS policy (which was pending approval in spring 2005) emphasized a developmental approach to advising as well as informational (what advisors should know), conceptual (what advisors should understand), and relational (what advisors should do) advising elements (State U administrator 2005). State U leadership seemed particularly motivated to form and implement similar policy for the institution as a whole; the State U community at large appeared similarly interested and involved. Nevertheless, disappointment over the recent decline in policy efforts (explained by the need for leadership to attend to other matters) also was palpable.

Communal College

Communal College was dominated by a clan culture: it was close, collaborative, prestigious, innovative, student-centered, diverse, and community-oriented (Cameron and Freeman 1991). This ethos has served to shape institutional advising statement policy. Communal College tends toward informal rather than formal policy, perhaps as a result of the campus’s communal, student-centered nature. As one professional advisor noted, “The ‘Communal College Way’ tends to be a few people in a department sitting, talking, and flushing out key themes, key words.” A Communal College administrator said, “We’re a much smaller institution, and institutional size is as important a variable in the way in which we then deliver these concerns or act upon these concerns as any other variable.” Efforts aimed at enhancing the campus’s prestige and innovative nature could result in greater formalization of policy. One administrator stated, “I think that we could come up with an umbrella set of issues—terms—approaches that would help us across the board. I think that it would be much easier for us.”

Some formalization could benefit students, particularly as confusion about the nature of the advising relationship at Communal College did seem to exist. One professional advisor explained, “I’m…not clear if students really know what advising is. Sometimes I hear students say, ‘I’m not really sure what I can come to you with.’” A Supplementary Model of Advising in which professional advising centers supplement advising by faculty was in place at Communal College (Pardee 2000). While faculty members took a fairly active advisory role, rewards for advising were primarily intrinsic. More than five years ago, Communal College altered its advising model, moving from a Total Intake Model to a Supplementary Model. Freshmen were advised by their first-year seminar instructors until they declared a major; from that point on, they were advised by
a faculty member in their major area of study. Meanwhile, the deans in the main professional advising center on campus provided supplementary advising and helped students with matters related to scholarships, learning differences, and academic risk, among others. Likewise, the deans in the other five advising centers on campus provided their own form of supplementary advising on issues ranging from study abroad to internships to preprofessional programs. However, the mission statement and other larger advising policy elements of the main professional advising center did not reference the advising work of the other five centers on campus or of Communal College as a whole. One professional advisor lamented, “There isn’t a [common] philosophy out there yet.”

Strong personal associations on campus could pose difficulties for the implementation of institution-wide advising statement policy. Communal College’s tight-knit culture at times has sparked a certain amount of tension, which can thwart collaboration on matters of policy. One professional advisor explained, “It is very collaborative and collegial across kind of ‘predetermined lines.’” Some suggested that a more concerted effort on the part of leadership to manage tensions could help facilitate policy. In spring 2004, a group of individuals from the main advising center and from some of the other advising centers on campus voluntarily met to begin to formulate a semblance of common, institution-wide policy; workgroup members felt that their efforts ultimately failed because of a lack of support from leadership. In fact, in part in response to the group’s work, the provost of Communal College was taking steps to conduct an assessment of advising. It seems this information never reached the group. Nevertheless, the efforts of the workgroup resulted in the following statement (Communal College Workgroup 2003):

[We] share a mission to strive for supportive and inclusive environments that cultivate opportunities for academic achievement and life-long learning. We collaborate with faculty and staff, as educators, to:
* Support the Communal College community by mentoring students as they explore and navigate academic and personal goals through the following:
  – Experiential and cross-cultural learning opportunities
  – Advising
  – Programming
  – Leadership
  – Campus involvement

* Provide opportunities for students to:
  – Make connections
  – Build personal and professional skills
  – Gain global competencies
  – Engage in ongoing reflection

As at State U, the need to work on a more local level to implement the specifics of any institution-wide policy was also was emphasized. Specifically, formal policy should take into account the diverse nature of the campus as reflected in the form and function of the various advising centers. One Communal College administrator said, “I think that we need to be more flexible in our approach so that when we come up with this ‘process,’ it needs to…take into account the flexibility and the nuance of each of our centers.”

While certain differences do exist, a common goal could guide matters of advising statement policy. In discussing the various advising centers on campus, a Communal College administrator explained, “Our relationship to academic advising is intertwined but separate in that we operate different shops and very different styles. But we have the same values about getting a student into a position to make us obsolete in their lives.”

**DISCUSSION**

Communal College, which is a “clan” culture, and State U, which is an “adhocracy” culture, are very dissimilar institutions though they do share some common characteristics. For example, Communal College, a small, private, residential undergraduate liberal arts institution, is fairly selective whereas State U, a large, dynamic, comprehensive, public institution, accepts the majority of its applicants and has a large commuter and part-time base with many older and non-matriculated students. Yet both institutions also must deal with the “loose coupling” common to higher education institutions. (In loosely coupled systems, events are independent yet responsive to one another [Weick 2000]). For example, two offices might have a few shared variables, such as certain staff and responsibilities, but they would provide a connection that “may be circumscribed, infrequent, weak in its mutual affects, unimportant, and/or
slow to respond” (Weick 2000, p. 38). Communal College has been described as collaborative along “predetermined lines” while “silos” is a term frequently used to describe the disjointed environment at State U.

Overall, the cultures of Communal College and State U are reflected in their efforts to shape and implement institutional advising statement policy. Despite many differences, there also were striking similarities. For example, the structural models for advising at Communal College (i.e., Supplementary) and at State U (i.e., Split) differed according to their cultures, but the aim of each was similarly developmental, and this drove their philosophies of advising. Also, the advising policies of the main professional advising centers at Communal College and at State U had limited influence; as a result, members of the respective institutions took it upon themselves to begin to develop independent policies that would be farther reaching. Generally, these grassroots efforts tended to predate related actions on the part of the institutions’ leadership. Policy efforts in general had progressed more rapidly at State U, perhaps as a result of its innovative, entrepreneurial, and dynamic tendencies as an adhocracy culture (Cameron and Freeman 1991). Regardless of where they were in the process of implementing official institutional academic advising policy, the Communal College and State U communities seemed to agree that any such policy would have to account for the diversity of their respective advising systems. At Communal College, for instance, this meant the diversity of each of the six professional centers of advising while at State U this meant the diversity of each school or college as well as of students advisees. Finally, leadership was a critical factor to those involved with advising policy at both Communal College and State U. At Communal College, those involved with advising policy were unaware of leadership’s efforts, and this seemed to result in frustration and the feeling that the leadership necessary to support policy implementation was absent or lacking. There also was frustration at State U when the leadership’s attention was diverted elsewhere, but in general, the dynamism of the institution’s leadership propelled official academic advising statement policy efforts forward.

CONCLUSIONS
This research suggests several lessons for decision makers who are considering implementing official institutional advising statement policy. It is hoped that the following formative list of lessons learned will aid as well as encourage official institutional advising statement policy efforts.

At highly innovative and entrepreneurial institutions, such as some comprehensive universities, the official institutional advising policy process not only may advance more quickly but also may be more necessary.

At Communal College (the liberal arts college), the prevailing belief seemed to be that an informal rather than an official approach to advising statement policy was more suited to the institution given its culture (e.g., small size, nurturing environment, personal relationships). In contrast, at State U (the comprehensive university), steps to implement a formal advising statement policy already were underway and seemed to be more widely accepted. State U was characterized by fragmentation (i.e., eight schools and colleges on three campuses); official advising statement policy may have been viewed as a much needed and desired formal reference point to draw together the institution’s various disconnected units. An adhocracy culture, State U also demonstrated more innovative and entrepreneurial characteristics (Cameron & Freeman 1991). At both institutions, some confusion seemed to surround the developmental advising relationship, so that even institutions like Communal College might benefit from a more formal approach to advising statement policy—so long as it is carried out within the framework of the personal relationships that define the collaborative nature of the institution’s culture.

The formal advising policies of professional advising centers are not a substitute for official institutional advising policies.

At least at institutions like Communal College and State U, where the structural models of advising included faculty as well as professional advisors, the formal advising policies of professional centers of advising may not have much influence beyond the centers’ own jurisdictions. For example, some faculty may view the centers merely as service units. Departments also may perceive the policies of the professional advising centers as not sufficiently specific to their own advising issues. Certainly it is useful at the institutional level to
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put into place some cohesive advising statement policy that is implemented with respect to the particular culture (see #1 above). In general, institutional statements on academic advising have been recognized in part for their perceived ability to clarify aspects of the academic advising relationship (Grites 1979; Larsen & Brown 1983; White 2000).

Grassroots advising policy efforts tend to predate official institutional advising policy efforts and in fact may signal the need for more formal institutional policy.

Policy efforts at the local level seem to predate more formal advising statement policy efforts. Perhaps as a result of the limited influence of the advising policies of their main professional centers of advising, members of both Communal College and State U became involved at the grassroots level in forming policy reflective of official institutional advising statement policy. These efforts seemed to take place in order to establish some reference point for diverse institutional constituencies involved in advising (i.e., college departments at State U, multiple advising centers at Communal College). Palumbo and Calista (1990) suggest that policy environments are interrelated, and implementers often are involved at every stage of the policy process, including formation. Thus, grassroots policy formation efforts by local institutional advisors, who would be responsible primarily for advising policy implementation, could suggest that the time for official institutional academic advising statement policy has come. Indeed, leadership at both institutions seemed to interpret grassroots efforts as signifying a need for advising policy clarification at the institutional level.

There must be allowance for the adaptation of official institutional advising policy at the local level.

The models for advising differed at State U and Communal College; nevertheless, there was general agreement at both institutions that any official institutional advising statement policy must allow for adaptation at the local level (e.g., professional centers, schools or colleges, academic departments). This is in keeping with the observations of policy scholars in general (Berman 1978; Brewer and deLeon 1983; Elmore 1980; McLaughlin 1987; Mills 1998; Nakamura and Smallwood 1980; Pressman and Wildavsky 1984; Yanow 1996). Participants at both institutions often pointed out that they have particular constituencies and issues they must deal with, and many stated explicitly that they would need some freedom in order to do so.

Support from leadership is critical to the implementation of official institutional advising statement policy.

Leadership appears to play a critical role in the implementation of official institutional advising statement policy. In fact, Grant and Riesman (1978) determined that support from leadership is essential to the implementation of other policy matters in higher education (e.g., the revitalization of intellectual communities for undergraduates). Support from leadership can be a help in keeping the peace when things get too personal in a communal environment or too antagonistic in a fragmented one (Cameron & Freeman 1991; Clark 1987). Leadership also can work to ensure that institutional priorities remain in place. Nevertheless, as at State U, disappointment may be a result of matters of resource allocation and capacities, as when leadership’s time and attention are diverted elsewhere (Baier, March and Sætren 1988; Pressman and Wildavsky 1984). Or, as at Communal College, disappointment may result when the distance between leadership and other involved actors causes distortion (e.g., lack of understanding of what is actually happening) (Brewer and deLeon 1983; Pressman and Wildavsky 1984).

The existence of rewards for advising may aid the implementation of official institutional advising policy.

Rewards and incentives for faculty advising were generally lacking at Communal College and at State U. This seemed particularly problematic at State U, where the institutional emphasis on faculty research was beginning to increase. Rewards and incentives for advising may encourage faculty members to support official institutional advising statement policy despite tension relating to the balancing of research efforts with teaching and advising duties. In general, advising scholars (Habley 2000; Tuttle 2000) as well as scholars of policy implementation (Brewer and deLeon 1983) emphasize that a lack of rewards or incentives may cripple the policy implementation process.
FINAL THOUGHTS: IMPLICATIONS FOR PRACTICE
Overall, while official institutional advising statement policy may be more necessary for certain types of institutions (e.g., comprehensive universities), decision makers and leaders at all institutions should be sensitive to signs—such as grassroots policy efforts—that official advising statement policy is becoming more useful and desirable. All institutional leaders and decision makers also should acknowledge the loosely coupled nature of higher education institutions and so should allow for official institutional advising statement policy to be adapted at the local level. It also is critical that all institutional officials support the advising policy process. Finally, putting into place rewards for advising could aid the implementation of official advising statement policy, especially at institutions where faculty work roles may not emphasize advising or where they are politically charged. Overall, some key lessons (e.g., leadership support) and challenges (e.g., loose coupling) regarding official institutional advising statement policy implementation likely are shared by all types of higher education institutions. Yet institutions must remain sensitive to specific cultural issues they may face (e.g., intense personal relationships).
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The purpose of this qualitative study is to analyze how advertising affects search and college choice among the plethora of college choice influencers. The results of the research indicate that parents, older siblings, friends, career aspirations, personal funds, scholarships, institutional reputation, location, sports, high school counselors, and college visits are more persuasive than advertising. However, if the college or the university identifies a key consumer insight, then advertising has a greater effect on search and college choice.
Advertising’s dynamic persuasiveness embeds itself in the social, cultural, economic, and political network of society. Advertising flourishes in media and uses an array of mediums to touch — and ultimately persuade — those who come into contact with it. Advertising bombards our conscious and subconscious thoughts as we have the potential to be exposed to some 3,000 ads per day (Sell and Spin undated). Advertising does not tell us what to think, but rather, what to think about. Thus, ads can infringe upon consumers’ awareness and affect their “...thoughts, attitudes, feelings, and decisions” (Tellis 2004, p. 3).

In 2003, U.S. companies spent more than $240 billion on advertising (Brock and Green 2003) to “get in touch” with potential consumers and “stay in touch” with current customers. One entity that is vying for consumers’ attention is colleges and universities. Research suggests that high schoolers begin the college search process as early as their freshman year (Clayton 1999). At some high schools, the curriculum formally teaches eighth and ninth graders about career and education planning. (The teaching usually occurs in civics or sociology courses [Hossler, Schmit, and Vesper 1999].) Junior year in high school is “...when students seriously begin to extensively gather information” (Hossler, Schmit, and Vesper 1999, p. 61). With more higher education options for students to select from and an array of college choice influencers, colleges and universities are redefining the roles and goals of their marketing and advertising efforts in order to bolster enrollment.

