

- a liaison system with each coaching staff for open communication
- training of support personnel, including coaches
- class scheduling with career objectives in mind, and
- constant surveillance of academic progress in all sports.

Through the guidance of our Intercollegiate Council on Athletics we intend to further strengthen our advising commitment through a Mentor-Student Help program; greater emphasis on mutual guidance by the academic staff; improved course selection and drop/add monitoring through department computerization; and, increased student-athlete academic awareness and degree goal responsibility counseling.

After reviewing the impressive advising program of Steven C. Ender at Kansas State University, our program of outside resource development might well explore Mr. Ender's ideas on a required three hour credit/no credit classroom situation. Mr. Ender's model could be a direction toward attitude modification that would result in a more quality-of-life approach toward academics by the student-athlete. I would go further and attempt a one or two quarter follow-up on a one hour credit/no credit class where a continuous process of successful academic modification might be enhanced. This program might be a success for the marginal educational disadvantaged student-athlete, where years of academic struggle have created patterns of failure. This plan's success, however, would depend on a coordinated team effort with a myriad of academic and financial players. Only through team effort can such an educational commitment be successful.

The coaches' awareness and education must also be constantly reviewed and developed if these student-athletes are to have the necessary reinforcement for academic success. Ultimately, the coaches' effort will be the foundation for advising success. Since the courts are becoming more involved in education and athletics, every coach and institution must be aware of the legal obligations to the student-athlete.

I would also endorse and urge any plan of information dissemination to make the high school student-athlete and counseling department more aware of college expectations, specifically grade and class requirements. Much of this lobbying effort would have to be shouldered by academic counselors at the levels which have the greatest involvement with secondary and junior college students. Athletic departments may foster greater acceptance of this message by participating as speakers or resource people when called upon.

Academic advising of the student-athlete is without a doubt the sine qua non of intercollegiate athletics today. The commitment to academic success has been stated by the NCAA, and it must be supported if intercollegiate athletics is to maintain the status it has enjoyed in this country over the last century. The commitment made by member institutions must be a collaborative effort including the academic community, secondary and college administrators, athletic directors, coaches, counselors and ultimately the student-athlete.

The course has been set and only through a thorough realistic approach of advising the student-athlete can the challenge be met. Harry Cross, the highly respected Faculty Representative to the NCAA and PAC-10 Conference from the University of Washington might well have summed all this up in *Law and Contemporary Problems* when he stated, "Intercollegiate Athletics must be based on principles. Principles of governing bodies and those recruiting athletes. They must be based upon purposes compatible with the purposes of higher education."

Advising: Implications for Faculty Development*

HOWARD C. KRAMER, *Director, Research and Planning, Division of Campus Life, and Associate Dean of Students, Cornell University.*

Discussions about advising, that is, discussions about the definition, implementation, evaluation, and improvement of advising policy and practice, are useful not only in their own right, but also as a means of fostering faculty/institutional development.

How might this be so? I'd like to draw on a recent publication entitled *Leadership in the 80's*, prepared by the Institute for Educational Management at Harvard.

According to one of the authors, Richard Cyert, currently the President of Carnegie-Mellon, the challenge of many colleges in the 80's is their response to the problem of attaining a new equilibrium at a smaller scale of operation that is of the same quality as the larger scale.¹ Put simply, how can the attention of faculty be kept focused on maintaining excellence in the face of forces pulling their attention to survival? Also, why should we expect that institutional discussions of advising might be helpful?

Advising, as a topic, may be useful for a number of reasons:

First. Advising is one function that has "face validity" as something we should do for our students. There are few institutions or individuals that would publicly admit that advising is unimportant and should not be provided in a planned way to assist students.

Second. Advising is not the major or primary job responsibility of faculty. Consequently, discussion of what we do in advising, or how well we advise, is generally less threatening to members of the faculty than discussion of either their teaching or their research. Presumably, then, it is "easier" to engage faculty in discussions about advising.

Third. Although teaching, learning, and advising are individual activities, they occur within a social context: thus, if we bring about some form of change in, or through, advising it is reasonable to expect the change to influence other aspects of the person's work or other segments of the educational establishment.

* This article is based on a presentation delivered at a workshop sponsored by the Faculty Development and Welfare Committee, Georgia Southern College, Statesboro, Georgia.

¹Cyert, Richard M., *Managing universities in the 1980's. In Leadership in the 80's: Essays on Higher Education, 1980, Institute for Educational Management, Harvard University, p. 46.*

Fourth. Recent research on adult development indicates that complex and life-altering growth is a natural occurrence for adults. Discussion of the growth and change of the person in the advisor role extends to similar discussion of change on one's other roles within the institution.

