INDIANA UNIVERSITY STUDENT PERSONNEL ASSOCIATION

INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Department of Higher Education and Student Affairs
School of Education
W. W. Wright Education Building, Suite 4228
Bloomington, Indiana 47405
(812) 856-8364/8362

JOURNAL STAFF

IUSPA Officers 1994

President	Mary Spellman
Vice President	Karla Ruggiero
Secretary	Kelly Moran
Treasurer	Darnell Cole
Dir./Relations	Nicole Phillips

IUSPA Officers 1993

President	Bill Woodward
Vice President	Karen Paulsell
Secretary	Laura Riley
Treasurer	Dee Jordan
Dir./Relations	Matt Supple

The Journal of the Indiana University Student Personnel Association is published by the IUSPA with support from the Department of Higher Education and Student Affairs. The primary sources of funding are alumni donations, and a grant from the Commitment to Assist Student Initiatives (CASI) through the Indiana University Student Association. The *Journal* is produced expressly to provide an opportunity for HESA master's students to publish articles pertinent to the field of student affairs.

JOURNAL OF THE INDIANA UNIVERSITY STUDENT PERSONNEL ASSOCATION

1994 Fall Edition

CONTENTS

FACULTY ADVISORS

Dr. Elizabeth Greenleaf	1960–1977
Ms. Wanda Deutsch	1970–1971
Dr. David DeCoster	1972–1976
Dr. George Kuh	1977–1982
Dr. John Schuh	1983–1987
Dr. Don Hossler	1987–1988
Dr. Frances Stage	1988–1989
Dr. Don Hossler	1989–1990
Dr. George Kuh	1990–1994

EDITORS

Susan Mears, 1965
Bill Ehrich, 1966
Ann Paloney, 1967
Michael J. Wiener, 1967
Marily Liechty, 1968
Dallas Bauman, 1969
George C. Dehne, 1971
Jane A. Lundahl, 1972
Helen Mamachev, 1973
Winnifred Weeks, 1973
Elizabeth Brannon, 1974
Robert Cieslicki, 1974
Barbara Moudy, 1974
David Stacy, 1974
Dann Lobsinger, 1974, 1975
Ann Deborah Alter, 1975
Karen Farmer, 1976
Diane Burnside, 1976
Richard Scott, 1976
Susan Hopp, 1977
Frank Ardaiolo, 1977
Vince Carunchia, 1977
Elizabeth A. Zavodny, 1978
Marc Kaplan, 1978
Jim Scroth, 1978, 1979
Laurie Bell, 1979
L.E. Wegryn, 1980
B.J. Bischoff, 1981
Brian Pisaro, 1981
Rodney P. Kirsch, 1982
Janet R. Wright, 1982
Nedra Hartzell, 1983
Daniel W. Salter, 1983
Susan Buffington, 1984
Diane Ledger, 1984
Margaret O'Brien, 1985
David Stewart, 1985
Lora Burnett, 1986
James Vander Putten, 1986
James J. Holmen, 1987
James J. Hurley, 1987
David J. Strauss, 1988
J.J. Thorp, 1988, 1989
Patricia Harned,1989, 1990
Diane Robinson, 1990, 1991
Anne E. Spitler, 1991, 1992
Lisa K. Mitchell, 1992, 1993
Allison B. Block, 1993, 1994
Melody M. Snyder, 1994

EDITORS' COMMENTS

The environments at our respective colleges and universities have an undeniable impact upon our lives; they shape our daily activities and our long-term goals. A better understanding of the factors that influence our institutions will better equip us, as student affairs professionals, to handle the challenges that come our way. This year's issue of the *Journal* addresses the myriad of climates that exist on the college campus: physical, social, cultural, academic and philosophical.

The following articles are a product of the author's personal interests, professional experiences and exposure to CSPA coursework. As such, they represent a wide variety of perspectives within the field of student affairs.

Two IU landmarks, Dunn Meadow and the Indiana Memorial Union, were selected as the subjects of environment assessments. The information gleaned from these pieces of research is valuable and relevant to institutions of higher education nationwide. "The Barriers of Race and Gender: The Experience of African-American Woman in Higher Education" addresses the "chilly" climate often experienced by members of underrepresented populations. "Changing Sexual Behaviors of College Students" addresses the social climate on college campuses. "In Loco Parentis in Transition" discusses the philosophical underpinnings of higher education, while "Examining Graduate Preparation in Student Affairs" challenges us to take a closer look at the ways in which institutions of higher education prepare future student affairs professionals. Finally, "Student Affairs: A Return to A More Certain Future" provides analysis of the current state of affairs of student affairs.

We are grateful to several individuals without whom production of this year's *Journal* would not have been possible. We thank the outstanding Review Board for their careful evaluation of articles, the authors for their enthusiasm and eagerness to incorporate suggestions for revisions, and George Kuh for his continued support and training of the *Journal* staff.

Finally, we express our appreciation to the Indiana University Student Association, the Indiana University Student Personnel Association, and generous alumni whose funding makes publication of the *Journal* possible. We apologize for the delayed publication of this issue of the *Journal*. It is our sincere hope that future issues will receive adequate funding and be published on schedule. Once again, thank you for your continued support of our efforts.

Allison B. Block is a second-year graduate student in the School of Journalism. After earning a B.A. in English from the University of California, Berkeley, she worked as a writer, editor and public relations executive. Upon completion of her degree, she plans to continue her writing career.

Melody M. Snyder is a second-year master's student in CSPA. She completed her B.A. in English and German at the University of Nebraska at Kearney in 1993. She has served as a Graduate Resident Assistant in McNutt Residence Center and is currently a Graduate Advisor for the Indiana Memorial Union Board of Directors. She plans to pursue a career in student affairs.