**LITERATURE REVIEW**

The higher education arena has grown tremendously over the last 350 years. According to Nafukho and Burnett (2002), there are more than “...3,100 baccalaureate-granting institutions, each with its own unique purpose, history, student body, and faculty” (p. 3). Higher education was long immune to marketing and advertising initiatives; certainly the influx of students after World War II provided colleges and universities with robust enrollment. This lasted until 1980 and was attributed to the baby boomers (Nafukho and Burnett 2002). Beginning in 1975, however, enrollment slowly declined until 1985 (Nafukho and Burnett 2002). Since the turn of the 21st century, higher education has begun to witness an increase in enrollment as a result of an increase in the number of high school graduates. The National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES) (2005) reports that the number of high school graduates is expected to increase nationally by 15 percent. In addition, NCES projects that between 2000 and 2013, total enrollment at degree-granting institutions (associate’s, baccalaureate, or higher degree) will increase by 19 percent. The number of traditional students (those ages 18–24 years old) is also projected to increase.

Given the increase in the number of traditional students, institutions of higher education will be vying for attention as high schoolers begin the search and choice process of which college or university to attend. The plethora of higher education options available equates to stiffer competition (Nafukho and Burnett 2002); institutions will be
forced to revisit their marketing and advertising objectives if they are to get their message out through the enormous array of advertising clutter. Refined recruitment strategies will be required if institutions of higher education intend to enroll new students. Until recently, higher education influencers for high schoolers have been plenty, despite marketing and advertising initiatives having accounted for only a limited part of the recruitment equation. In fact, for most colleges and universities, the advertising strategy has meant mailing solicited and unsolicited literature to prospective students (Hossler, Schmit and Vesper 1999).

High schoolers seek information about higher education options because “people approaching a choice among unfamiliar options seek information on how to structure the problem” (Wright and Rip 1980, p. 177). Many influencers affect high schoolers’ college and university choices. In fact, the list of influential factors is lengthy as college or university choice is a “high-involvement” purchase (Tellis 2004, pp. 50–51). Influential factors include the institution’s size (Jortner 2001), proximity (Hoover 2006; Jortner 2001), convenience (Hoover 2006; Jortner 2001), academic programs (Hoover 2006; Johnson and Stewart 1991; Jortner 2001), social life (Jortner 2001), athletics (Pope 2006); scholarships and financial aid (Hoover 2006), rank (Mortland 2003), professors in aspiring major (Johnson and Stewart 1991; Winzenberg 2006), campus visits (Cole 2006; Fluter and Fluter 2001), college fairs (Clayton 2000; Gordon 2006), meeting with a professor in a prospective major area of study (Winzenberg 2006), literature (Cole 2006), evidence that graduates get good jobs (Marklein 2007), reputation (Hoover 2006; Johnson and Stewart 1999; Jortner 2001), and perceived image (Grunde 1976). Social influencers also can affect college choice. Social forces have the ability to influence behaviors because they provide information, offer a means of comparison, and lend guidance (Wells, Moriarty and Burnett 2006). The most important social force is the family, because “…of its longevity and the intensity of its relationships…” (Wells, Moriarty and Burnett 2006, Every year, the University of Maryland, University College receives applications from every corner of the globe. We rely on AACRAO evaluations because of their consistency and quality. AACRAO has the resources to keep current with the latest educational developments around the world and the integrity to serve as the authoritative source for evaluations.” Diane Lampe, Associate Vice President Student Services and Academic Advising.
Other social forces include high school counselors and teachers, adult acquaintances, older siblings, peer groups (Cole 2006; Johnson and Stewart 1991; Wilson 1971), and college admissions consultants (Clayton 1999). Finally, college choice may be dictated by family legacy (Wingert 2003).

One way students learn about college options is from marketing and advertising initiatives. Research conducted by Hossler, Schmit, and Vesper (1999) reveals that “…college direct marketing and recruitment activities had an effect on the choice stage…” (p. 96). However, to date, little empirical research has analyzed advertising and its effect during the search process. In addition, most advertising research focuses on the effects of direct marketing (Hossler, Schmit and Vesper 1999; Utley 1994) and does not analyze other advertising strategies (with the Internet [Stoner 2004] being a small exception). More analysis is needed to understand one of the most unexamined influences to affect search and college choice: advertising. Advertising is defined as “…a paid persuasive communication that uses nonpersonal mass media—as well as other forms of interactive communication—to reach broad audiences to connect an identified sponsor with a target audience” (Wells, Moriarty and Burnett 2006, p. 5). According to Raisman (2000), the media can assist colleges and universities with enrollment: “The ability to communicate and shape a message is essential to effective marketing and promotion” (p. 21). However, marketing was not developed to meet the needs of the higher education enterprise (Sickler 2006). Sickler (2006) contends that if institutions of higher education are to attract new students, they must center on the customer: students.

Prior to developing an advertising campaign, colleges and universities first must engage in researching their current and potential customers; then, in segmenting the population; and finally, in targeting their audience. Engaging in research will help colleges and universities understand the many factors that influence prospective students’ search and college choice. Research means tapping into target audiences’ needs and wants. Understanding target audiences’ needs and wants is accomplished not by advertising but by marketing efforts. The goal of advertising is to persuade members of the target audience that they must invest in a product (buy) and/or a service. Tellis (2004) suggests that three elements are imperative: (1) the advertiser (i.e., the college or university) must be perceived as credible; (2) the content of the message must position the brand (e.g., institution, curriculum, programs, athletics, and social life) so that it satisfies the consumers’ (i.e., students’) needs and wants; and (3) the advertiser (i.e., the college or university) can expect consumer (i.e., student) involvement only if it understands what motivates the consumer (i.e., student).

Advertising works best when compelling emotions and rational arguments are incorporated into the selling mes-

“Colleges and universities are investing huge amounts of university resources into identifying their institutions’ brands, with the goal of melding the institutional identity into the minds of prospective students, families, and potential donors”
The aim of the dent research undertaken in the hope of boosting enrollments are the lifeblood of college (Hossler, Schmit and Vesper 1999, p. 7). Several colleges and universities have begun to place greater emphasis on researching their brands, with the goal of melding the institutional identity of university resources into identifying their institutions’ "Colleges and universities are investing huge amounts of time and effort into the minds of prospective students, families, and potential donors" (Glass 2004, p. 2). After all, "Student enrollments are the lifeblood of college" (Hossler, Schmit and Vesper 1999, p. 7). Several colleges and universities have developed new advertising campaigns as a result of student research undertaken in the hope of boosting enrollments. Their advertising campaigns include such strategies as branding, changing the institution’s tagline, integrating computer technology, using multiple media outlets to convey a message, as well as utilizing media. For example, in Texas in 2001, St. Edward’s University launched a new campaign called “Learn to Think” as part of a brand awareness and recruitment strategy. Klein (2004) says the campaign was a success: Enrollment increased 9 percent in two years, and retention rates increased as well. Klein (2004) reports that the campaign’s success is largely the result of media. “Comprised of [sic] four radio ads, three TV ads, three billboard ads, and two print ads, the campaign is able to successfully reach its target audience, which includes college-bound teens and their parents, working adults who are prospects for undergraduate or graduate education, and donors and alumni” (p. 74). A community college in the Midwest re-branded itself so the community and other interested parties would know it. Re-branding resulted in an increase in enrollment despite little change in the size of the regional population. Local residents know the school as second only to a large university; the school receives attention from the community as well as business leaders; and there has been an increase in school pride among staff, administrators, and students (Seifi and Snell 2003). Another institution that has updated its image and branding efforts is DeVry University. Some 71 years old, the university determined that its image had not evolved with its mission. DiPasquale (2002) quotes the executive vice president of the university: “[T]hey want to further develop the university brand and more clearly articulate who they are and the scope of their offering, as well as increase enrollment and reach new audiences...” (p. 6). Similarly, Weatherhead School of Management at Case Western Reserve University instituted a new “branding statement and tagline” (Mortland 2003, p. 20). The dean of the school hopes the new tagline and branding statement will gain the attention of prospective students and encourage them to inquire about the school. The new tagline—"Bold Ideas, Lasting Impact”—is displayed on banners, brochures, and the institution’s Web site (Mortland 2003). The University of Phoenix, the largest not-for-profit college in the nation, is buying advertising space on search engines. When a prospective customer types in key words for colleges and universities, other than the University of Phoenix, the college’s name pops up as an online ad.
(Carnevale 2005, p. A27). In 2006, Hudson County Community College embarked upon a new ad campaign to increase enrollment and to remind current and prospective students of its mission. The college uses an array of媒体, such as newspapers, magazines, transit, billboard, television, and radio. Each advertisement contains the college’s tagline: “A World of Possibilities” (Hudson County Community College 2006). The University of Texas at El Paso knows the power of Hollywood movies. The university was approached by Disney to tell the story of its national champion men’s basketball team. (The team was the first to have black starting players.) Not only did the movie do very well at the box office, but it also promoted the university. Kean (2006) reports that soon after the film’s release, “…applications have jumped 40 percent… More importantly, the university enrolled 4,400 freshmen this fall—over 80 percent more than in the previous academic year…” (p. A43).

**THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK**

The interpretivist perspective guides the current research project. Interpretation enables a researcher to untangle webs of meaning that develop when participants are exposed to and interact with different people, places, and ideas. Interpretation answers the question, “What are the meanings in the data?” (Gay and Airasian 2000). Geertz (1973) contends that interpretation “…illuminates the meanings and conceptual structures that organize a subject’s experience” (p. 27). *Interpretive interactionism* is applied to this research project because it combines *symbolic interactionism* and *interpretive inquiry* (Blumer 1969; Denzin 1992, 2001). This combination highlights a thorough understanding of interpretive thought and the presence of symbolic undertones.

**CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK**

Hossler and Gallagher’s (1987) three-stage model of college choice is used in this study to understand the search and college choice process. The first phase of the model is *predisposition*. It “…refers to the plans students develop for education or work after they graduate from high school” (Hossler, Schmit, and Vesper 1999, p. 9). This phase also includes other college influencers, such as family, peers, and academics. *Search*, the second phase of the college choice model, involves students’ exploration of various college options and gathering of information about each college’s characteristics. It is in the last phase, *choice*, that a student decides at which college to enroll (Hossler, Schmit, and Vesper 1999). Because the present study examines how advertising affects search and college choice, *search* is the relevant stage for examination. It is during the search phase that current and potential college-bound students receive information from colleges and universities, ultimately influencing their college choice. This is the stage that addresses the question, “How do students learn about college options?” (Hossler, Schmit, and Vesper 1999, p. 53).

**METHOD**

This qualitative study investigates how advertising affects students’ search and college choice. Undergraduate participants were selected in response to their availability and accessibility. Berg (2001) defines this as a convenience sample because the “category of sample relies on available subjects” (p. 23). Participants included college students engaged in the college experience. (They bring rich data to the research, having chosen recently to engage in the college experience.) Prior to attending college, study participants were subject to numerous preconceived notions about college. Lingering questions may have included, “Should I attend college?” “Which college should I attend?” “What is college about?” In their search for answers to these questions, research participants browsed solicited and unsolicited information (i.e., brochures, catalogs, and flyers) from colleges and universities. They also may have paid attention to radio, television, and billboard advertisements. Some may have visited colleges and universities and seen the institution’s branding statements. Finally, they may have utilized personal computers to download school literature (Hebel 1993), take a virtual tour, or chat with currently enrolled students at the college or university.

Research participants were 69 undergraduate students enrolled in advertising courses at a public four-year institution in St. Louis, Missouri. Participants’ age and nationality were not considered in this study given the institution’s student demographics. The university enrolls a diverse population, increasing the generalizability of the current research’s findings. The institution’s range of subjects is broad, reflective of the student population. For a variety of reasons, focus group interviewing was the qualitative research method used to investigate the proposed research
question. First, focus group interviewing encourages subjects to speak freely, completely, and without criticism about “...behaviors, attitudes, and opinions they possess” (Berg 2001, p. 111). Second, focus group interviewing creates a "synergistic group effect," which lends to greater ideas, analysis, and discussion about the given topic (Berg 2001, p. 112). Third, and most important, this method is based on interaction: “Meaning and answers arising during focus group interviews are socially constructed rather than individually created” (Berg 2001, p. 115). It was imperative to use focus group interviewing in this study because the process of selecting a college or a university occurs socially (i.e., symbolic interactionism). After the focus group was convened, the researcher bracketed the data, as focus group interviewing can be phenomenological (Berg 2001).

Prior to data collection, research participants were told the research question. The advertising classes were not divided into subgroups, as it was thought that doing so might taint the data. The participants are familiar with one another and, for the most part, are comfortable speaking freely and sharing their thoughts on a given topic. Dividing the research participants may have induced anxiety among some because of removal of their classmates from the classroom. In an effort to elicit the most discussion about how advertising affects search and college choice as well as to understand the deep structural elements of the search and college choice process, the researcher crafted a series of discussion questions (Berg 2001).

- What advertising strategies do you recall seeking out or receiving from colleges and universities while you were gathering information?
- Of those influencers, which were most pertinent in your college choice decision?
- What advertising strategies are effective at gaining attention, aiding in the search process, and possibly recruiting prospective students?
- Explain how you think advertising may affect college choice.