Fifth. Advising has as its focus the matching of student need and institutional resource in such a manner so as to provide benefits for both students and institution. Advising can be designed to accommodate the two types of learning referred to by the second author, Chris Argyris. Argyris, professor of education and organizational behavior at Harvard, discusses the characteristics of learning he identifies as single-loop or double-loop learning.

In the publication *Leadership in the 80's* Professor Argyris defines single-loop learning as any detecting and correcting of error that does not alter the underlying values or policies of the organization. An example would be helping students in appropriate sequencing of courses, fulfilling requirements or in meeting pre-requisites. Thus, advising would be intended to help students with the process of making decisions within known, and accepted, alternatives.

Argyris defines double-loop learning as any detection and correction of error that involves the changing of underlying values and policies. An example here would be the use of data gained by advisors to change policy or procedure to benefit both students and the institution. In an individual context such learning would involve assisting students in exploring or examining the nature of the assumptions from which choice is generated. According to Argyris, one may conceptualize single-loop learning as focusing on changing the routines whereas double-loop learning focuses on changing the values and policies from which the routines are designed.¹

Advising, then, is an arena where persons (faculty, staff and students) can learn how to produce, or how to improve their existing production of double-loop learning. In other words, where one can learn how to perfect those skills that result in a person having the competence to produce viable solutions for specific questions.

So what's the big deal, you may ask? What's so hard about that?

Recent research suggests that there is a difference between the theories people espouse and those they actually use in an action context.¹ For instance, if I asked you to describe how you advise student X or how you teach class Y, you would be able to describe what you think you do, that is, give your espoused theory. However, if we had a videotape of that activity we'd likely find the correlation between what you say you do and what you actually do to be rather low.

Another consistent finding reported by Argyris is that although people will give the "wrong" in-use theory, they readily agree with a third-party's formulation of their theory-in-use. So on one hand, people have a notion of what they do (the espoused theory) that is incorrect, on the other hand, they quickly agree with another's description of their theory-in-use (what they actually did). In the case of advising this would mean that our notion of

¹Argyris, Chris. *Educating Administrators and Professionals. In Leadership in the 80's: Essays on Higher Education.* (Institute for Educational Management, Harvard University, 1980). p. 3.

¹Argyris, p. 10.

what we do in advising may have little relation to what actually happens. Furthermore, in most contexts, we're unlikely even to know that differences exist between what we say we do and what, in fact, we do.

Even if we know of the difference, and wish to change, how do we go about changing to produce the desired behavior? In other words, how do we as individuals carry out double-loop learning that results in greater agreement between our espoused-theories and our theories-in-use? For example, let's say we believe that a college education should enable a person to think critically about the implications of their decisions. Furthermore, we espouse our advising practice as an opportunity for students to learn how they go about making decisions and to evaluate the validity of the process used and the decision reached. But in actual practice, our advising custom is to elicit "answers" from students regarding courses, sequencing, majors, etc., without any consideration of the "how" or the "so what" of the decisions. How then, do we go about learning to do what we say is important to do?

This is where discussions of advising make a contribution. If there's any punch line at all to this presentation, this is it! Discussion of advising is important because:

1. Advising frequently brings issues (problems) to the surface, issues that are related to institutional mission (that is, what the institution says is important).
2. Advising involves the important players (that is, students and faculty).
3. Advising may be used to identify the problems (needs) that students report are important, and unresolved.
4. Advising may be used to identify differences between the faculty advisor's espoused theory and the advisor's theory-in-use.
5. Advising provides a training ground for faculty and students to learn to produce the actions they say they want.
6. Advising serves as a common meeting ground, where faculty may peruse agendas that are important to the institution and not just those agendas that are important to the person, department or discipline represented.

As a consequence, work done, learning attained, and competencies acquired in the advising arena may be used in pursuit of other important institutional agendas. Specifically, competence gained in producing double-loop learning is not only valuable in dealing with advising issues, it is also valuable in dealing with other institutional issues. When competition for scarce resources increases, tensions rise, and persons resort to a variety of actions designed to achieve their private purpose. Moreover, they may attempt to camouflage their actions in order to reduce the likelihood that they will be confronted.

Realistically, we face the possibility of a world increasingly "polluted" with games and camouflages that are undiscussible, and their undiscussability is undiscussible.¹ The ability to carry out double-loop learning to help identify, examine, and resolve these intricate and often emotionally-laden issues may be critical for the institution.

Recently I came across an example of this complex problem while investigating relationships between graduate committee chairpersons and graduate students. Representatives of

¹Argyris, p. 21.

each constituency were asked to give their estimate of the importance of various factors to the relationship and to indicate what they thought to be the ratings of the other party. Faculty placed high importance on the kind and quality of student's research and estimated that students would rank this factor as less important or lower than other factors. Students concurred; they reported the kind and quality of their research was more important to the faculty than it was to them in determining the quality of the relationship between graduate student and committee chairperson.