STATE OF THE PROGRAM

Greetings from Bloomington! As always, thanks to you, interest in graduate study in higher education and student affairs at IU remains high. Last fall, 38 master's students and 15 doctoral students matriculated. For this fall, we received more than 600 inquiries (an all-time high) and more than 200 applications for admission to the master's program. About 250 people requested information about the doctoral program with 56 completing applications. Funds from the Bloomington campus and the School of Education allowed us, in partnership with employing offices, to provide fellowship support for four masters's and two doctoral students from historically underrepresented racial and ethnic groups committed to a career in higher education and student affairs.

After two years, we are now settled in our new location on the fourth floor of the School of Education building on the corner of Seventh Street and Rose Avenue (south of Ashton, west of Willkie North, north of Forest, northeast of Read). In March, just prior to the start of the American College Personnel Association meeting in Indianapolis, a reunion of higher education and student affairs graduates was held, in part to show off the new facility. Dr. Keith Miser (M.S. '69, Ed.D. '71) gave the keynote address at this gathering. Speaking of the ACPA meeting in Indy, a host of current and former IU folk were involved in the planning of that conference including Carol Cummins-Collier, Frank Borelli, Kathy MacKay, and Myra Morgan. The most important news is the addition of two new faculty members, Professors Guadalupe Anaya and John Thelin.

Dr. Anaya is a recent graduate of UCLA's Ph.D. program in higher education where she studied with Alexander Astin. During her graduate studies, she also worked with Professor Astin on several research studies dealing with "value-added" assessment, student outcomes, and a national faculty survey. Certainly worth noting is that Guadalupe is a Hoosier! Originally from northwest Indiana, she received both her undergraduate and graduate degrees from IU-Bloomington and worked in Counseling and Psychological Services and Latino affairs here before going to California. Her research interests include the study of college impact on student learning, and the collegiate experiences and academic achievement of Latinos and other minorities. At the 1993 meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education (ASHE) in Pittsburgh, she presented a paper titled, "Assessing College Student Learning: Comparing Alternate Measures." At the recent AERA conference in New Orleans, she presented another paper, "College Learning: Women and Men."

John Thelin teaches in the higher education program as well as in philanthropic studies, American Studies, and educational policy studies. His special interests are the history of higher education, philanthropy, and public policy. He especially likes using fiction, memoirs, biographies and documents for reconstructing higher education's heritage. In April, the John Hopkins University Press published his book, *Games Colleges Play*, a history of college sports scandals and reforms since 1920. His article, "Reasonable Doubts About Newman's University," was published in the Spring, 1994 issue of *The Review of Higher Education*. During the summer, John conducted research in archives for a study of the 1947

Truman Commission Report's influence on admissions, access, and financial aid policies for colleges and universities. In the Fall, 1994 semester he will teach a special topics course in Bloomington on the history of intercollegiate athletics, and in Indianapolis he will teach "Higher Education in the United States" (C654).

Philip Chamberlain completed his twenty-second year as Faculty Representative for the Indiana Memorial Union Board of Directors. He also served as consultant for the Catherine Booth Bible College in Winnipeg, Canada, which is preparing for accreditation. He continues to teach several doctoral courses, the introductory course in College and University Administration, and the College Student and the Law. He also developed a new course in leadership development. His article, "Fund-Raising Practice for College Unions," was published in the *ACUI-Bulletin*.

Don Hossler was on sabbatical leave for the Fall, 1993 semester continuing his research on student college choice. He also started the long ("very long" Don says) process of learning the Russian language. Along with six doctoral students, Don has been examining state funding policies for public institutions and financial aid programs in all 50 states. The book he co-authored with Larry Litten, *Mapping the Landscape of Higher Education*, will be published this fall by the College Board. Don returned to his teaching and duties as chair of the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies in January. Thus, graduating students again had the pleasure of writing their Capstone Seminar papers in his class!

John Bean, coordinator of the doctoral program, now holds a joint appointment with the inquiry faculty and taught Y620 (proposal writing) for students from throughout the School for the first time last summer. He presented a paper entitled "An Approach/Avoidance Behavioral Model of Student Retention" (with IU grad Shevawn Eaton) at last fall's ASHE conference. He was the keynote speaker at the Oakland University Faculty Forum on Student Retention in Rochester, Michigan. John devoted considerable time this past year developing a new Ed.D. degree program that requires 60 credit hours beyond the master's degree.

Jerry Preusz continues to play the key leadership role for students and courses on the Indianapolis campus.

Fran Stage is in her second year as Associate Dean for Research in the School of Education. In the summer of 1993, she taught Student Development Theory (U548) simultaneously to classes of students at Bloomington and Indianapolis using the interactive video technology now available in the Center for Excellence in Education. This past summer, she team taught that course with Guadalupe Anaya. Fran also is teaching an advanced doctoral research seminar. Her publications this past year include "Differences in Malaysian and American College Students' Study Patterns" in *Papers in Applied Linguistics* and "Fine Tuning the Instrument: Using Process Models for Work with Student Development Theory" in *The College Student Affairs Journal.*

My regular teaching assignments are Introduction to Student Affairs (U544), Environmental Theory and Assessment (U549), and two doctoral classes (Higher Education Administration and Campus Cultures). I did the closing session at the ACPA meeting, chaired the ACPA Senior Scholars this past year, and published papers in several journals (*American Educational Research Journal, Journal of College Student Development, Liberal Education*). I also contributed to two working documents, the "ACPA Student Learning Imperative"

(which was distributed at ACPA in Indianapolis) and the NASPA "Reasonable Expectations" project; only time will tell if either has an impact on the field. Personal highlights include election to the ASHE Board of Directors and the NASPA meeting in Dallas where I received the Robert H. Shaffer Award for Academic Excellence as a Graduate Faculty Member; the latter event was made even more special because Bob was able to attend.