RESULTS

The salient findings are discussed as they relate to Hossler and Gallagher’s (1987) three-stage model of college choice. Specifically, the results address stage one, search, and stage three, choice. The researcher bracketed research participants’ responses to reveal how advertising affects search and college choice. The data suggest that advertising initiatives by colleges and universities have the potential to attract attention and, ultimately, to persuade prospective students if the advertiser (i.e., the college or university) has conducted the research necessary to understand and assess students’ needs and wants. Influencers such as parents, siblings, friends, economics (i.e., money), and career choice are considered more persuasive than advertising in the search and the choice process. However, if a student expresses specific needs and wants (e.g., an athlete or international student) identified by the college or university, then advertising has a greater effect on search and college choice. Thus, the college or university that identifies a key consumer insight and crafts responsive advertising can trigger “…certain processes that lead to some outcome” (Tellis 2004, p. 43). Consumer insights are critical to reaching the targeted market because “[a] great insight always intersects with the interests of the consumer and the features of the brand.... It identifies the value that the brand has for the consumer...uncovers and showcases the relevance factor [and] the reason why a consumer cares about a brand message. Consumer insights reveal the inner nature of a consumer’s thinking—including such things as mindsets, moods, motivations, desires, aspirations, and motives that trigger their attitudes and actions”
mindsets, moods, motivations, desires, aspirations, and motives that trigger their attitudes and actions” (Well, Moriarty, and Burnett 2006, p. 196).

Search

Participants suggested several reasons for continuing their education after high school and, thus, for setting the search stage into motion. The most discussed reasons that students searched for higher education options were: college was not an option but rather the next step after high school; parents gave an ultimatum: either leave the family home and enlist in the military or go to college; a college degree is essential in today’s marketplace if one wants to succeed in business and earn “good” money; and a college degree yields a certain amount of respect among family and in the business community. Several students began the search process after learning that working full-time immediately after high school was not ideal because they did not understand their career aspirations. Interestingly, for those students who were high school athletes and for one who was an international student, the search process differed from that of the other participants because it was the college or university that was engaged initially in the search for athletes and students from diverse cultures. The search for athletes and international students was less laborious than that for students interested in a specific major because the college or university had established an important aspect of the key consumer insight.

The data also reveal that the students’ search process was extremely limited to the higher education recommendations of family and friends. For example, research participants reported that they were interested in a certain university because it is where their father or mother went, or it was the choice of their friends. Other limiting factors in the search process include location, tuition cost, reputation, and campus culture.

Choice

Despite the plethora of influencers that affect college choice, only the athletes and the international students acknowledged the role of advertising. Research participants who were not athletes or international students suggested that the influencers most pertinent to college choice include parents, older siblings, friends, career aspirations, personal funds, scholarships, institutional reputation, location, and sports. Two additional influencers are high school counselor and college visits. One student said that but for her high school counselor, she would not have continued her education—let alone at a specific institution; it was the high school counselors who called the university admissions department. The final influencer is a college or university’s Web site. Web sites are deemed effective on the basis of their accessibility at students’ convenience. Nevertheless, research participants stated that Web sites do not speak to their needs or age bracket; several suggested that colleges and universities should feature a special link for graduating high school students.

Advertising’s Effect on Search and College Choice

Only in response to researcher prompts did students recall advertising strategies from the search process. Despite students’ recall, advertising strategies were not influential in students’ search or choice process. The most common advertising strategies (as indicated by research participants) include unsolicited direct mail pieces, TV commercials broadcast during college sporting games, billboards, college recruiters visiting high schools, a personal visit to an athlete’s home (with sports statistics provided to the prospective student in booklet form), and the Web.

Research participants rated the following advertising strategies as most influential in the search and college choice processes: college recruiters visiting high schools (advance posting by the college or university required in order to be effective), humorous radio ads by the college or university (locally), billboards (locally), campus visits arranged by the high school, the institution’s Web site, and virtual tours. Advertising may have triggered thoughts, attitudes, and motivations, but participants suggested that ultimately, the search and choice process is largely contingent upon word-of-mouth advice. Advertising can provide the catalyst for discussion—discussion that occurs among family, older siblings, and friends.

Many colleges and universities use direct mail to gain the attention of prospective students, but research participants said that direct mail does not serve its intended purpose as it typically is discarded. Chapman (1981) had a similar finding: students do not choose a particular college as a result of reading printed literature. In short, direct mail is ineffective at gaining the attention of prospective students because it does not address their needs.
(e.g., major, campus living, campus life). The current study suggests that direct mail is effective in the recruitment of athletes and international students because their needs are consistently identified by the institution and thus become a critical part of the student/institution dialogue. For example, many student athletes reported having received personal letters signed by the college or university coach asking for a personal meeting at the expense of the university. (Often, the letter was accompanied by a statistical booklet about the sports team.) International students reported having received direct mail pieces that highlighted student diversity and student organizations that focused on meeting the needs of international students. One such student described her receipt of a packet in the mail that focused on the diversity of students on campus, resources for international students, and social groups to alleviate the stress of being far from home.

SUMMARY/CONCLUSION
This research suggests that advertising can affect search and college choice only if colleges and universities intentionally become an integral part of the socially created search and choice process. At present, parents, siblings, and friends are the key influencers in search and college choice because they are part of a continuous dialogue with prospective higher education students. In order to become a significant influencer in the search and choice process, colleges and universities must identify a key consumer (i.e., student) insight before investing in advertising initiatives. Being part of the social process will enable higher education marketers and advertisers to better appreciate what makes current and potential students “tick”—that is, their inner motivations, conscious and subconscious thoughts. Athletes and international students in the current study suggested that advertising had a positive effect on their college search and college choice because the institution was able to relate to their inner motivations.

A college or university’s advertising will prove effective if and only if the institution does its “homework” regarding student motivations. “[M]otivation uncovers the “why” questions: Why did you buy that brand and not another?” (Wells, Moriarity and Burnett 2006, p.139). Likewise, colleges and universities must understand their brand and what it means in relation to the diverse needs of the student population. At the most basic level, colleges and universities can utilize a questionnaire to inquire about the motivations of currently enrolled students. A more grandiose advertising strategy would involve the establishment of college days in each U.S. city, with representatives of participating colleges and universities available to determine which students’ needs match any given institution’s brand. Assuming a match between student and college or university, more personal advertising strategies could be implemented (e.g., web links, direct mail pieces, campus visit) to continue the dialogue between student and institution.

Advertising is pervasive and has the ability to tap into peoples’ innermost motivations. It invades their conscious and subconscious thoughts and may change, modify, or reinforce their attitudes, feelings, and decisions (Tellis 2004). We are drawn to advertising when it resonates with our attitudes and opinions, informs, or simply entertains us. Colleges and universities are not immune to advertising initiatives, particularly as graduating high school students often seek out multiple sources of data when searching for a college or a university that has the right “fit” for them. Just as students research colleges and universities, so colleges and universities should research students, and particularly to determine their needs and motivations. The process is a dialogue: a dialogue with current and potential students to gain insight into their conscious and subconscious needs, wants, motivations, desires, and attitudes. Gaining such insight will enable higher education to focus first on students and then to communicate its message to a listening and attentive audience—one that can increase an institution’s enrollment and, ultimately, become its best form of advertising.
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David L. Evans, Senior Admissions Officer for Harvard College, is a native of Phillips County, Arkansas, and holds degrees in electrical engineering from Tennes-

see State University and Princeton. Before coming to Harvard’s Admission Office, he worked in Huntsville, Alabama, on the Saturn/Apollo Project that in 1969 landed a man on the moon.

At Harvard, in addition to his admissions work, Evans has been a proctor in Harvard Yard, an advisor to first-year students, an assistant dean of freshmen, and advisor to the Harvard Foundation for Intercultural and Race Relations. In 2002 he received the highest honor that Harvard’s Faculty of Arts and Sciences confers on an administrator: the FAS Administrative Prize.

Evans has helped recruit and select 38 Harvard classes. During his admissions tenure, more than 15 times the number of African-American students have matriculated at Harvard than had in the institution’s previous 334 years.
Let’s begin with your telling me about your Arkansas upbringing and how it influenced your career.

My Arkansas background has a very significant influence on what I do. I was born in the Great Depression, and my parents were sharecroppers. Between them, they had six years of education. (My father never went to school, and my mother went until 6th grade.) Their lives were about as close to serfdom as one could get. We were on the Arkansas side of the Mississippi River, right in the Delta, and the biggest crop was cotton. There were seven of us, and I was the middle child. My father died when I was ten years old; my mother died when I was sixteen. Of those seven children, somehow all seven went to college. One of the reasons is I guess that they (my mother and grandmother) pushed us on religion and education. They believed that a combination of the two would work magic. They had more of the first than they did of the second. We, in many ways, have more of the second, but I truly believe that religion helps you to deal with the unanswerable when all you can do is persist. The education unravels many other things. That, I believe, is what has guided me.

It’s a wonder we survived with our psyches in tact. When my father died, some relatives wanted our mother to move to Chicago or Cleveland. With six children, pregnant with another, and with an almost blind grandmother, if we had moved, we probably would have evaporated. There would have been no way for my mother to contain and control and direct all of us. Our little town had some direction and intervention from neighbors to help out; there was a custom of respect, and staying there, we somehow made it.

I wanted to go into creative writing, but given our family situation, I didn’t have the option. I knew that whatever I studied in college, nothing else but education would work. I remembered that to my parents, it was the only way out.

My second eldest sister, who had assumed the role of legal guardian, and the first in our family to attend college, became a substitute teacher while she took care of us until she got her degree in Memphis (part-time), 64 miles away. I knew that if I were to pursue creative writing, I wouldn’t be able to contribute to this family situation. I had some solid talents in math and science, so I decided to pursue that and got an undergraduate degree in electrical engineering at Tennessee State. I thought I was going for a Ph.D. at Princeton but cut it short with a master’s degree because of the family situation, and then I went back to the closest place to home that I could at that time (1966) and practice engineering. NASA (National Aeronautics and Space Administration) was in Huntsville, Alabama, which was an interesting setting. At that time, Huntsville was ordered to integrate because the biggest industries in town were the Army and NASA. With integration, they closed down...
the black schools and moved essentially all the students to the white schools, with almost no black teachers or administrators. With that practice, the result was widespread drop-out. All of this happened in the early 1960s. I arrived a little later. The situation bothered me greatly.

Because I had a secret clearance, I couldn’t get active in the anti-war effort as I wanted, but I was restless to do something; I was sending money home to help the family, but I wanted to do more. I constantly thought of what it was that delivered us: education and a role model. The role models for the oldest siblings were our mother and grandmother as well as our teachers in school. So I thought I’d find some kind of tutorial organization around these newly integrated schools and help tutor these students. I found one, and I learned that there were some students with perseverance who were doing exceedingly well in those schools. I learned about them from the students we tutored. Some of the students doing well were known to the administrations of the different high schools; others were not known. I went to the schools and identified myself and said I would like to help counsel them. Before doing that, I wrote to about 100 colleges, introducing myself and saying what I was trying to do. All of them answered, but Chase Peterson, Dean of Admissions at Harvard, responded with a three-page, hand-written letter saying he wanted to work with me to help make Harvard’s student body more diverse.

I met with the students and explained that I couldn’t promise that this could succeed but that I would try. Jack O’Sander, whom I knew from Princeton, became my private counselor. When I ran up against something I couldn’t answer, I would call him for help and to seek a strategy. Five students were admitted the first year, in 1969. They went to Princeton, Smith, Brandeis, and Washington State. I had also written the College Board asking if it were possible to get fee waivers for SATs and explaining that I had corresponded with teachers at the students’ schools.

In 1968 I was invited to a conference in Florida. There I was approached by George Hanford, then acting president of The College Entrance Examination Board. He knew what I had been doing and suggested that I take a two-year leave of absence from engineering and come to work in the Atlanta office of The College Board. A few days later, I told Chase Peterson at Harvard about this offer, and he said, “That makes it easier for me to ask you something I’ve wanted to ask you for two years. I’d like to see you work for the Harvard Admissions office.” I said, “I’m a country boy from Arkansas.” He said, “I’m a country boy from Utah.” I said, “I’m an engineer.” He said, “I’m a medical doctor.” I came to Harvard in the 1969-70 year. I was supposed to stay two years. I’m still here.

In some ways, it stayed in my mind that there were people who helped us because it was the right thing to do in that black/white segregated system. I remember when Mrs. Rightor from the welfare office visited us when I was seven. She said, “Get your education; that’s one thing they can’t take from you.” At seven, I was fascinated by this woman because I knew that “they” meant the whites, yet she was white. When our hometown had its 150th anniversary, they honored six citizens, and I was the only black one. (Our speaker was Governor Bill Clinton.) And I mentioned that Mrs. Rightor had been a significant inspiration, God rest her soul, and someone came up to me and said, “She’s not dead. She’s here tonight.” I hugged her in her wheelchair. Reverend Theodore Roosevelt Redmond was another inspiration, and I quote him today when I see someone get recognition in his or her life. He said, “Sometimes the good, the fair, the just and loving get their just rewards while they still live and are examples—especially to the young. The strongest compliment you can make is to recognize someone while he is living, because once someone is gone, people usually exaggerate.”

WHEN YOU WENT TO PRINCETON, NJ, YOU HAD TO MAKE THE ADJUSTMENT YOU LATER HELPED FRESHMEN MAKE FOR MANY YEARS...

I graduated from Tennessee State, an historical black college, but I worked in industry with all whites, so I had a sense of what was there. Princeton had maybe 20 black undergrads and maybe 15 black graduate students when I was there.

I knew that in most of the situations I would find myself, I would be the sole black person. Most of the people with whom I was going to interact had never interacted with blacks as equals. Until this day, most students come to a college having never ever interacted with black persons, except in a token way—perhaps one or two who went to an elite prep school with them or whom they had as a servant. That becomes difficult in an intellectual community because their experiential development has not caught up...
with their intellectual development. They don’t want to admit that maybe they are naïve in the area of race relations. A typical U.S. history course seldom gets to World War II. So these students have not been taught much about what we are doing. They don’t understand or haven’t been taught why we are doing what we are doing. The critics of black solidarity groups don’t know that maybe if whites had been enslaved they would need advocacy groups too. Justice Harry Blackman said (in the Bakke case in 1978) that “To get beyond racism, you must first take account of race.” How do you go away from something if you don’t know where you are or how you got there?