So, we have here a situation where both parties "understood" that a student's research, compared to other things, was more important to the faculty than it was to the student. Yet, the "espoused theory" played out in their interaction was the notion that research was the important factor as far as students were concerned. Generally, faculty behavior during interaction with students take the form of "What do you want to do?" After all, taking the faculty perspective, if research is important to the student, then students must decide, or they will decide, what to do. However, students really wanted to follow their understanding of the theory-in-use. That is, research is important to the faculty, so what do you, the chairperson, want *me* to do? Unable, or unwilling, to surface this openly, chairpersons and students tended to play the game dictated by the espoused theory, that is, research is important to the student so we'll both pretend that students know, or like, or understand what they're doing while we each try to figure out what the chairperson really wants. As you might imagine, and probably have experienced, this unresolved dilemma is frustrating for graduate student and chairperson alike.

Now a different scenario, one you find in some instances, is where a chairperson and graduate student are adept at double-loop learning and are able to articulate, challenge, examine, and resolve issues pertaining to their joint, as well as their individual, responsibilities. My point here is that advising discussions, workshops, or seminars may serve as a training ground, or a proving ground, where faculty and students may learn to perfect skills in accomplishing those objectives they say they wish to accomplish.

It seems grandiose to suggest that involvement with academic advising is somehow going to be translated into a host of solutions for the many difficult and complex problems facing colleges and universities today. That is certainly not my intent. I believe, however, that concentrated and concerted efforts to improve advising may provide institutional benefits other than the mere improvement of advising services rendered. Many distractions exist for faculty in coming years, and it is clear that attention will not be uniquely attracted to excellence. Cyert contends that the future will bring a significant increase in the number of conflicts. The expected reduction of the total pool of resources available will lead to conflicts within and among departments.¹ These conflicts will be more difficult to resolve because to do so will require alterations of underlying values and policies. You name the topic, the curriculum, majors or major requirements, admission standards, tenure, faculty evaluation, space, support staff, we could go on and on. Many issues are either here, or just around the corner, and someone will have to deal with them.

Kastenbaum,² describing a different system, a hospital, talks about the phenomenon of a meta-issue, that is, an issue that is encompassing and reflective of other issues, and

¹Cyert, p. 49.

²Kastenbaum, Robert. The psychologist and hospital policy: A report from the real world. *American Psychologist*, 37, (1982), pp. 1355-1358.

describes how it influences a hospital. According to Kastenbaum, some of the outcomes of this meta-issue are:

- Some of the most able and best-qualified nurses leave their chosen employment; not just this or that hospital, but the field itself.
- Outmoded and ineffective modes of providing service to the patients continue indefinitely.
- Errors in professional judgment and service are covered up.
- There is always a budget crisis and it is almost always "deepening" or "intensifying" (your choice).
- Among clinical staff, interpersonal relationships are tense, stress reactions common, and communication less than dependable.
- Among top administrative staff, attention is riveted on matters such as marketing techniques, the latest plan for merging with other service agencies, or finessing the next site visit by the accreditation team. And finally,
- Among patients and their families there is a sense of captivity and either hyper-alertness or detached fatalism about what might happen next.

Without too much alteration some of these observations fit colleges and universities quite nicely. This meta-issue, as suggested by Kastenbaum, is, "Can I act - now - on the basis of what I know and feel to be right?"

A secondary issue becomes, "What kind of person am I, if I continually think and feel one way, and act in another?" According to Kastenbaum work priorities tend to shift to how can I squeeze the most compensatory satisfaction from this situation, given that I no longer expect basic fulfillment through practicing my profession at its and my best?

Remember the question I posed earlier? "How can the attention of faculty be kept focused on maintaining excellence in the face of forces pulling their attention to survival?"

One solution, perhaps the solution that is too often given, is better leadership.

Cyert suggests that the leader must articulate a set of goals for the total organization that captures the imagination of the participants and induces them to forsake their personal and subgroup goals to enlist in the cause of the total organization.³ Now that's a tall order! In addition, it is incomplete and too simplistic. It is almost a single-loop learning kind of statement. That is, if we just had better leadership things would be better. We are similarly guilty when we argue that advising would be easier if we just had better students!

More appropriately, the statement might be amended to include the question, what are you willing, or able, to do to help solve those challenges facing the institution? More specifically, what are you willing or able to do in order to improve the advising provided by you, your department, and your institution?