The Indiana University Student Personnel Association remains robust, providing important professional development opportunities as well as social events for students, faculty, staff and others. Representing IU this year in the NASPA Case Study Competition were Dee Jordan who did her undergraduate degree at Loyola University of Chicago and Michael Farley, a graduate of the University of Florida.

As you know, the School of Education no longer provides resources to publish the *Journal*. Thus, we ask you to help us continue our tradition of excellence in student affairs preparation by making a contribution to IU and designating your gift for the *Journal of the IUSPA*. Most important, please stay in touch and continue to recommend IU to outstanding prospects. We would like to share news of your accomplishments so keep us informed. As always, we are very grateful for your continuing support.

AWARDS AND HONORS

Congratulations to these members of the Indiana University family on the following recognitions:

Terry Williams 1994	Elizabeth A. Greenleaf Award
Alice R. Manicur	1994 Robert H. Shaffer Award
Paula Rooney	NASPA Past-President
Terry Williams	ACPA Past-President
Karen Adams	Raleigh W. Holmstedt Fellowship Award
James C. Arnold	Raleigh W. Holmstedt Fellowship Award
Margaret P. Jennings	Raleigh W. Holmstedt Fellowship Award
	1993 Elizabeth A. Greenleaf Fellowship Award
Kathleen Cappelletti	1993 Elizabeth A. Greenleaf Fellowship Award
George D. Kuh	NASPA Robert H. Shaffer Award for Academic Excellence
Richard N. McKaig	Kate Hevner Mueller Award

CALL FOR NOMINATIONS

Nominations of individuals for the 1995 Elizabeth A. Greenleaf Award are now being accepted.

The Greenleaf Award is presented annually to the graduate of the master's degree program in Higher Education and Student Affairs, "exemplifying the sincere commitment, professional leadership and personal warmth characteristic of the distinguished professor for whom the award is named." Previous Greenleaf Award recipients include Vicki Mech-Fields, Keith Miser, Louis Stamatakos, Phyllis Mable, James Lyons, Paula Rooney, Joanne Trow, Carol Cummins-Collier, Thomas Miller, Frank Ardaiolo, Deborah Hunter, Vernon Wall, William Bryan, and Terry Williams.

The Robert H. Shaffer Award is presented to the graduate of the Indiana University Higher Education doctoral program who exemplifies outstanding service to the student affairs profession. Previous Shaffer Award recipients include John Welty, David Ambler, L. "Sandy" McLean, Thomas Hennessey, Jimmy Lewis Ross, Robert Ackerman, Don G. Creamer, Nell Bailey, and Alice Manicur.

Nominations for both awards will close on February 4, 1995. The awards will be presented at the 1995 NASPA and ACPA conferences. Please direct your nominations and supporting materials (e.g., vita) to George Kuh, W.W. Wright Education Building, Room 4228, 201 N. Rose Avenue, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN 47405. Thank you.

Playing in the Front Yard

Max Davis O'Guinn
Michael Farley
Matthew Supple
Jill Sabatino

Physical settings on college and university campuses, including outdoor areas, play an important role in student satisfaction. Their features influence the extent to which individuals are attracted to and satisfied with any given setting (Strange, 1991). It is important to consider the design and maintenance of outdoor environments because of their importance in portraying the personality of an institution. The settings reflect the values and traditions of the institution in a way that sets the campus apart from others (Thelin & Yankovich, 1987). Studying physical environments, especially outdoor settings, can provide meaningful information about how well the setting promotes the institution's mission and values. Using environmental assessment techniques, practitioners can evaluate how campus environments affect, and are affected by, students and other campus community members.

Dunn Meadow at Indiana University-Bloomington, is a multi-purpose outdoor area with a rich tradition of student activity. On a sunny summer day, dozens of people participate in an assortment of activities. Relaxing, sunbathing, expressing views on social issues, playing ultimate frisbee and exercising pets are activities that happen simultaneously in Dunn Meadow. The Meadow serves as the main area on campus for recreation. As Richard McKaig, Dean of Students at Indiana University states, "Dunn Meadow has the ambience of the campus frontyard—it's the home for unorganized events" (personal communication, May 25, 1993).

In addition to its recreational purposes, Dunn Meadow is the political heart of the campus (Millett, 1991), the place most campus protests and demonstrations occur. In the early 1960's, when student protests, marches and assemblies were frequent, a resolution was introduced in the Bloomington Faculty Council "to prevent further debacles over freedom of speech, protests, and orderly demonstrations by setting aside a place on the campus where anyone could speak freely to any audience, or to no audience" (Clark, 1977, p.557). It was suggested that a corner of Dunn Meadow be used for this purpose:

> To establish an easily available facility for spontaneous speaking and assembly, the University hereby designates an area of Dunn Meadow, immediately north of the Memorial Union Building, to be known as the Indiana University Assembly Ground and to be marked as such. Here, in particular, members of the University community may express themselves freely on all subjects, within the limits of applicable laws and regulations, with or without advance notice.
>
> (Official Board of Trustees Minutes, July 18–19, 1963, p. 14, Part 6, a, 2).

The Board of Trustees passed the proposal on July 18, 1964, officially designating Dunn Meadow as the space on the Bloomington campus for student assemblies.

The purpose of this study is to assess the Dunn Meadow environment in the summer, including the characteristics of those who utilize the space, as well as the perceptions of the purpose of Dunn Meadow compared to how the space is actually used. According to Dober (1992), "settings . . . define and celebrate a sense of place; communicate an institution's purpose, presence, and domain; and generate a public image charged with symbolism, graced by history" (p. 3). Dunn Meadow signifies such an institutional image created in response to student need.