**WHAT KIND OF COPING SKILLS DID YOU USE?**

Growing up in the South you have a sixth sense: you know how to measure personalities, how to weigh them in the balance. Some racists were actually helpful, even if condescending. I learned to be selective with my challenges.

**WHAT MADE YOU STAY AT HARVARD?**

Martin Luther King was killed on April 4, 1968. Admissions folk all over the country wanted to recruit black people after this. But decisions for the new class (the class of 1972, which entered in September 1968) had already been made and would be mailed in a week or so. So the next year, in the fall of ’69, the big step came, and the number of blacks doubled, from 50 or 60 to 123 in one year at Harvard; similar changes happened all over the place.

So all these black students showed up with essentially no black faculty or administrators. At this time, civil rights was morphing into black power and anti-war. People in these movements came to the campus to talk to students. There was turmoil with no systematic preparation.

That was what I came into. I was living in the dorms; I was almost an older brother to the black students. The class of ’74, now age 55, were my first advisees and proctors. Along with that turmoil came the anti-apartheid movement; that ended in ’94 — 25 years later. The attitude of many black alumni who experienced all of this was that they didn’t want to be involved in their colleges. I stayed at Harvard and had more credibility with many of these alums. I could have gone back to electrical engineering.

I understood why alumni were not involved after their experience at Harvard. Because they knew me, I could ask them, “If Harvard was so bad, why are you trying to get your children in? If you’re trying to get your kid in, it is only fair that you get involved in alumni affairs.” But what many felt was, “Well, I should not have come to Harvard. I should have gone elsewhere.” But they found that out in life, it was the same at many other colleges—at Amherst, the University of Chicago, etc. What I’ve been able to do is get together some recent alums and current undergraduates, and we brought back more than 600 alums in 2003 and 800 black alums in 2006. So now we have far more alums involved. I was able to tie the older with the younger. We had a man come from the class of 1947. They established a scholarship in my name in 2003. By 2006, they had raised $1 million for scholarships for students from underrepresented backgrounds. I had no idea that folk cared that much.

**WAS THIS MORE REWARDING THAN GOING BACK TO ENGINEERING?**

My friends who stayed in engineering made tons more money. But I met my wife here two weeks after I arrived at a panel at Currier House.

**WERE YOU EVER TEMPTED TO LEAVE HARVARD?**

I saw here something that I thought was more influential on society than my work in engineering. Admissions officers traveled to all 50 states in recruiting back then, and what Harvard did/does is symbolic and influential. So I stayed.

**WHO WERE YOUR ROLE MODELS AND SOURCES OF INSPIRATION?**

My mother was in many ways because she was able to keep going, keep going. She knew how to keep the troops cheered up. As I grew up, I realized how much hardship she hid from us. Intellectually, I read about W.E.B. Du Bois and Martin Luther King. To both of those persons, logic said, “You are attempting the impossible.” Yet they persisted. Reading about those few African Americans with college training who after the Civil War helped form all the historical black colleges, I realized that they did this despite the “logic” that this wouldn’t work.

Today, we know so much more. The examples and role models are so obvious. The future will be even better. Our children are able to pull up information on the Internet. They know of two black secretaries of state, 40
black members of the House, presidents of Ivy League universities. They don’t have to think like we did. Thinking about what the people did who got us this far—that’s what pushes me along.

WHAT ADVICE DO YOU GIVE TO COLLEGE STUDENTS ABOUT WORKING IN HIGHER EDUCATION?

Someone has to do it. It’s not going to take care of itself. And if everybody is going to take the Wall Street job, if no one goes for the Ph.D., students will still be protesting that we don’t have enough black faculty members when kingdom comes. Somebody has got to say, “I won’t become wealthy.”

There are some unforeseen things happening that I fear might adversely affect affirmative action. Many recent Americans (immigrants) don’t have the intuitive history of race and its implications in our country. They have had it easier than the long-term African Americans. Ninety percent of the time blacks have been in this country they have been slaves or subjected to Jim Crow segregation. Parts of that time it was illegal to teach them to read or write. But that is not the case with recent immigrants.

HOW DO YOU IDENTIFY FUTURE LEADERS?

You can only project by reflecting. Those who have been involved, who hold together the academics, who have the energy and who have brought something to the classroom and to the community where they are: they are potential leaders. But you can’t totally project.

ONE OF THE THINGS YOU ARE MOST PROUD OF IS THE INCREASE IN MINORITY STUDENTS AT HARVARD. IS THAT BECAUSE OF YOUR DEDICATION TO THIS CAUSE?

No one person has brought the change in numbers of minority students. Everyone has that responsibility. Now some might be more sensitive. But we don’t have all athletes go through X admissions counselor, all Harvard children go through Y. It’s whoever is in the geographic area of the staff member; it is her or his responsibility. If you need more advice, there will be staff or faculty you can go to,
say, to evaluate a musician or athlete. In the late 1960s, one university I know of had a separate committee to admit minority students, and they met in a separate building. That is one thing I got straight. No, no, no. Chase Petersen believed that this door is wide enough that anyone who should be at Harvard can come through. There would be a stigma if they came through a separate door. In the 38 years I’ve worked here, the student with the lowest credentials has never been a student of color. I wouldn’t have known that if I had been meeting in another building. And we have never held up academics as the sole criterion. We do not dismiss academics. That is the one category in which you can get admitted almost on that alone.

The same thing is true if the person has an extracurricular talent. In 1971, there was a great cellist who came from NYC. He was good enough academically, but he played the “big violin.” The music department auditioned him and concluded that he was truly special. Yo Yo Ma was admitted.

We do the same with athletes: They have to do the academics, but the coaches do help us in the evaluations. We are committed to finding diversity. We have to work on it. It didn’t get where we are by laissez faire or indifference.

WHAT TRENDS DO YOU SEE IN ADMISSIONS?
The numbers have been growing and growing and will continue to for two to three more years. The sheer numbers have increased, and college sizes haven’t changed. At the same time, there is the ability to embellish standardized test scores; students can take all these preps, so you are seeing all these artificial numbers. With numbers growing and college classes remaining the same size, you are going to get more and more people with super credentials who are not getting in.

SO WHAT ARE THE CHALLENGES?
What I say applies to many colleges: Try to be fair, but know there is the iceberg of 90 percent that we are not seeing. What good have we done if we only save the 10 percent? What is going to happen in New York and Chicago if only 30 percent of black men graduate from high school? What is going to happen to them? All of them will not die soon. They will live at least 40 more years, and society will have to pay for them. Try to find ways to reach them. They start to fall behind in 3rd grade. In mathematics and science, once they fall behind, their pride won’t let them raise their hands and say anything. So over the next seven to nine years, they don’t stay, and they become dysfunctional. At the same time, we are beaming out to them — on TV — these fancy shoes, fancy cars that they have no legal way of getting. Prisons are overrun. One point one million black males are locked up in this country — more than in the rest of the world combined. We should examine ways to reach those ensnared in the system.

Athletic coaches more than anyone else are able to motivate these young black men. They go into the worst schools and they are winning state championships. What are they doing? Why don’t our schools of education consider a one-year program for coaches stepping down? They can run them through a program and rekindle their teaching and then they can run tutorial programs right across the street from the schools. (On school property, union and other rules might get in the way.) It’s ironic that at all elite prep schools, the coaches teach. That would be one approach.

Also, bring in retired drill sergeants because the military is another place where black men have succeeded. They know how, and once you get the kid back up to grade-level reading, the world becomes a different place. I believe, too, with the California budgets running $10 billion this year, with $60,000 each year for each inmate, that the Black and Latino Caucuses should go to Sacramento with a reporter from the LA Times and ask, “Of the $10 billion, how much is appropriated for education and skill building? Now how many GEDs came out of that? If you don’t know, maybe we should bring some educators from the outside.” With no skills, these inmates will come out bitter and dysfunctional. My grandmother used to describe time served in prison as, “They go in there and start serving a life sentence on the installment plan.” (She didn’t know the word recidivism).

WHAT SOLUTIONS DO YOU SEE?
TV and documentaries need to show that life in the academy is a viable profession. Otherwise, graduates will go off and be lawyers and doctors. When have you seen a documentary showing a professor enjoying what he or she does? It’s all doctors or lawyers.

WHAT DO YOU DO IN YOUR SPARE TIME?
All I keep doing is trying to keep something going out to the black alumni, to keep Harvard on their mind.
WHO WILL TAKE OVER FOR YOU SOME DAY?
Derek Bok (Harvard’s interim president) asks me that. The kind of people they need are in law school or on Wall Street. The person they need is rare. I have mentored good folks, but they head off to business school. Folk have to be willing to do something to make it attractive. I am asking a person to give up something for small compensation. There are some persons who are aware that the market is supply and demand. Those wishing to hire minority staff must know what they are going up against. It’s a big issue and needs some consideration. When I came early on, I was working in admissions and was Assistant Dean of Freshmen. I didn’t get paid much for that. It may be necessary to pay more. It’s about supply and demand. We do not live in a time when we can just dismiss race. It’s still there. People talk about the race card. Most of the time, the answer to that is, “I’m playing with the cards I was dealt.”

WHAT ARE THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF WHICH YOU ARE MOST PROUD?
I think seeing the numbers go up, even greater than seeing the alums come back. For a long time I saw those 25th reunion books that referenced black alumni as “whereabouts unknown,” but I knew where they were. The alums didn’t care. They should have cared but were too emotional at the time. I have reminded them that these universities are some seats of influence.

DO YOU HAVE SOME FINAL WORDS FOR THE READERS OF THIS JOURNAL?
To the admissions officers and administrators: Your work is worthwhile. You are planting seeds. And at almost all levels of change in our society, college students have had a major part. These institutions are change engines. They have done much. You are reconstituting those changes. There is no other job where you will see so many of the brightest and most interesting minds laid before you as in these application processes. We see things the general society doesn’t see. We see the disparity in educational opportunities; we see students in some cities around the county; we push our interviewers to reach out in cities all over. Nothing can influence good like a powerful lawyer or banker who is interviewing students from a good school and sees a student from a terrible school who has done everything but score well on a standardized test.

In the wake of Hurricane Katrina, the average American couldn’t believe the people who came out in New Orleans in the year 2005 who had no idea what to do. They came from nowhere. But admissions officers have known that they are there. No filter can change a person in such a short time as our educational enterprise. Even if a dropout gets into a GED program, in five to six years that person can be a college graduate. One can’t do that in anything else but education. We as a country have the potential to do a lot, but we have to redefine our educational enterprise.
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Among the most common reasons people give for working in a small college setting is that they want to have an impact on the life of the school; they want to help shape what’s going on rather than be shaped by it.

Students, faculty, and parents at small schools typically expect a high level of individualized attention. Make this work for you by being proactive. Form a student advisory group for the registrar’s office. Reread every print and electronic communication that will go out from your office—and if it’s not sufficiently interesting enough to read, rewrite it. Contribute a column to the parents’ newsletter—inform parents of important matters before they perceive them as problems.

Remember, too, that you have all sorts of data that can be used to answer questions that should be addressed. You should be able to discern important patterns before they become obvious, and sharing that sort of information can help others to see the value of including you in planning groups or other important campus committees.

Although there are no templates that work in all cases, there are some general principles which can increase the likelihood of success. One principle is to support the attendance of your assistant or associate registrars—and also your office staff—at conferences. They deserve these opportunities, and you and the office will benefit from the knowledge they gain. And perhaps more than anything else, keep a sense of perspective and a sense of humor so that you can find the proper balance among competing pressures.

How big is a small-campus setting? For the purposes of this chapter, the upper limit is approximately 2,500 students.1 Factors such as student/faculty ratio, percentage of students living on campus, presence or absence of fraternities and sororities, dining arrangements, and a host of other considerations can make a school of 3,000 seem rather small, or a school of 2,000 seem much bigger.

THE ISSUES ARE THE SAME AS FOR LARGE SCHOOLS, BUT...

What are the salient issues? For the most part, they are the same as those confronting large schools: tight budgets, increasing responsibilities, and rapid changes in technology. We all are expected to do more with less while keeping up with technological advances that seem to proliferate exponentially. As institutions adjust to rising costs, it is unusual for registrar’s offices to be the beneficiaries of the limited departmental budget increases—even though significant portions of our expenses, e.g., the number of transcripts...

---

1 In the Data Dispenser’s “President’s Column” (an AACRAO publication), Louise Lonabocker defines “small college” as one with “an enrollment of less than 2,500.”
Conversely, one could argue that having a large array of responsibilities and/or tasks makes a position more interesting and increases the likelihood of job satisfaction. They are different. One could argue that having a broad set of responsibilities and/or tasks makes a position more interesting and increases the likelihood of job satisfaction. Conversely, one could argue that having a large array of responsibilities makes it difficult to be equally proficient at all of them, or spreads staff members too thin, resulting in frustration and job dissatisfaction. I suggest that, in fact, it is a matter of balance and perspective.

Regardless of whether a small staff is considered an asset or a liability, it is likely to be more difficult to keep up with the workload when someone is out, or to mount a solid program of cross-training. The combination of small numbers and multiple responsibilities for each individual can lead to real problems if someone is out for very long. Similarly, these factors also make the need for adequate cross-training among staff exceedingly important, while also making implementation of such cross training very difficult. Who has time to spend learning someone else’s job when there is hardly enough time to do one’s own? In a small college registrar’s office, no one has only one job; instead, everyone has many jobs rolled into one.