I'd like to refer to an ancient report, that is, one dated January, 1968. The report, *The Student in Higher Education*, was sponsored by the Hazen Foundation and the working

³Cyert, p. 64.

committee that generated the report was chaired by Joseph Kauffman. In discussing the direction colleges should take the committee suggested:

The developmental college or university understands that the whole man must be educated. It recognizes the vast diversity among students; seeks to integrate the classroom experience with experiences outside the classroom, particularly in the student community and in service beyond its borders; eliminates many forms of competition, and stresses the student's development of his native talents as well as mastery of certain areas where he is relatively weak. It places importance on the freshman year, when it offers the student adventures with great ideas and helps him pursue his own interests at his own pace, until at the end of this year of speculation and experimentation, he has a much clearer idea of what his educational needs and desires really are. It tries to build some kind of faculty-student-administration community on the campus so that study, work, recreation, and life may be shared, and loneliness and isolation minimized.⁶

The recommendations call for an improvement in the quality of human relationships in the college, an improvement which will require far better integration of the cognitive and noncognitive dimensions of human growth. The committee also observed that although the primary concern of the report is the student in higher education, it should be noted that unless the quality of relationships for faculty and administrators is also improved, no lasting effect can be had on the life of the student. Colleges and universities must become more human environments for everyone involved, or they will become so for no one.⁷

Later, in their conclusion, the committee states, "We are convinced that the knowledge of human development from the behavioral sciences now makes possible a wider vision of what the school can accomplish and of more effective ways of teaching. American higher education has not paid enough attention to human development as a part of its mission, and the time has come for this neglect to end—in the name of better education."⁸

Advising offers an opportunity to improve the quality of human environments found in colleges and universities. The advising program is particularly appropriate for providing a means of expanding the double-loop learning carried on by students and faculty. I believe advising may be conceived as a special teaching function where faculty do what they do best, teach. In the advising situation, the faculty advisor may help the student learn how to carry out double-loop learning, that is, to challenge the underlying values or assumptions of some of the advising choices.

In addition, advising may be designed to accomplish another major institutional purpose, that is, advising may be conducted so as to facilitate the intellectual development of the advisee. Here the advisor may proceed in ways designed to help students increase their capacity to think critically and to assume responsibility for their decisions and their actions. Again, to support double-loop learning.

⁶Report of the Committee on the Student in Higher Education, Joseph F. Kauffman, Chairman, New Haven, CT.: The Hazen Foundation, (January, 1968), p. 52.

⁷Kauffman Report, p. 58.

⁸Kauffman Report, p. 66.

A major reason for promoting advising development is that a healthy advising program serves as a useful mechanism for faculty development. Although advising services may be thought of as being provided for the student's welfare, the institution may also use the program to develop skills that are useful in other contexts as well. Advising programs should endeavor to improve students, the faculty, and the institution. The question "How do we improve advising at this institution?" just might be one of those topics that captures the imagination of the participants and enlists their energy and creativity in a cause for the total organization.

Now, more than ever,
a vital ingredient
in your career.



The Chronicle of Higher Education.

From the beginning, The Chronicle has maintained a staff of reporters, editors, artists, and production people who have just one assignment:

to cover higher education and the events affecting it with a thoroughness, accuracy, and readability worthy of the subject matter.

Our aim is to provide you with the full and impartial information you need for your institution, your specialty, and your career.

Try a short term, trial subscription to The Chronicle, and find

out what a decisive difference having your own subscription can make.

Clip and mail this coupon to: The Chronicle of Higher Education, P.O. Box 1955, Marion, Ohio 43305.

☐ Bill me \$20.75 for 24 issues.
☐ I enclose \$20.00 for 24 issues.

Send my subscription to:

Name _____

Dept./Institution _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____

NACADA

Career Indecision: A Dilemma & A Solution

LORETTA J. BRADLEY, Associate Professor, Department of Human Development Counseling, Vanderbilt University.

Career indecision is prevalent on the college campus. It not only presents a problem to the student, but also serious concerns for the academic advisor. This article describes and documents a successful career counseling program that became an integral part of an academic advising office.

Consider the following dialogues between an academic advisor and a college student concerned about a major.

CASE I

Advisor: So you don't know what you want to be.

Student: No, I really don't know.

Advisor: Give me some idea of some things that you have considered.

Student: Well that's pretty difficult to do because you see I've considered about everything at one time or another. I can't seem to come up with any decision; yet, I know I must make a decision soon. I just can't continue taking courses in all of these areas when I really don't know what I want to be.

Advisor: It sounds like you are saying "I'm running out of time and I'm getting pretty anxious about selecting a college major."

CASE II

Student: I came in today because I'm so unhappy with my major. I thought I wanted a major in math, but now that I'm here in college I know that math isn't for me.

Advisor: You say you know you don't want a major in math but do you have any idea(s) about what you want to major in?

Student: Not really. Oh! I have thought of other things, but I really don't know. Honestly, I don't know what I'm suited for, about all I know about this major is that I want to stay in college.

Advisor: It sounds like you know you want to be in college but beyond that you are very unsure about what you should major in.

Student: I'm afraid that's about right.