A review of the literature on campus environments provides guiding theoretical perspectives: physical, perceptual, and human aggregate. The physical approach holds that all environments contain certain physical features, both natural and man-made, that influence human behavior by setting broad, but specific, limits on the behaviors and activities that can occur in any given setting; thus, some behaviors or activities are more or less likely to occur in certain settings than others (Strange, 1991).

The physical environment indirectly affects the social climate of a particular setting by attracting certain types of people. Moos (1979) reported that the physical characteristics of the environment affect perceptions, attitudes and values which directly influence behavior. Given the concept of the campus as a place intended to encourage contact and communication, a setting such as Dunn Meadow encourages both formal and informal meetings, events, and congregations that serve to enhance the social environment.

Koffka (1935, cited in Walsh, 1973), offers an alternative interpretation: how one internalizes or perceives the physical environment determines one's behavior. According to the perceptual approach, "the physical world can affect the individual only through his or her perceptions or experiences of it. It is the psychological environment, not the physical environment, that determines the way in which the individual will respond" (Walsh, 1973, p.2). Therefore, knowledge about individual and collective perceptions of an environment is needed to better understand how individuals are likely to behave. In this study, the users' perceptions of Dunn Meadow's environment and purpose determine its use.

The human aggregate approach assumes that the character of the environment is dependent upon the nature of its members. People tend to search out, enter, and remain in environments that are consistent with their interests and personalities. An environment dominated by the presence of a particular personality type, such as those used in the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator would likely reflect the characteristics of that personality type. One can, therefore, predict what will happen when a person is put into a particular environment.

Methodology

In order to conduct an environmental study of Dunn Meadow, the physical boundaries of the setting must be determined, as well as the inclusive range of meanings and activities located there, including sensory perceptions and purposes, memories, feelings, ideas, and orientations (Moos, 1979; Thelin & Yankovich, 1987; Walter, 1988). A multi-method approach was used to assess Dunn Meadow, allowing the researchers to take advantage of the various resources (Baird, 1988).

Physical Analysis

Jim Gibson, director of student activities, Richard McKaig, dean of students, and Dave Smith, from the University Architect's Office, were interviewed about the history and intended uses of Dunn Meadow.

Questions for these interviews differed according to the function of each office and its relationship to the site. Gibson and McKaig were both asked about the history of Dunn Meadow and the institution's dedication to the preservation of Dunn Meadow. Questions addressed to Smith covered the intended, current, and future physical and architectural designs for the area, as well as its landscaping and maintenance. Responses were used to direct the focus of the study and identify the historical characteristics of Dunn Meadow.

Instruments

Three instruments were used to collect data from people in Dunn Meadow. The first, the Personal Style Inventory (P.S.I.) (Hogan & Champagne, 1979), was used to determine what types of people use Dunn Meadow. The P.S.I. categorized respondents' behavioral preferences into personality trait dimensions: introvert/extravert, intuitive/sensing, thinking/feeling, and perceiving/judging.

The second instrument used was a questionnaire developed specifically for this study. Through multiple-choice and open-ended questions, respondents were asked about what they do when in Dunn Meadow, how often they use the space, how long they stay, for what reason they visit, and how they feel while in Dunn Meadow. The questionnaire also asked respondents to describe what they like most and what they would like to change about Dunn Meadow. Respondent anonymity was assured.

The third instrument, the Space Usage Observation Form (S.U.O.F.), was used to record behaviors observed in Dunn Meadow for a ten-day period. Each observation included the day of the week, the time of day, and the weather conditions. Those utilizing Dunn Meadow as a thoroughfare were documented by gender, by mode of transportation, and use of sidewalks or grass. The various types of activities, and where they were taking place, were noted with a designated symbol on the Dunn Meadow map.

Method of Data Analysis

Individual's scores of the P.S.I. were completed to determine the personality types of respondents in Dunn Meadow. The results were compared to identify any commonalities among respondents. Commonalities were then classified using a method similar to the Environmental Assessment Technique, in which absolute numbers for each personality type are converted to percentages of the total number of P.S.I.s completed (Holland, 1966). The environment is then represented by the highest percentage of each type, and is classified into the four personality categories of the P.S.I.

The qualitative questionnaires were compared to identify similarities and differences among responses. Conclusions were drawn concerning who uses Dunn Meadow and for what activities. Respondent demographics were also recorded in order to identify who uses Dunn Meadow.

The S.U.O.F.s were tabulated and inferences were drawn concerning the various activities recorded in the environment of Dunn Meadow. Gender of observed users was recorded.

Observations of individual activities were transposed onto a perceptual map of Dunn Meadow to determine the most frequent locations of certain activities.

Limitations

One limitation to the study was its seasonal nature. The study took place during a summer semester when student enrollment was considerably lower than the fall or spring. As a result, fewer people participated in various activities in Dunn Meadow than would have during the academic year.

The second limitation to the research was human error factors such as the subjectivity of choosing questionnaire respondents and the impossibility of making error-free observations. Since not all users of Dunn Meadow were questioned or observed, the results were not based on a statistically random sample, but rather on subjective selection. This limitation also affected the precision of the statistics offered in the results and the conclusion.

The third limitation of the study was the weather. Since the environment studied was an outdoor area, observed activities decreased, as anticipated, when the weather was poor. Results of the data obtained during poor weather conditions skewed total usage figures slightly.