There are other reasons for focusing on small school issues. In general, the clients—students, their parents, faculty members, the administration—at small schools have greater expectations of personal attention than do their counterparts at larger colleges or universities. Personal attention is touted unabashedly in viewbooks, news releases, alumni publications, and in any other possible setting, so it should come as no surprise that students, and their parents, expect it. Faculty members also expect individualized attention, if only because small schools tend to be less bureaucratic and thus foster such expectations.

One of the results of this expectation by students is that they often believe that rules can and should be waived, often as much for the sake of personal convenience as for justifiable reasons. Many are quite persistent in making their appeals. I am reminded of my daughter, Katherine, when she was only seven.

In the summer she started campaigning for permission to do one of the readings at a Sunday service in church even though she had never seen anyone as young as she at the lectern. Every week she would inquire about when it would be her turn. Liz and I tried to slow her down, as did the Rector, but it was like trying to stop a steam roller. In November she was given her chance and, even though she had never seen anyone as young as she at the lectern. Every week she would inquire about when it would be her turn. Liz and I tried to slow her down, as did the Rector, but it was like trying to stop a steam roller. In November she was given her chance and, even though she was a nervous wreck, Katherine performed flawlessly without even a waver in her voice. When Liz asked her how she felt, expecting to hear something about relief or perhaps even joy, she got a surprise. Katherine informed...

requested and related postage and security paper costs, or outside printing of course schedules and catalogues, are beyond our control. And who among us has seen any significant cost savings as a result of technological advances, in spite of claims made by vendors or the expectations of the budget office?

If the issues are the same without regard to the size of the institution, why focus on small colleges? We do so because there are differences in the effects of these issues on the schools and their offices. Typically, registrar’s offices at small schools are characterized by fewer staff members, less specialization or differentiation among them, and consequently, greater difficulty in providing adequate backup and cross-training.

While it is true that a lower number of students should entail a lower level of staffing to meet their needs, it is also true that a minimum amount of staffing is necessary to provide adequate coverage. A critical mass is needed. Almost everyone would agree that an academic department could not offer a robust major with fewer than three faculty members; but who agrees on the minimum number of staff needed for a registrar’s office to provide appropriate high-quality services?

Even if a small office has at least a critical mass (whatever the actual number), it still is unlikely to exhibit the same degree of specialization among its workers as larger office does, at a larger institution. For example, in a small college registrar’s office, it is unlikely for a subgroup of employees to exist whose members are exclusively responsible for preparing and distributing academic transcripts. Usually, the person who oversees transcripts in a small college is responsible for other functions as well. In addition, there typically is less differentiation, i.e., the line separating the administrative from the support staff is likely to be less rigid. The small college registrar or associate registrar is involved more often than his or her colleagues at larger institutions in tasks such as making changes to the database or preparing a mass mailing. Similarly, support staff may be more directly involved in such administrative tasks as making decisions on routine transfer credit evaluations.

These conditions are not necessarily good or bad, but they are different. One could argue that having a broad set of responsibilities and/or tasks makes a position more interesting and increases the likelihood of job satisfaction. Conversely, one could argue that having a large array of responsibilities makes it difficult to be equally proficient at all of them, or spreads staff members too thin, resulting in frustration and job dissatisfaction. I suggest that, in fact, it is a matter of balance and perspective.

Regardless of whether a small staff is considered an asset or a liability, it is likely to be more difficult to keep up with the workload when someone is out, or to mount a solid program of cross-training. The combination of small numbers and multiple responsibilities for each individual can lead to real problems if someone is out for very long. Similarly, these factors also make the need for adequate cross-training among staff exceedingly important, while also making implementation of such cross training very difficult. Who has time to spend learning someone else’s job when there is hardly enough time to do one’s own? In a small college registrar’s office, no one has only one job; instead, everyone has many jobs rolled into one.

There are other reasons for focusing on small school issues. In general, the clients—students, their parents, faculty members, the administration—at small schools have greater expectations of personal attention than do their counterparts at larger colleges or universities. Personal attention is touted unabashedly in viewbooks, news releases, alumni publications, and in any other possible setting, so it should come as no surprise that students, and their parents, expect it. Faculty members also expect individualized attention, if only because small schools tend to be less bureaucratic and thus foster such expectations.

One of the results of this expectation by students is that they often believe that rules can and should be waived, often as much for the sake of personal convenience as for justifiable reasons. Many are quite persistent in making their appeals. I am reminded of my daughter, Katherine, when she was only seven.

In the summer she started campaigning for permission to do one of the readings at a Sunday service in church even though she had never seen anyone as young as she at the lectern. Every week she would inquire about when it would be her turn. Liz and I tried to slow her down, as did the Rector, but it was like trying to stop a steam roller. In November she was given her chance and, even though I was a nervous wreck, Katherine performed flawlessly without even a waver in her voice. When Liz asked her how she felt, expecting to hear something about relief or perhaps even joy, she got a surprise. Katherine informed...
her mother that she had learned a good lesson—if she wanted something she had to do it herself, because others would just give her excuses about why she shouldn’t or couldn’t. Training for the expectation starts early!

Ultimately, institutional pressure to retain students melds with a desire to be “fair” to the young man or woman (who likely is known by the person acting on the request), with the result that a large majority of petitions for waiving rules, late fees, deadlines, parking tickets, or just about anything else get approved.

Parents of students attending small colleges have similar expectations. How many times have we heard a parent complain, “I sent my child to your school because you are supposed to pay attention to his needs, but what you are saying he has to do is ridiculous,” or, “I am not paying xx thousand dollars a year for my daughter to have to ...”? And if the answer given isn’t that which was sought, how often have we then heard either from our supervisor or from the President’s Office that the parent called him or her? (Surely the president of a university with 20,000 undergraduates does not receive as many calls as a small-college president from parents whose children were closed out of an introductory photography class.)

Take advantage of students’ and parents’ wanting to talk to you by meeting with them and listening carefully to their requests. Politely prod to be sure you have a good idea not only of what they want, but why. Sometimes the request is more sensible than it originally seemed, and you can help guide the student or parent toward getting it approved. Alternatively, if the request is not reasonable, help the student or parent put the situation in better perspective, not by lecturing on the need for rules (causing frustration while providing no progress) but rather by engaging the individual in a discussion. Acknowledge when the person has made a reasonable point. It is very important for the student or parent to believe he or she has been given an opportunity to present the case and be heard, even if the decision is not what had been hoped for. As hard as it may sometime be, it usually pays to be open and attentive while having these conversations; 15 minutes of open...
give-and-take at the beginning can save many times that amount of time in the future.

Another way to take advantage of students' desires to receive special attention is to form a student advisory group for the office. Invite students from a variety of backgrounds to serve on it, being sure to specifically invite some who have questioned rules or requested waivers. Discussion of matters of importance to students often brings out issues people “inside” the institution may not have thought of. It also may provide an opportunity to explain the origins of the rule (or whatever is in question), and who would have the authority to approve a change. Educating a small group of students can result in getting the information out to many more, because they will talk to their friends. This is good public relations—particularly if the students describe how helpful and open you and your staff were in discussing certain issues.

Student advisory groups can also be very helpful in pointing out the strengths, and weaknesses, of the office Web site and/or notices and publications. Since we are hoping to inform students through these tools, it makes sense to find out what is and isn't working. Prepare to respond to criticism in good humor! What seems catchy to us may seem lame or outdated to them. What we consider complete and clear may be too boring to hold their attention. Every year there is a list in The Chronicle of Higher Education that tells us what the incoming students are too young to remember, and it's very sobering. Commenting on not wanting to sound like a “broken record” is apt to bring a blank expression to the face of a freshman. A few years ago, my son Charles reminded me of how little youngsters know of times past. I told him about how, when I was his age, we didn't have a television set. He got this really puzzled look on his face and very seriously asked, “How did you spend all of your time, playing on the computer?”

Remember that the primary purpose of a document or Web site is not to serve as “insurance” for the institution. If a document or Web site is not sufficiently interesting, then rewrite it. Members of the student advisory group might even supply ideas as to how to improve it.

Parents expect to be able to talk directly with you about whatever is perceived to be a problem for their child, sometimes not even knowing what it is a registrar does or can control. But they have, after all, read the viewbook and listened attentively at the meetings for parents at orientation meetings; they know that everyone is anxious to hear about any problems their children might be having, no matter how large or small. So have the conversations and, if you are a parent, point out how you know from experience how difficult things can be when a child is on his or her own. On occasion, a parent’s request may turn out to be much more reasonable than it initially seemed; in these situations, you can help guide the parent to a favorable outcome (score a point for the registrar!). It will not always be possible to reverse a parent’s conviction that the system is unfair, but most will appreciate both the time you spent and the concern you expressed. Open dialogue—however brief—can result in savings of time, frustration, and anger for both parties.

At a small school you are more likely to be able to get on the stage and address the parents at orientation. Ask to do so if someone doesn’t ask you, and then use your time to get out in front of two or three questions most likely to be asked. For instance, tell them that their children will have other occasions to take introductory economics if they don’t get into the course first semester; reassure them of the value of majoring in philosophy or art history as against something “practical;” remind them not to purchase plane tickets until they know when their children will be finished with exams, since an exam will not be rescheduled simply to accommodate an early departure. Try to be positive and to act as if you are enjoying yourself (even if you aren't); doing so can go a long way to help you out in the future—and the parents, too.

If your college produces a parents’ newsletter, contribute a column at least occasionally. This gives you further opportunity to inform parents of important matters (before they can be perceived as problems) and to present yourself as a humane administrator rather than a petty bureaucrat.

Just as the registrar’s office at a small college is less bureaucratic than its counterpart at a large college, so is the college itself apt to be. Everything is on a smaller scale and people do, in fact, tend to know just about everyone on the faculty and staff. Consequently, faculty at small colleges also expect special attention and selective application of institutional rules. “I know somebody has to have the final on the last day, but I really need to have mine much earlier” and “There is no way I can get my grades in on time. A long research paper is due on the last day of classes and I am giving an essay final” are not uncommon rationales for special
treatment. Rather than grousing about these expectations and causing yourself frustration—and, in the process, making no progress at all in terms of changing the situation—it is wise to recognize them as opportunities for meaningful interaction that may be used to your advantage.

At a small school, it is possible to get to know and be known by a significant proportion of the faculty. Be sure to go out of your way to be pleasant and, as possible and appropriate, to talk about things not directly related to your office. Let the faculty know that you have a life outside of producing class rosters, managing a database that doesn’t serve their needs, and hounding them for final grades. The more you are known as a “person” rather than just as “the registrar,” the more likely you are to be considered a colleague. It’s much harder for most people to cause difficulties for colleagues than for strangers. It is also more likely that messages from a colleague will be read rather than tossed and a colleague is more likely to be invited to serve on a faculty/staff committee, where it is possible to help form rather than react to institutional policy.

GUIDING PRINCIPLES FOR A REGISTRAR AT A SMALL COLLEGE

Any chapter in a book seeking to provide insight into best practices in the field should include some advice about how best to handle the responsibilities of the office. But there is no template that works in all cases. (If there were, our functions would have been outsourced some time ago.) Instead, I believe that there are some guiding principles which can help increase administrators’ likelihood of success. These principles are perhaps especially potent at small colleges, where the registrar may have an impact beyond the confines of his or her office.

Understand and take advantage of the campus climate.

Be observant and try to ascertain the unwritten rules for conducting business at your school. Knowing the organizational chart and attendant lines of communication can be helpful, but understanding the informal structure is crucial. Find out which secretaries have the most clout, and don’t be afraid to ask them for help if you are trying to get their supervisor(s) to consider something. They will be flattered to have been asked, and you will get the information you need. Seek advice from individuals who have been at the school longer than you. Insight and wisdom are not yours alone.

Recognize that planning is a process—it is not static—and that not all planning is strategic.

It is important to plan and to do so strategically. In a recent article, Bart Strong (2005) writes,

Wait a minute, don’t strategic and planning both mean the same thing: Isn’t it like saying you need to have a plan in your plan or a strategy in your strategy? What exactly am I talking about here? What’s so strategic about planning?

Well, here’s the scoop: “Strategic” implies

* process,
* creative thinking,
* teamwork, and
* flexibility.

“Planning” is just, well, planning. Anybody can plan. Not everybody can be strategic about it.

Strategic planning uses a methodical, step by gradual step approach to determine who you are (mission), what you are not willing to compromise (values), where you are going (vision), and how you are going to get there (planning). Each careful step is based on the previous step and builds toward a thorough understanding of your institution’s or unit’s business, its viability, and its future. Goals, measurable objectives, and assigned action steps help ensure that your strategic plan has a beginning and an end. Part of the “process” of strategic planning is its constant updating and follow-up. Once you have reached your objectives, it’s time to take stock again to see whether your mission has changed—or if it needs to. Planning is best represented as a circle rather than as a straight line.

Hire staff members who want your job.

Be brave when hiring. Whenever possible, hire individuals who are thinking ahead, who aren’t yet at their pinnacles of success. Complacency—no matter how well the office seems to be running—seldom leads anywhere but to trouble. One of the best ways to ensure that office policies are regularly subject to re-examination is to hire individuals who want to learn and who are seeking advancement. It is these types of employees who will keep you vigilant.
Become a big fish in your little pond.

Often, one of the reasons people choose to work in a small college setting is because they want to have an impact upon the life of the school; they want to help shape what's going on rather than be shaped by it. If that's part of what you want, then you have to be proactive in making yourself known as a person to go to for information; someone who tries to figure out how to do something rather than why it can't be done, and who sees the glass as half full, not half empty.

As registrar, you have all sorts of data that can be used to answer important questions that should be addressed, even if others have not yet specifically asked you to do so. You should be able to detect patterns before they become obvious, and sharing that sort of information can help others to see the value of including you in planning groups or other campus committees.