Results

History of Dunn Meadow

Dunn Meadow has a rich tradition of student involvement. In fact, the acquisition of the land first known as Dunn Meadow was initially recommended by students in 1894. An editorial in the *Indiana Student* on April 17, 1894, called attention to the face that Purdue and DePauw had recently purchased extensive parks for athletic purposes. "Let us make it our ambition to secure, within the next five years, the Dunn Field north of the University as a playground" (cited in Myers, 1952, p. 387). The land was subsequently purchased in 1897.

Through the years, Dunn Meadow has undergone numerous dramatic changes, responding to the needs of the University and the students. Following the designation of an easily available facility for spontaneous speaking and assembly in an area of Dunn Meadow in 1963, student protests were numerous and varied. The Vietnam War years at the University were a period when students marched in protest and presented demands and petitions. This culminated in a student boycott of classes in 1969 involving over ten thousand students amassed in Dunn Meadow (Raines, 1969).

In 1969, guidelines were created governing the use of the free speech space known as Dunn Meadow (Campus Demonstration . . ., 1969). These guidelines include the disciplinary actions the University may take and in what circumstances; use of signs, symbols, or structures; and rules regarding the right to gather in other areas on campus. These parameters were constructed in an attempt to more clearly state the university's position and procedures regarding freedom of speech (Jim Gibson, personal communication, May 20, 1993). These guidelines have been amended on several occasions since 1969.

Although the name and purpose of Dunn Meadow have not changed, the actual amount of space defined as Dunn Meadow has decreased dramatically since the original purchase in 1894.

Physical Approach

Dunn Meadow is shaped like an isosceles triangle, approximately two blocks long and one block wide. The Jordan river forms a natural boundary on the south side, while Seventh Street and Indiana Avenue form the north and west boundaries respectively.

The Meadow has numerous shady areas along the sides of the river and roads where the observed activities were predominantly studying and exercising pets. There is a large, open, grassy area in the northwest corner with no shade in which all observed team sports took place. There is a paved sidewalk running parallel to the river, cutting the Meadow approximately in half. Group activities were observed taking place on the west side of this sidewalk, while individual activities (e.g., sunbathing, studying, eating) took place on the east side of the walkway. The majority of socializing (with one other person or a group) in Dunn Meadow occurred at these sidewalk intersections.

Results of total observations concluded that males accounted for 57% (3,221), and females 43% (1,361), of the users of Dunn Meadow. During every hour of data collection, more males were observed in the Meadow than females. Results also showed the three busiest one-hour time periods for Dunn Meadow usage were from noon to one p.m., eleven a.m. to noon, and four p.m. to five p.m. Those using the Meadow as a thoroughfare represented more than 87% (4,001) of the total observations (4,582). Of this 87%, males accounted for 59% and females 41%. Over 73% of all thoroughfare usage took place on the sidewalk, with walking representing over 77% of this figure.

When utilizing Dunn Meadow as a thoroughfare, males were twice as likely as females to use the grass. Significant results were considered to be differences of 30 percentage points or higher between male and female usage. This comparison shows males biked and jogged on both the sidewalk and grass more than females.

Significant results for activities occurring in Dunn Meadow were considered to be differences of 0.5 percentage points or higher between male and female usage. Females were observed talking with another person, talking with a group of people, exercising their pets, and tanning more often than males. Males were observed participating in non-team sports and undefined activities more frequently than females.

Average observed usage by time of day was also determined after dividing data collection periods into three categories. The noon to four p.m. time period was most used by respondents (43.5%), eight a.m. to noon ranked second (30%), and four p.m. to eight p.m. was third (26.5%).

Human Aggregate Approach

The P.S.I. was administered to twenty-five random individuals who were utilizing Dunn Meadow at the time. Only two users refused to complete a P.S.I., resulting in a 93% completion rate. Because of tied scores on certain traits, 33 different personalities were found.

Of the respondents, 79% were categorized as "Feeling" people, compared to 50% of the population of the United States and 61% had natural tendencies for intuitiveness, compared to 25% of the population with this natural inclination (Keirsey & Bates, 1984).

Questionnaire results concluded that all of the possible sixteen personality types were present in Dunn Meadow. The most common combinations found were ENFJ, ENFP, INFP, and INFJ. These four types represented 48% of those tested on the Meadow.

The study also identified four different temperaments of individuals who used Dunn

Meadow. The NJ temperament makes up only 12% of the general population of the United States, while 48% of the people surveyed in the Meadow exhibited this personality type combination. Results showed that while SPs represent 38% of the population of the United States, only 9% of the respondents of the P.S.I. had this temperament (Keirsey & Bates, 1984).

Perceptual Approach

The results of the questionnaire revealed that users' perceptions of Dunn Meadow's environment and purpose have an effect upon its usage. Of the ninety questionnaires distributed, all were completed and returned. No respondent refused to complete a questionnaire, resulting in a 100% completion rate. The results were then tabulated by both quantitative and qualitative means.

Over 78% of respondents were self-described students, 10% were visitors, 9% alumni, and just over 2% staff. No self-described faculty members completed the survey. Of the ninety respondents, 47% (42) were males and 53% (48) were females. The overwhelming majority of respondents described their ethnicity as Caucasian (89%), while 6% responded they were either African-American (3%) or Hispanic/Latino (3%). The remaining 4% were comprised of Asian-Americans (2%), Native Americans (1%), and other (1%).

On the questionnaire, respondents were first asked to identify how often they used Dunn Meadow other than as a thoroughfare. Given six descriptions from which to choose, ranging from never to more than five times per week, the two most frequent responses were: 1) only for special events (24), and 2) two to five times per week (20).

The most frequent responses to why respondents never used Dunn Meadow were: 1) they did not have enough time, and 2) they lived too far away. The most frequent responses to why Dunn Meadow was used often were 1) to play with pets, and 2) to socialize or recreate.

Asked when they used Dunn Meadow most, 87% of the respondents replied that they used it in the afternoon, 3% in the morning, and 1% in the evening. The remaining 9% did not respond to the question.

The next question asked how long respondents stayed in Dunn Meadow other than just passing through. Of the ninety respondents, 78% answered that they stayed in the Meadow for more than 15 minutes per visit. Nearly 39% indicated they stayed between 30 and 60 minutes.

Respondents were then asked what they usually do while in Dunn Meadow. The four most frequent responses were: 1) relax (15%); 2) socialize (14%); 3) study (11%); and 4) read (10%). The two least occurring responses were 1) demonstrate (2%) and 2) protest (1%).

When respondents were asked what their perceptions of the intended use of Dunn Meadow were, the five most common responses were: 1) to socialize; 2) to recreate; 3) to relax; 4) to protest and demonstrate; and 5) for special events. Seventy-nine of those respondents also felt that Dunn Meadow served its intended purpose well, two said it did not, and nine did not respond.

Respondents were then asked how they felt when using Dunn Meadow. The top five responses were: 1) relaxed (17%); 2) peaceful (14%); 3) content (12%); 4) happy (12%); and 5) free (11%).

The last two questions were open-ended providing the study with environmental referent information. The first asked what respondents liked most about Dunn Meadow. The most frequent responses included physical descriptions, location, and the diversity of activities and users. The second asked respondents to identify what, if anything, they would change about Dunn Meadow. The most frequent responses to this question included changing nothing and improving physical characteristics such as lighting, benches, and tables.

Discussion

In order to determine who uses Dunn Meadow, the study compared the results of the S.U.O.F.s and the P.S.I.s. The S.U.O.F.s provided limited demographic knowledge other than what percentage of the users were male and female and which gender used the Meadow at what times. Males represented 60% of the users while females only 40%. Males also outnumbered females using the Meadow at all times of the day.

In an attempt to identify what type of person uses Dunn Meadow, two different personality temperaments were studied. Results showed the NF temperament, which makes up only 12% of the general population of the United States, represented 48% of the people surveyed in the Meadow. Common characteristics of NFs include: passion, creativity, and genuineness. NFs strive to maintain their own individuality, but also seek out relationships, thrive on interaction, and enjoy socializing (Keirsey & Bates, 1984). These characteristics fit the personality types of a typical user of Dunn Meadow. Dunn Meadow was identified by respondents of the questionnaire as an excellent place to socialize and meet all types of people.

Results also showed that Dunn Meadow was perceived as a place where people went to be themselves and meet other people. Questionnaire respondents commented often that Dunn Meadow accommodates and attracts all types of people and is a good place to express individuality.

Evaluation of the P.S.I.s also indicated that while SPs represent 38% of the population of the United States, only 9% of the respondents of the P.S.I. had this temperament. It can be hypothesized that this type of person may not use Dunn Meadow because SPs are super-realists and extremely action-oriented (Keirsey & Bates, 1984). They enjoy such things as racing cars and skydiving. The slow, relaxed pace of Dunn Meadow would bore SPs.

Of the users of Dunn Meadow, 70% were "Feeling" people. "Feelers" prefer to be sociable and friendly. This helps to explain why the most frequent response to this question "What is your perception of the intended use of Dunn Meadow?" was "to socialize." Results obtained from observations also showed the largest percentage of people using the Meadow did so to socialize. All of these results helped confirm what activities occurred in Dunn Meadow.

Finally, the study compared the perceptions of the intended purpose and uses with the observed purpose and uses of Dunn Meadow. Self-reported perceptions were confirmed by the study's observed usage of Dunn Meadow. The three most frequent perceptions of intended use were confirmed by site observations, showing socializing, recreating, and relaxing to be the most popular activities on Dunn Meadow.

Consistency of respondent demographics might be explained as a reflection of campus demographics. Of the respondents, 89% identified themselves as Caucasian and 78% students. It would be interesting to study the affirming nature of Dunn Meadow to determine

if minorities as a percentage of the population actually use the Meadow less than Caucasians as a percentage of the population. This could be accomplished by choosing respondents who reflect the appropriate percentages of the campus population.

It is meaningful to note that the fourth most frequent perception of intended use of Dunn Meadow (for protests, demonstrations, and assemblies) was represented by only 3% of the questionnaire respondents. Of the eighty-one respondents who identified whether Dunn Meadow served its purpose well, seventy-nine responded yes. This shows a discrepancy between the perceived intended purpose of Dunn Meadow and the actual reason why respondents used Dunn Meadow. Further research should be conducted to explain this discrepancy.

Recommendations

Based on the results of this study and environmental referents from the questionnaires, ten suggestions have been identified to make the Meadow more convenient, safe and aesthetically pleasing. These changes require only minor physical changes to the existing environment.

First, picnic tables and benches should be added along the south bank of the river to attract more people to Dunn Meadow. This was the most frequent recommendation by those responding to the questionnaire.

Second, better lighting along the sidewalk parallel to the Jordan River should be added as an increased safety precaution for those who walk through Dunn Meadow at night. This was the second most frequent suggestion recorded on the questionnaire, and a possible reason for the lack of observed users in the Meadow after dusk.

Third, in recognition of the tradition surrounding Dunn Meadow, a plaque should be constructed next to the kiosk's current location in the southeast corner of the Meadow. The plaque should state some of the history of Dunn Meadow, as well as its designation as the free speech area and assembly ground on the Bloomington campus.