Be creative in your thinking about what information would helpful for better understanding the school, and would be important for strategic planning purposes. Inventory the data elements you can access, and see what possibilities exist for looking at more than simple grade distributions or average section sizes. Think about issues such as differences in GPA by student major. Are there significant differences in the numbers of students from different majors who study away during all or part of their junior year? Do the male/female or racial/ethnic ratios of department registrations or student majors differ significantly from the college’s overall ratios? Do honors at graduation vary greatly by department? Are the number of independent study registrations significantly different when grouped by departments or divisions? Are there patterns in course choices among students who flunk out or who are placed on academic probation?

Don’t stop with what you can look at with only that information you have at your fingertips. Identify other offices that might be willing to look at other issues in concert with you. Consider looking at data according to whether or not the students received financial aid. Do athletes differ from non-athletes in terms of their course choices, majors, and/or proportion sanctioned for disciplinary infractions? The possibilities are almost endless, and sophisticated knowledge of statistical analysis is not required to begin the process of identifying areas that might warrant further study.

It is not necessarily easy to find the time to conduct such inquiries. But if you want to be valued as more than a bean-counting record keeper, it is essential that you make the time to do so. Breaking down barriers between yourself and the faculty and other administrative staff is important if you are to become a “big fish.” Providing data pertinent to the kinds of questions mentioned above will be an important step toward that goal, and will pay big dividends.

Participate in professional development.

Attend regional and national conferences (including, but not limited to, AACRAO’s), and take full advantage of the sessions, workshops, and opportunities to mingle with colleagues from near and far. If possible, attend a conference focusing on institutional research, enrollment management, or some other area that might increase your understanding of the particular issues facing your school. Check out—if with a skeptical eye—what products exhibitors are touting. And forget about room service: Instead, go out for meals with other attendees so you can talk informally about issues confronting your offices and/or your institutions.

Three important principles should guide professional development efforts: First, be sure your assistant or associate registrars attend conferences, even if you yourself have to skip them in order to stay within budget; they deserve the opportunity, and you will benefit from the knowledge they gain. Second, find workshops for your office support staff to attend. The more they feel a part of the office and able to contribute to its overall mission, the better they will perform their jobs. And third, give back to others. You owe your colleagues and professional organizations something for the help they provide you; your own active participation in conferences or workshops is a good way to pay back.

Keep things in perspective.

You are affiliated with a college, not a bank or a department store. The primary goal is to educate students, which means hiring excellent faculty, providing adequate resources to the academic and student life programs, and enrolling capable applicants. Your role in this process is to assist and support, in the background rather than in the limelight. Your institution’s marketing efforts likely will highlight the faculty, the curriculum, opportunities
to study off campus, the athletic program, the physical plant, etc. Recognizing the legitimacy of your office’s supporting role will help you understand—and perhaps may guide—differences in your institution’s resource allocation. I keep in my top desk drawer a note that says, “No student ever came to, or left, Williams College because of its registrar.”

It matters very much who says something. While it may not be logical or even fair, it still matters who says it. For example, a student is told by an assistant in the registrar’s office that he must complete a particular requirement by the end of the upcoming term, but the student doesn’t think that’s correct and wants to hear it from the registrar. Or, you are at a meeting at which a senior member’s proposal is greeted with enthusiasm; several months ago, you made a similar suggestion that met with no support. Rather than despair, use the experience to your advantage, perhaps by making it a habit to share your ideas with someone who has more clout. Do that often enough, and people will begin to realize your strengths; eventually, they may well solicit your reactions to their ideas before they present them.

Don’t take yourself too seriously: Have fun.

Being professional does not mean being dour. In fact, poking fun at yourself can be a great way to get people to listen to what you are saying. When we converted our administrative system to PeopleSoft, many faculty members were confused by the seemingly complicated and “business-like” terminology used to access records. Complaints and gibes were many. So at the last faculty meeting of the term after we went live, I said, “I rise to remind you, as I do every year at this time, that your PeopleSoft, People-Tool, Learning Management, Use, Evaluation Indicators are due in the registrar’s office within four days of the final exercise in your course. If you anticipate any difficulty meeting the deadline, especially for seniors, please send me a People Missal Epistle right away.” The grades came in about as quickly as usual, and the complaints softened and subsequently were aimed more at the system and less at the office.

Life can be grand, but it doesn’t get that way on its own. You can help nudge it in the right direction by maintaining flexibility in thinking and action, by finding the proper balance among competing pressures, and by being sensitive to the needs of others. Recognize that others may have better ideas than yours and that you need to listen carefully—with an open mind—to hear them accurately. Don’t ever say, “But we’ve always done it that way.” Instead, become comfortable saying, “I really don’t know, but I will find out.” Don’t become a slave to the rules and regulations, for they are the means to an end, not the end itself.

**CONCLUSION**

Many things compete for your time and attention, both in and out of work. Just as a strategic plan at work can help frame needs and the actions required to meet them, so a strategic plan for yourself can help guide your responses to everything outside your job.

Finally, be considerate of and sensitive toward other people. Be passionate and compassionate. For in the end, whether you serve at a large or at a small college, you are a role model. And it is in that capacity that you may well have the most profound impact on your institution.
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All colleges and universities of the 21st century aspire to have a competitive advantage over peer institutions. Of late, this advantage most often has taken the form of technological advances. Although a college or university certainly would be disadvantaged if it failed to keep pace with technology in the student service sectors, technology alone is not enough. Institutions that place all of their faith in high-tech advances yet fail to address the high-touch needs of students may miss critical opportunities. It was this realization that spawned the customer service effort at Columbia College of Missouri.

The highest-ranked recommendation of the Student Centered Services Task Force was to develop a college-wide culture of customer service. In response, the college president appointed a Customer Service Committee charged with developing ways to engender such a culture. The committee is comprised of directors and key staff members from all student service organizations within the college, including admissions, registration, evaluations, financial aid, and student accounts.

The president’s charge to the committee was to “out-service” our competition and become a model for first-class customer service. The president made no assumption that customer service to date was poor, only that with focus, it could be exemplary.

A brief description of the college should put the effort in context. Founded in 1851 as Christian Female College, it was renamed Columbia College in 1970, when it opened its doors to both women and men and expanded from a two- to a four-year institution.

Columbia College’s home campus, in Columbia, Missouri, offers a Day Campus for approximately 1,000 traditional-age students annually; Evening Campus serves more than 3,300 adult learners annually. The College operates an additional 32 campuses nationwide, in eleven states and Guantanamo Bay, Cuba; half of the campuses are located on military installations and serve more than 11,000 adult learners and military students each year. The College also serves more than 12,000 students annually through its robust Online Campus.

Although the College serves, in aggregate, nearly 25,000 students each year, the expectation at each campus is that the institution is “small, caring, and friendly.” It was the challenge of the Customer Service Committee to promulgate such an atmosphere.

Who are our customers? The committee struggled from the outset with the term “customer.” We were reluctant even to keep the term in the committee’s title. “Customer” seemed to have a retail connotation that made some committee members uncomfortable. However, upon closer
examination, the committee realized that Columbia College had many different customers. On a daily basis, and in addition to the student customer, we deal with parents, alumni, vendors, higher education colleagues, members of the media, and colleagues within the College. The idea that our own employees are “customers to each other” has become central to our customer service culture. In the final analysis, “customer” refers to anyone with whom we interact in the conduct of our duties.

Having defined customer, the next challenge was to make extant a culture of customer service. After several meetings involving a good deal of discussion but little action, the consensus was to focus on staff members and not on the more obvious customers. The committee felt that in order to change the institutional culture, support of the employees was essential: Job satisfaction and employee morale are fundamental to a culture of service. Poor job satisfaction and employee morale are most commonly the result of lack of job knowledge, inadequate skills, negative atmosphere, and high stress. To enhance job satisfaction and employee morale, the committee focused on three areas: training, staff recognition and workplace environment.

**TRAINING**

The core of the training scheme was built on the principle that well-trained employees would be more likely to deliver first-class customer service. Training was identified as including two components: job skills and customer service knowledge. Each year, the Customer Service Committee develops a training plan that addresses both of these elements. Although it is not mandatory, training is highly encouraged and is available to all staff members—including those not typically considered front line customer service staff, such as housekeeping and facilities maintenance employees. Examples of the wide variety of training topics covered include—

- Change Management
- Telephone Skills
- Generational Differences
- Workplace Diversity

---
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A variety of internal and external speakers, as well as audio-visual material, is used to deliver the training programs. Two videos—“Give ‘em the Pickle!” by Bob Farrell and “The FISH! Philosophy”—are particularly popular with staff and set the tone for the customer service initiative. These videos also are used in the Customer Service Revisited presentation given to staff members who joined the college in the past year.

In any complex organization, there is a tendency toward “stove piping”: Staff members may know their jobs well, but they are myopic about the work of colleagues in other departments or campuses and are particularly unaware of how all the pieces of the institution fit together. Often, this results in a lack of understanding among employees and impaired customer service as staff members are unable to answer questions outside their specific areas of expertise. The committee therefore initiated “staff integration visits” among campuses and job shadowing among offices.

Because Columbia College has several campuses within driving distance of the home campus, one strategy was to have staff members from the home campus visit their colleagues at sister campuses, and vice versa. These visits enhanced communication and put faces to names and voices. Home campus employees tended to be specialists and focused on detailed knowledge of all aspects of their areas (e.g., financial aid, admissions, etc.). In contrast, employees at the nationwide campuses tended to be “generalists;” they knew a great deal about many functions but seldom were expert in any one area. This often resulted in tension, as employees in each location did not understand the different roles they played. Staff integration visits have improved coordination and cooperation among employees, enhancing service to students.

The value of cross-training soon became evident. Job shadowing was introduced to provide cross-training for home campus staff members. Directors of student service departments provided opportunities for their staff to job shadow in other areas. This training focused more on increased awareness of other staff functions than on the learning of specific skills. Staff members became better able to assist customers because they themselves were more aware of the services each department provided. Job shadowing also increased the familiarity of staff members with one another and so fostered a more collegial environment.

To the maximum extent possible, staff training is exported to all campus locations. This includes the shipping of training videos and printed materials and the promotion of measures such as staff integration visits and job shadowing. Nationwide campuses are encouraged to provide staff training opportunities in support of the customer service initiative whenever possible. A portion of the customer service budget is dedicated to this effort.

**Staff Recognition**

Employee recognition is an important component in achieving positive staff morale. Whereas some institutions embrace individual recognition programs (e.g., employee of the month, etc.), we recognize departments through our Departmental Showcase program. Each department is encouraged to develop an entertaining theme to showcase staff and departmental functions. Departments often become quite creative, attempting to tie their themes to the functions of their unit, as, for example:

- Development & Alumni Services: Construction Theme
- Student Records: ‘50s Music Theme; Jukebox (records) motif
- Online Campus: Outer (cyber-) Space Theme

The departments provide refreshments as well as entertainment in the form of games and prizes. Most offices also create departmental materials that highlight each staff member as an individual (as, for example, in a short bio) and describe his or her role in the department. Departmental showcases continue to far exceed the Customer Service Committee’s expectations. They provide the desired recognition for each staff member, highlight the many functions of each department, put faces to names, and are well attended!

**Workplace Environment**

The final area of focus was workplace environment. While training and recognition efforts had positive effects on the work environment, we made a conscious decision to
make the campus a more fun place to work. For years, the College sponsored a successful staff and faculty picnic, a Halloween costume party, and a winter holiday lighting reception—events that provided palpable energy to the campus. The Customer Service Committee built on these successes by sponsoring quarterly customer service breaks for staff and faculty members. Like the departmental showcases, the breaks were planned around seasons and themes and included refreshments, entertainment, and prizes. Examples include:
- Winter Wonderland Break
- Sundaes on Thursday (ice cream social)
- Valentine’s Day Break (heart wellness, blood pressure and cholesterol screening)
- No Whine & Cheese Party (positive attitude and non-alcoholic wines and assorted cheeses)
- Who Moved My Office? (scavenger hunt in temporary offices during renovation)

The quarterly breaks provided an opportunity to reward and show appreciation to staff and faculty, to foster an atmosphere of “fun,” and to facilitate collegial interaction among members of the campus community.

Most good initiatives come at a price, and the customer service program is no exception. Costs are incurred for external training programs, refreshments, prizes, and travel to other campuses. From the outset, our president was committed to funding our efforts; we believe that the creation of a customer service culture has resulted in a positive return on investment. Of course, it is difficult to “prove” that money spent on the customer service initiative has a positive revenue impact. Nevertheless, with the annual budget of our customer service committee amounting to less than $10,000, the program pays for itself if we attract or retain at least one student. In fact, we believe that an improved customer service culture delivers and/or retains a significant number of students. An added—and significant—benefit is that our staff retention has improved.

Two key aspects helped the customer service initiative attain success: leadership buy-in and staff buy-in. For any initiative to succeed, support must come from the top. Our president fully supported our efforts. (Depending on the audience targeted by the initiative, leadership at other institutions may mean a dean, division head, director, or coordinator.) We believe that our efforts in the areas of training, recognition, and workplace atmosphere helped garner staff buy-in.

Ultimately, knowledgeable, well-trained employees who feel appreciated and have a positive work atmosphere provide higher levels of customer service. They become true ambassadors of the college in helping to recruit and retain students.
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Ask anyone who works in higher education and you will hear them say that parents increasingly are part of the college experience. Parental involvement no longer is limited to the application and college choice process, a phenomenon we’ve seen for years. Now, parent involvement spans the spectrum of college life, and every day, that involvement conflicts with the regulations of FERPA (Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act). Few student services staff members have been spared the question, “If I’m paying the bill, why can’t I have the bill?”

Although the media have put “helicopter parents” on our radar screens as a looming danger, parents are not the enemy; in fact, they can be effective educational partners if we work to make them so. By accepting the fact that family involvement is based largely on good intentions and is inherently beneficial to the student, colleges and universities can play a pivotal role in helping parents and students to learn, grow, and develop a healthy family relationship that will support academic success. Providing such assistance need not conflict with FERPA.