The next three recommendations were each suggested by respondents in roughly equal numbers. First, respondents indicated that the Jordan River was one of the most well-liked characteristics of Dunn Meadow, but its banks should be cleaned and maintained periodically. Second, many respondents complained about pet owners' lack of consideration for other Dunn Meadow users. With this in mind, signs should be posted on all exterior limits of the Meadow emphasizing owners' responsibility for cleaning up after their pets while in Dunn Meadow. Third, a drinking fountain should be installed conveniently located near the middle bridge on the north bank of the Jordan River to accommodate the 78% of Dunn Meadow users who stay more than fifteen minutes.

The next recommendation for improving the physical environment of Dunn Meadow is to rebuild the stage located on the south side of the Jordan River. The research team believes the current stage is a potential liability for the University and should be made more structurally sound and aesthetically pleasing.

According to Huebner (1989), a campus environment can influence the physical, mental, social, and spiritual well-being of students. The purpose of this study was to identify the activities that occur during the summer in Dunn Meadow, who participates in these

activities, and how the perceptions of the intended purpose of Dunn Meadow compared to the observed purpose. Further study of Dunn Meadow is suggested to obtain more information regarding the Human Aggregate Approach and the influence of the environment upon students. Studying Dunn Meadow during different periods of the academic year, such as August, December, and March is also recommended.

Implications

In light of the information obtained from this environmental assessment, campus officials should consider qualitative and quantitative assessment of significant areas on campus as a means of learning more about why specific settings become important to their constituents. Environmental assessments are also valuable in identifying who uses these settings, and for what purposes these areas are used as compared to their intended purposes. Understanding the history and functions of significant settings on campus, as well as their uses and space efficiency, is important in developing an attractive, unique institution whose setting communicates its purpose well and generates a positive public image.

The research team has attempted to demonstrate the process and value of performing an environmental assessment for an outdoor campus setting. The process of data collection and methods of analysis used in this study are examples of how such an assessment might be conducted. Although these worked best for this study of Dunn Meadow, each assessment requires a combination of different processes and methods, depending upon the needs and purposes of the evaluation.

References

Baird, L. (1988). The college environment revisited: A review of research and theory. In J. Smith (Ed.), *Higher Education: A handbook of theory and research* (Vol. 4, pp. 1–52). New York: Agathon.

Banning, J. H. (1989). Creating a climate for successful student development: Campus ecology manager role. In U. Delworth and G. Hanson (Eds.), *Student Services: A handbook for the profession* (pp. 304–322). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Banning, J. H., & McKinley, D. L. (1988). Activism and the campus ecology. In K. M. Miser (Ed.) *Student affairs and the campus dissent: Reflection of the past and challenge for the future*, (pp. 42–60). NASPA Monograph. Washington D.C.: NASPA.

Board of Trustees Minutes (1969 July 18), p.14, Part 6, a, 2.

Campus demonstration, picketing and assembly ground policy (1969). Handout from Student Activities Office, Indiana University.

Clark, T. D. (1973). *Indiana University midwestern pioneer, volume II, In mid-passage*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Clark, T.D. (1977). *Indiana University midwestern pioneer, volume III, Years of fulfillment.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Collins, D. C., & Byrd, C. K. (1992). *Indiana University: A pictorial history.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Dober, R. P. (1992). *Campus design.* New York: Wiley.

Ehrlich, T. (1987). Education and values. *Inaugural address of Indiana University*, p.8. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Holland, J. L. (1966). *The psychology of vocational choice: A theory of personality types and model environments.* Waltham, MA: Blaisdell Publishing Company.

Huebner, L. A. (Ed.) (1979). *Redesigning campus environments, New Directions for student services*, No. 6. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Huebner, L. A. (1989). Interaction of student and campus. In U. Delworth & G. Hanson (Eds.), *Student services: A handbook for the profession* (pp. 165–208). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Keirsey, D., & Bates, M. (1984). *Please understand me: Character & temperament type.* Del Mar, CA: Prometheus Nemisis Book Company.

Kuh, G., Schuh, J., Whitt, E., Andreas, R., Lyons, J., Strange, C., Krehbiel, L., & Mackay, K. (1991). *Involving colleges: Successful approaches to fostering student learning and development outside the classroom.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Millett, E.A. (1991). *The right foot 1991–92.* Bloomington: Indiana Student Publications.

Moos, R. (1976). *The human context: Environmental determinants of behavior.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Moos, R. (1979). *Evaluating educational environments.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Miller, M.R., & Banning, J.H. (1992). Campus Design: Guidance from voices of the past. *The campus ecologist, 10*(2), 1–4.

Myers, B. D. (1952). *History of Indiana University, volume II, 1902–1937: The Bryan administration.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Policy for the use of amplified sound in Dunn Meadow (1971). Handout from Student Activities Office, Indiana University.

Raines, K. (1969, May 5). "Myers against boycott." *Indiana Daily Student*, p.1.

Strange, C. C. (1991). Managing college environments: Theory and practice. In T. Miller and R. Winston, Jr. (Eds.), *Administration and leadership in student affairs* (pp. 159–198). Muncie: Accelerated Development.

Thelin, J. R., & Yankovich, J. (1987). Bricks and Mortar: Architecture and the study of higher education. In J. Smart (Ed.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research, Vol. III*, (pp. 57–83). New York: Agathon.

Walsh, W.B. (1973). *Theories of person-environment interaction: Implications for the college student.* Iowa City, IA: American College Testing Program.

Walsh, W.B. (1978). Person-environment interaction. In J. Banning (Ed.), *Campus ecologist: A perspective for student affairs* (pp. 6–16). Cincinnati, OH: National Association of Student Personnel Administrators.

Walter, E. V. (1988). *Placeways: A theory of the human environment.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina.