Campus programs dedicated to family services are becoming commonplace. No longer limited to small, private colleges where individualized service is an expectation, these programs are cropping up in all sectors of higher education. They are part of a broad effort to improve the undergraduate student experience and the institutional image in multiple ways.

In the mid- to late-1990s, for example, the University of Minnesota implemented a number of efforts to make its large, urban campus feel like a smaller community. These efforts included first-year programming, intentional community-building initiatives, living-learning communities, and programs for transfer and commuter students. The parent program was another of these projects. Initially, the parent initiative comprised 10 percent of a staff position; the employee’s sole responsibility was to design, edit, and produce a parent newsletter. Soon it became clear that parents were eager for information about their child’s experience; many began contacting the newsletter editor for additional information. As parents’ desire for information increased, the position evolved until, in 1999, it became full-time. Parent services now include a comprehensive Web site, e-mail listserv, on- and off-campus events for parents, parent orientation, surveys, workshops, and a hotline that responds to phone and e-mail questions. The program also works to educate departments across campus as to strategies for working with and educating parents.

Longitudinal parent surveys, administered biannually since the mid-1990s, have shown continuing growth in parent satisfaction with services provided; improved per-
ceptions of connection to the University of Minnesota; and evidence that parents do indeed use the information they receive when they talk with their students. Parents welcome tips on student development, and they reinforce our institutional messages when they repeat those messages to their children—our students.

**PARENTAL EXPECTATIONS**

Increased parental involvement at the collegiate level should not come as a surprise. From the time their students were infants, this generation of parents has been told to be involved. They have been advised to know their children’s teachers and friends, to be aware of what’s happening at school, and to keep tabs on their children’s activities. Their involvement has paid off: students who are admitted to the more competitive colleges and universities have been successful—at least in part—because of guidance from their families. Asking parents to “let go” when their children enroll in college is equivalent to asking them to change a successful and satisfying family relationship. They will adjust their level of involvement eventually, but they will not do so overnight. First, parents must see that the college is considering its students’ best interests; that policies and procedures are intentional and transparent; and that their children are not floundering in institutional bureaucracy. When parents are convinced that we are treating their child fairly and that their child is increasingly capable and responsible, they will step back.

Even as parents and students gradually loosen their family ties, purse strings keep them attached. Given the skyrocketing college expenses of recent years, parents are expected to contribute considerably more toward college costs than in previous decades. Many are genuinely sacrificing for their children’s education, and they want to be assured that they are investing their money wisely.

Technology also keeps parents and students closely connected. E-mail, cell phones, texting, and instant messaging make communication both immediate and constant. In a 2007 study conducted by College Parents of America, 73 percent of parents said they are in touch with their student two or more times a week, and more than 30 percent said they are in touch daily [Second Annual Survey on College Parent Experiences 2007]. Another survey, conducted by the Pew Research Center, indicated that 82 percent of 18- to 25-year-olds “mentioned talking with a parent yesterday” [How Young People View Their Lives, Futures and Politics: A Portrait of Generation Next 2007].

In fact, parents today not only hear from their children on a frequent basis, but they actually may see them daily, thanks to camera phones and Webcams. It is not surprising, then, that when a family doesn’t hear from their child for a few days, they contact the college.

Compared to their counterparts in previous generations, today’s parents are more likely to be college graduates themselves. However, their experiences of student services in the 1970s and 1980s likely was much more hands-off. Today’s parents do not trust that we are providing the support their students need. As a result, they advocate for and intervene on behalf of their children, and they challenge institutions if their expectations are not met.

Comprehensive communications from campus have become a basic expectation of most parents. They likely received regular updates on their children’s elementary, middle, and high school experiences, from weekly e-mails about school events to regular updates on students’ grades and assignments. Consequently, they expect comparable communications from college. A recent e-mail from an admitted student’s mother read, “I have a son who will be a freshman at (the U of M’s business school) this fall. I am wondering if UM has something where parents can monitor grades, assignments, and progress through a Web site. In Texas, it is called a ‘Blackboard.’ Please advise if U of M has something similar. Thanks.”

Parents also expect a secure, comfortable, and regulated environment; safety is a high priority. Having had Columbine on their minds during their children’s high school years, parents now must come to grips with recent events at Virginia Tech—events that are at odds with traditional images of college. For the price most parents are paying, they expect their children to be the beneficiaries of amenities (larger residence hall rooms, more privacy, better dining experiences, and enough electrical outlets), as well as improved learning conditions and services (“smart” classrooms, excellent academic and career advising, and free tutoring). They also expect that their children will have control over their schedules (no evening classes and block scheduling to allow for the possibility of working part time). They want customization and personalization, not a one-size-fits-all approach. They expect value and results in students’ educational experiences, culminating in
a clear path to a career or graduate program. They also expect their children to be able to take full advantage of the college experience while still graduating in four years (and admittedly, too often our rigid curriculum doesn’t allow for any deviation or exploration).

Not surprisingly, students’ expectations mirror those of their parents. Changes in lifestyle, finances, and communication influence students as much as they affect parents. All their lives, today’s students have been told, “If you have a problem, go to an adult.” In most cases, they turn first to their parents, even before they seek assistance on campus. Whereas previous generations of teenagers might have shared their problems or questions first with their peers, today’s students frequently regard their peers primarily as competitors for awards and achievements, and as limiting their own access to competitive academic programs. They trust their parents, however, and often perceive them as their best advisors. Increasingly, students recognize their financial dependence on their parents; they acknowledge, “My parents are paying a lot for me to be here. I can see why they would want to know what my grades are.”

In short, parents and students alike want the best services their money can buy, and they want a continuous flow of accurate, relevant, and complete information. More often than not, college-parent relations run smoothly right up to the point at which FERPA is introduced. The concept of data privacy actually launches a significant change in family roles: Whereas academic records had belonged to the family, they become—overnight—the student’s property. Remember: Parents are accustomed to receiving detailed information about their children from their elementary, middle, and high schools. In fact, parents are held accountable for student progress during the K–12 years; some states even penalize parents if their children have poor attendance. Postsecondary institutions’ refusal, in the name of FERPA, to release non-public information thus seems not to make sense.

Adding to the confusion, state law requires some colleges and universities to release so-called public information—e.g., name, campus address, and phone number—to anyone who asks for it, yet often, that is precisely the information parents don’t want given out. Many parents are shocked and angry to find their children’s residence hall addresses in an online directory. They object to their children receiving unsolicited credit card offers, and they fear stalkers. Parents and students are informed about public information at orientation, but the implications tend not to sink in until later.

FERPA can be confusing for parents, but when it is explained and how it is explained can make a difference both in parents’ perception of the institution and in their acceptance of the restrictions. Often, parents’ first encounter with FERPA is when they are told, “No, you can’t have access to your child’s bill without his or her written permission.” An adversarial relationship seems a logical (if undesirable) outcome; the best method for preventing such an outcome is to educate parents early and often.

**FERPA EDUCATION: A CASE STUDY**

The University of Minnesota approaches FERPA education from several angles, and it is woven throughout parent program offerings. The regulation is introduced in a program session during parent orientation, and the summer newsletter, distributed to parents at orientation, includes an article about FERPA. The hope is that parents not only will hear the information, but that they also will see and read FERPA policy; still, parents typically don’t recognize the importance of FERPA during a summer orientation session. They do not assume their children will have problems or will receive poor grades, and they imagine that communication with the institution will be comprehensive.

E-mail messages sent to parents of matriculated freshmen briefly explain FERPA and include web links for further information. In addition, the University’s Web site features several pages dedicated to FERPA and includes a Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) page as well as an online guide to “Understanding Student Records Privacy.”

Nevertheless, no matter how often or how well FERPA is explained, parents are surprised to learn of the limitations imposed by the regulations. In almost all cases, parents seek information during what feels to them to be a critical situation. They may suspect their child is in trouble academically, or they may be informed that they must pay a bill immediately and yet not be provided any further details. Parents may be concerned about the health or welfare of their child, and they do not want to hear that a federal regulation prevents them from being informed whether their student attended class that day. To confuse matters

1. See <www.parent.umn.edu/ferpa.html>.
further, colleges and universities handle FERPA differently. As a result, parents may have one child enrolled at a college where information is more accessible. Without warning, a phone conversation that began amicably can become confrontational.

Parent expectations can be addressed without violating FERPA. Although you may not be able to provide specific answers about a student's situation, you can talk about the policy as it pertains to their questions—for example, admissions criteria, or probation and suspension—and make the written policy readily available. You are free to discuss “what usually happens in this situation” even as you clarify that you cannot say that the student is in that situation. Certainly, schools can make it easy for students to provide information or access to their parents, and they can educate parents as to how their children can share information. Ultimately, the goal of such discussions with parents should be to return the conversation to them and to their child, where it belongs.

A nearly universal truth is that students who are doing well and who have good grades and predictable expenses do not object to allowing their parents access to their academic records. In fact, many students willingly share their user name and password with their parents. (What many students don't realize is that doing so allows parents not only to look at student information but also to change it.)

Part of the University of Minnesota FERPA and general privacy and security education effort is to encourage parents to go through the appropriate parent access channels rather than use their children’s access codes. The Parent Program and the Office of the Registrar share horror stories with parents, including one about a parent who changed a student’s registration because she didn’t think her child should be taking a particular class. As it turned out, the student needed that class for graduation and had to stay an extra semester to complete his degree requirements. We also tell true stories of students sharing their user names and passwords with a boyfriend, girlfriend, or roommate, trusting that the information will be used only with the best of intentions. However, after a break-up or fight, former friends have been known to add or drop a student from classes, change the grading basis for courses, accept or deny financial aid, or send inappropriate messages from the student’s e-mail account. We emphasize that parents have the power to deliver the most compelling message about privacy and security by admonishing their children, “Never share your user name and password with anyone—not even me!”

Parents yearn to have a continuing role in their children’s lives. When we acknowledge that we need their assistance in promoting their children’s personal and academic success, they become willing partners. By giving parents the same messages we give their children—our students—explaining why we are relaying those messages, and asking for their help, we give them an appropriate role to play in the process.

A few years ago, the University of Minnesota developed a set of “desired parent outcomes” as we sought to articulate our goals for parent/student/university relations. As at many other institutions, we promote a list of student development outcomes that we want students to achieve during their college years. Our parent outcomes were designed to parallel the student outcomes and to contextualize how and why we work with students. The list also was intended to further secure parents as partners in the education and development process. The outcomes explain that families contribute to student success by:
- understanding the student experience;
- knowing campus resources;
- supporting the university’s goals for student learning outcomes;
- knowing when to empower students to take responsibility and make decisions, and when to step in with appropriate support; and
- developing an affinity for the university.

Yet no matter how much we work with parents, confusion still arises in regard to FERPA. Parents typically want certain information, and they believe that once their children have given them access to their records, they will receive any information they seek. Thus, when a parent calls to question a health service bill, or suspects her child may have been cited for drinking in a residence hall, she is frustrated to learn that health, counseling, and judicial records are handled differently from academic records. Parents also find it inconsistent that advising and faculty information may require separate releases. Parents are particularly sensitive to the bureaucratic processes of higher education, so it is important to be specific about what a release of information does and does not cover.
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The University of Minnesota has developed an online privacy and security workshop—essentially, a web-based PowerPoint—that addresses issues beyond the academic record. For example, it explains that housing records, mental and physical health information, advising information, and information from faculty are not part of the academic record release process for the Office of the Registrar and the Office of Student Finance, and it explains how students may approve access for those issues on a case-by-case basis. It also specifies that students have the right to withdraw parent access at any time. Finally, the workshop explains that certain information about students is publicly available unless the student chooses for it not to be, and it provides details regarding how public information can be suppressed.

Parents become most frustrated with FERPA during crisis situations. If they are fearful about the health and welfare of their child, they do not want to hear that a federal regulation precludes them from being provided information. At the University of Minnesota, the Parent Program, the housing office, the Office of the Registrar, and other offices (as necessary) work closely together in an emergency to ascertain the welfare of the student yet without violating FERPA. For example, if a student is living in a residence hall, the hall director will contact the student to confirm that he or she is safe and will tell the student to call home. If the student cannot be located or does not live in a residence hall, the registrar’s office will check the student’s course schedule and identify a course where the instructor is likely to know the student—e.g., a recitation or discussion class, a language class, or a lab class—and usually will contact the instructor to confirm the student’s attendance. If necessary, the registrar’s office will contact campus police to track down a student. In such cases, most parents are relieved to know that someone has seen their child, or to know that they may contact a specific person who is seeking information regarding the welfare of their child. Campus staff may be reluctant to tell a parent why her child has not been in contact, but they will notify a parent that her child has been located and has been told to call home. As described above, this process returns the situation to the parent and student, where it belongs.

Parents have the same goals for their students as the college or university has: for students to succeed, stay in school, and graduate. Working with parents rather than against them promotes student success, and addressing FERPA proactively is preferable to reacting to parents’ complaints. The institution is not going to change the nature of the family relationship, but parents can understand, appreciate, and support the concept of student development—if we explain it to them. When offices across campus collaborate in order to meet parent and student expectations, the institution’s outward expression of commitment to parents is clear. And that makes all the difference.
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Role Conflict and Ambiguity in Relation to Student Information Systems Implementation

By Sandra J. Lepley

EDITOR'S NOTE: This is the third in a series of four articles related to the functional role of community college registrars and web systems implementation projects. The result of doctoral research in educational leadership, the first article discussed the functional role of community college registrars during web-enabled student information system implementation projects; the second article focused on the role of registrars as mid-level managers during major organizational change, such as systems implementation. This article will review related literature on administrative role conflict and ambiguity, and the fourth will focus on the registrar's role as a leader during technology change.

ROLE CONFLICT AND AMBIGUITY

A 2004 study of community college registrars examined concepts of role conflict and ambiguity with respect to social aspects of higher education administration and the possible effects of web-enabled technology implementation (Lepley 2006). The continual evolution of the Information Age, with its heightened pace of uncertainty, affects managers of colleges, universities, and businesses (Rowley, Lujan, and Dolence 1998). When charged with implementing a strategic plan, managers often are involved with teams of various institutional constituencies and are expected to become ambassadors involved with duties such as team building (Rowley, Lujan, and Dolence 1997). In 2002, Seyfarth emphasized that for optimal performance, roles must be clearly stated in job descriptions and job models. Research findings of Bray and Brawley (2002) endorsed the importance of role clarity for the performance of formal roles in interdependent team environments. Other research found that role conflict and role ambiguity, resulting from a multitude of issues and challenges, led some community college administrators to be dissatisfied, to feel added stress, and to leave their jobs (Murray, Murray, and Summar 2001). Although role ambiguity has long been recognized as characteristic of higher education administration (Bess and Goldman 2001; Ecker 1979), an increased focus on accountability has resulted in higher education institutions performing more like businesses. This may result in less tolerance for ambiguity.

In addition to Elovanio and Kivimaki's (2001) finding that role ambiguity is moderated by one's personal need for structure, these researchers found that job dissatisfaction and strain are more prevalent among people who have a “chronic desire for clarity” (p. 367). Challenges of systems implementations have included social and psychological factors of behavior (Klein, Conn, Smith, and Sorra 2001; Miles and Healy 1998; Sarker 2000). At the same time, technology has been seen as an enabler with
Role Conflict or Harmony

A person may be directed by his superior and requested by subordinates and colleagues to assume power and exercise responsibility to achieve goals different from those that may be deemed “official.” This creates role conflict. According to Coladarci and Getzels (1955), this can lead to problems in the overall administrative process. Role conflict tends to arise when administrative relationships at a college or other institution are mishandled and functional roles are unclear (Coladarci and Getzels 1955). Coladarci and Getzels (1955) do not suggest that administrative relationships usually are limited to a single, narrowly defined role; rather, administrators (such as community college registrars) may serve multiple roles.

Kahn et al. (1964) propose that conflict related to functions is induced by various subsystems in an organization. As a result of the nature of their various functions within the organization, some employees may be oriented inward, outward, or toward adaptation objectives. This in itself may create potential role conflict as those oriented inward may maintain customs and loyalties that are questioned by those oriented outward or having adaptation objectives. An individual work area’s tendency toward the norm greatly determines the potential for conflict during an innovation phase (Kahn et al. 1964). A community college registrar may have increased opportunities to prevent or help solve any conflicts during systems implementation projects and may even take on a role as mediator.

Multiple roles and certain situations may influence role conflict. The effect of role conflict is prevalent in organizations: 88 percent of conflicts in organizations are between persons of different rank (Kahn et al. 1964). When they are combined, direct and indirect supervision result in role tensions and conflicts. Fewer than half of the study’s respondents reported conflict with a person outside the organization. Kahn et al. (1964) suggest, too, that role overload—a conflict among legitimate tasks or a problem in priority setting—constitutes a major type of role conflict. Upper middle management levels indicate the most occurrences of conflict, and this is the level at which many community college registrars operate.

According to Hoy and Miskel (1987), role conflicts in social systems refer to formal roles with respect to the expectations of those in a bureaucracy. A social system is a single social entity with a group of elements or subsystems and activities that are bound and that interact (Hoy and Miskel 1987). These writers present theory and research regarding conflicts related to: (1) authority, (2) bureaucracy, (3) choice of administrators, (4) decision-making theory, (5) group decisions, (6) organizations, and (7) professionals in bureaucracies, schools, and social systems. In formal organizations, role conflict is sometimes limited by the existence of rules and regulations as well as procedures. In spite of intense efforts to specify how work is to be carried out, stress does exist as people work to define formal roles.
and their expectations within organizations; resulting tensions emanate from within organizations, in turn effecting tensions and pressures outside the organizations (Hoy and Miskel 1987). Conflicts related to roles and norms tend to arise when the “formal” and “informal” organizations do not coexist easily (Hoy and Miskel 1987). Role personality conflicts arise when tension in an organization increases because bureaucracy gets in the way of personal needs (Hoy and Miskel 1987). Role conflicts share apparent incongruence of expectations among people in bureaucratic organizations.

Occupational stress and dysfunction are possible results of role conflict (Bandura 1997). Individuals who provide direct services to students may experience exhaustion and may lack a sense of personal accomplishment if the services they provide are routine and depersonalized. In contrast, individuals who provide human services may tend to treat individuals more personally (Bandura 1997). Dysfunction may be avoided if the human services focus remains strong throughout a major web-enabled technology implementation project.

Bandura (1997) proposes that one’s personal social influence might be enhanced if one uses personal influence on the conditions around him. Bandura (1997) suggests further that social systems involve continuous vying for power and lobbying as coalitions shift. Progress is limited when there is no shared vision; a clear vision communicated from the executive administration may support the efforts of mid-level administrators. Community college registrars preparing to lead web-enabled system implementation projects may find it helpful to promote open discussion of any conflicts.

According to Roy and Roy (1998), business processes may be redesigned or reengineered but job functions are not always clarified as implementations often focus exclusively on technology. Four case studies and 38 completed survey questionnaires of Canadian businesses led Roy and Roy (1998) to conclude that business process reengineering projects usually do not take a socio-technical approach because of the cost of participative processes, uses of top-down approaches, and the dominance of technical focus among consultants (Roy and Roy 1998).

Another upper mid-level administrator, the academic dean, is often caught between individual colleges and central leadership with respect to role expectations (Wolverton and Wolverton 1999). An academic as well as an administrator, the academic dean is subject to conflicts of priorities and issues. Despite the authority of the office, the academic dean may deem it best not to engage in direct use of power. Rather, negotiating and coordinating among educators and communicating priorities and issues to top executives may lead to greater influence and effectiveness. Seen historically as a quiet scholar, today’s academic dean is more politically skilled and has a strong sense of economics (Wolverton and Wolverton 1999). The community college registrar, though not usually holding the title of dean, may have role requirements similar to those of other mid-level administrators at an institution.

In 2001, Mohr and Dichter wrote that conflict is a normal developmental aspect of group behavior and that every member’s negotiation and mediation skills are important so that conflicts are resolved without too much compromise. Unacknowledged conflicts can arise repeatedly. As conflicts develop during system implementation, administrators (to include college registrars) may find that they play a role in negotiations and mediations (Mohr and Dichter 2001).

Montez, Wolverton, and Gmelch (2002) describe college and university administrators—deans, in particular—as thriving in a turbulent environment in which one challenging strategy is technology development and use. Administrators juggle their own values and work-related situations. In addition to role conflict and ambiguity and future challenging tasks, Montez et al. (2002) seek to understand what deans actually do. According to Rizzo et al. (1970), change in technology is one issue that may cause confusion on the part of a college or university dean. Previously, Kahn et al. (1964) concluded that common reactions to role ambiguity include heightened levels of tension and anxiety, negative attitude toward a superior, and diminished productivity. Montez et al. (2002) used data from a national study of academic deans that included a task inventory with a conflict and ambiguity section, as well as an open-ended inquiry concerning future challenges. They analyzed principal components with varimax rotation using an SPSS (2001) statistical package, reported the factor analysis of the task inventory list, and confirmed the previous results of Rizzo et al. (1970). They computed Pearson’s product moment correlation coefficients across constructs of perceived roles and role conflict and ambiguity. Key
duties were found to be those of internal productivity, academic personnel management, and external and political relations. Sources of role conflict included: (1) working with two or more different operating groups, (2) doing things accepted by one person and not by others, and (3) receiving assignments without proper resources. No causality was assumed, and relationships between role and conflict sources were not confirmed (Montez et al. 2002).

More recently, in 2004, Sotirakou recognized that technology and globalization, among other pressures, led to a new managerial philosophy in providing public services. In the United Kingdom higher education community, the focus of this study, a shift toward market principles conflicted with ideals of academic autonomy (Sotirakou 2004). According to Sotirakou (2004), role conflict without understanding could severely threaten an institution. Heads of departments are expected to take on new tasks, particularly leadership and entrepreneurial activities involving, for example, development of new partnerships and liaisons with academics, government, business, and industry (Sotirakou 2004). Sotirakou (2004) found numerous lists of universities’ department head duties—most calling for a dual role as academic and manager—but found little attention to stresses and conflicts. Her research identifies degree and type of departmental role conflict and identifies and analyzes sources of role conflict. Sotirakou (2004) found evidence of Janusian conflict—that is, lack of time for academics, and values conflict, or difficulty mediating incompatible demands.

**ROLE AMBIGUITY OR CLARITY**

Functional role clarity is likely to be important to individuals in organizations. Coladarci and Getzels (1955) theorize that when expectations are congruent, administration may progress as planned. Alternatively, if expectations are incongruent, processes may be stopped. According to the administrative theory proposed by Coladarci and Getzels, the three most important dimensions of the administrative relationship are authority, scope, and affectivity. **Scope** refers to the range of roles included in a relationship (Coladarci and Getzels 1955). Role clarity between managers and staffs, or between leaders and followers, leads to educational administration effectiveness Coladarci and Getzels 1955).

Kahn, Wolfe, Quinn, Snoek, and Rosenthal (1964) note that role ambiguity often leads to stress because people become frustrated when they do not have access to adequate information needed to complete important duties. This can diminish performance and decrease job satisfaction. Kahn et al. (1964) suggest that technology and task complexity are major sources of role ambiguity. A fast pace of change, internal connections among an organization’s functional roles, and a management philosophy in favor of restricting information are additional sources of role ambiguity. Kahn et al. (1964) also found that role ambiguity decreases self-confidence and negatively affects individuals’ attitudes toward one another, ultimately increasing tensions. Role ambiguity may lead to many problems and may be more prevalent during times of significant changes in the workplace.

According to Roueche, Baker, and Rose (1989), leader and follower cohesion may occur when both understand campus expectations. Technology implementation may be a time when there is increased confusion about such expectations. Modern leadership style is an interactive process and is tolerant of considerable ambiguity (Roueche et al. 1989). This tolerance may need to be understood to overcome any fear or confusion caused by technology changes. A registrar’s functional role in times of technology implementation may include allowing more time for listening to staff expectations.

In 1991 Singh and Rhoads developed role conflict and ambiguity scales to measure ambiguity in boundary-spanning roles. They found that role ambiguity is important because it is thought to have a negative effect on an employee’s job satisfaction, performance, and turnover. Role ambiguity causes problems because of a lack of information concerning how to proceed with critical tasks. This leads to frustration and tension (Singh and Rhoads 1991). Implications of this study of role ambiguity may well apply to the functional roles of college administrators during organizational change.

Community college registrars may be viewed as boundary spanners when they collaborate with individuals in other areas or with individuals outside the organization. Singh and Rhoads (1991) found that role ambiguity existed in varying degrees among people who collaborated regularly with others outside their immediate department or office when role performance instruction was missing or inadequate. Four types of role ambiguity were identified: the scope of a person’s responsibilities, the behaviors...
needed to handle responsibilities, expectations of those who assign roles, and lack of clarity regarding how one's actions would affect overall goals.

Singh and Rhoads (1991) developed the following definition in response to focus groups, discussions, and literature in the field: Role ambiguity is a complex evaluation of the need for additional information for effective role performance. Singh and Rhoads (1991) perceived the task environment as one of several aspects of the evaluation of ambiguity and also examined the extent to which different facets of role ambiguity were related to employee demographics and personality. Ambiguous task environment, demographics, and personality issues are significant variables in the study of functional role ambiguity.

Mohr and Dichter (2001) promote communication—to include many forms of communication by everyone in a work group, rather than maintaining one channel of authoritative communication—as a cure for ambiguity. According to Cramer (2005), conflicts during web-enabled student information system implementations may be resolved by maintaining strong authority while venturing into collaborative learning and decision making. Registrars' skills may determine the extent of role conflict caused by ambiguity that occurs during a system implementation involving cross-functional teams and committees.

Bandura (1997) also reported on role ambiguity. Evidence suggested that role ambiguity impeded best use of personal skills: Managers of high and low self-efficacy perform similarly in ambiguously structured roles. Bandura defines perceived self-efficacy as a person's ability to accomplish goals. Self-efficacy may influence role ambiguity, but Bandura found that when role expectations were clear, managers with high self-efficacy showed measurable performance improvements whereas those of low perceived self-efficacy improved only slightly. Bandura therefore suggests that different remedial measures may be required in situations where organizational productivity is low. Specifically, managers with high degrees of self-efficacy require role clarification whereas those with low self-efficacy require guided mastery experiences in addition to role clarification (Bandura 1997). Bandura's (1997) work may provide insights for management development programming.

According to Yukl and Lepsinger (2004), poor role clarification can cause team-member or interdepartmental conflicts when no one accepts responsibility for work that needs to be done. Yukl and Lepsinger (2004) found that role clarifying is particularly useful when work is complex (as when technology changes include large complex tasks performed by multiple people or groups) and that clarifying is a leadership behavior that enhances efficiency in an operation.

Tom Stewart, a registrar whose career at Miami Dade Community College was both lengthy (1966 to 2003) and exemplary, did not like ambiguity (Stones 2004b). A former a math professor with an engineering background, Stewart enjoyed the analytical aspects of systems development and implementation. He did not relish the prospect of having to make exceptions to rules, as deans often are called to do; he preferred things to be black or white, yes or no (Stones 2004b). Not surprisingly, his background characteristics may have influenced his style of work (Stones 2004b). Nevertheless, it is to be expected that a registrar in the midst of large-scale web-enabled system implementation may often be required to endure role ambiguity. If such ambiguity is not addressed, confusion that alienates project team members may be the result (Cramer 2005).
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