Wicker, A. W. (1979). *An introduction to ecological psychology.* Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Williams, T. E. (1987, June). *Student-institution fit: An ecological perspective.* Paper presented at Conference on Enrollment Management, New Orleans, LA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service 287 408).

Max Davis O'Guinn received his B.A. in political science from DePauw University in 1992, and his M.S. in CSPA in 1994. While at IU, Dave worked for Program Services at the Indiana Memorial Union and also as a Graduate Assistant at the Student Employment Office. Dave is currently the Assistant Director of the Hansen Student Center and Student Activities at Quinnipiac College.

Michael Farley graduated from the CSPA program in 1994. He earned his bachelor's degree in public relations at the University of Florida in 1992. At IU, Michael served as the Building Manager of the Indiana Memorial Union and the Graduate Advisor to the Interfraternity Council. Michael is currently a National Coordinator of educational and leadership programs for the National Interfraternity Council.

Jill Sabatino graduated from the CSPA program in May of 1994. She earned a B.S. in political science and exercise science from Ball State University. Jill was a Graduate Scholarship Advisor for Alpha Chi Omega sorority and very active in rush activities at IU. She is the Assistant Director of Student Activities at Southwest Missouri State University.

Matt Supple is a 1994 graduate of the CSPA program. He earned a B.A. in English from Depauw University in 1992. At IU, Matt worked for two years as an Assistant Coordinator in Foster Quad as well as in the Office of Student Activities. Matt is currently working as the Fraternity Advisor at the University of Maryland, College Park.

Examining Graduate Preparation in Student Affairs

Lisa Lorden

The first graduate program in student affairs was established in the early 1900's. Since that time, the primary purpose of graduate education in the field has been to prepare practitioners for various roles in colleges and universities (Penn & Trow, 1987). However, such graduate programs have come under increasing scrutiny. Critics question whether such preparation is relevant to actual practice in the fields; that is, whether graduate programs provide a set of competencies and skills essential to student affairs work. Thus, it is critical to address the issue of whether master's programs in student affairs provide relevant preparation that reflects the needs of professionals in the field.

According to Johnson and Sandeen (1987), "A general theoretical orientation should inform practice" (p.83). Graduate programs in student affairs provide a theoretical knowledge base that can guide and enhance the performance of practitioners in the field, similar to professional preparation in business schools (Goodchild & Fife, 1991). As with graduate programs in business administration, a student affairs curriculum often cuts across a variety of disciplines, including leadership, administration, and the social and behavioral sciences (David, Faith, & Murrell, 1991). The growth of programs in business administration and management indicates a recognition that this type of interdisciplinary training can contribute to the effective leadership of organizations (Goodchild & Fife). A student affairs graduate program curriculum that includes student development theory as well as environmental and organizational theory provides a fundamental framework for understanding student affairs work and guidelines for effective practice.

Furthermore, the increasing complexity of the college environment requires new knowledge and skills for those working in the field. According to Goodchild and Fife (1991), "The day of automatically assuming that a professor or scholar would make a successful dean, vice president, or president is over" (p.3). In the current climate of dwindling resources and an increasingly diverse student population, student affairs professionals must be knowledgeable about such issues as budgets and strategic planning, retention and enrollment management, and the unique needs of non-traditional students (DeWitt, 1991). A comprehensive graduate program in student affairs can equip practitioners with the expertise necessary to meet these challenges. Furthermore, student affairs academicians and practitioners alike are increasingly recognizing the necessity and value of practical work experience. Graduate assistantships and practicum requirements in many graduate programs enable students to acquire valuable experience in various functional areas of student affairs. Such coordination of academic study and work experience is crucial to the integration of theory and practice, thus enhancing professional performance in the field. Indeed, the successful attraction, preparation, and

retention of competent student affairs professionals may well be critical to the future of American higher education.

However, graduate programs in student affairs have been challenged for a variety of reasons, including the lack of a solid intellectual and scholarly base (Davis, Faith, & Murrell, 1991), a perception of programs as being too counseling-oriented (Johnson & Sandeen, 1987), and an impression that preparation programs are slow to respond to changes in society and the institutional environment (DeWitt, 1991). Furthermore, others have criticized the variability of graduate programs across institutions and an inconsistency in the curriculum content and quality (Keim, 1991). This lack of consistency may stem, in part, from the ambiguity of the student affairs field as a whole and disagreement about what components are relevant for professional preparation.

Students in graduate programs often confront a perception among the academic community that student affairs work in general is peripheral to the primary academic mission of higher education (Bloland, 1979). Student affairs professionals have been viewed by some as using "excessive jargon" or as lacking an understanding of the "complexities of higher education" (Johnson and Sandeen, 1987, p.85). In a rapidly changing and increasingly complex higher education environment, the set of counseling-oriented skills traditionally emphasized in master's-level programs is no longer sufficient. Professionals in the field require administrative and management skills, including budgeting, competence in the use of computers and other technology, and strong supervisory and leadership skills (J. Pica, personal communication, October 28, 1993). Opportunities for the development of such skills should be incorporated into both coursework and practical experiences. Furthermore, in order to ensure consistent quality, graduate programs in student affairs must have sufficient support from top administrators who allocate resources and funding (Goodchild & Fife, 1991). Therefore, research documenting and supporting the need for the student affairs profession is essential.

Although graduate programs in student affairs have the potential to provide a specific, degree-related learning experience to those who will assume critical roles in a highly complex environment, this potential has been underutilized (Goodchild & Fife). Given the extraordinarily wide variety of tasks performed by student affairs professionals, it is difficult, at best, for any one graduate program to adequately prepare people for such a diversity of roles (Johnson & Sandeen, 1987). However, Johnson and Sandeen assert that "a core curriculum and essential skills and competencies for the future should be identified" (p.86). Many authors agree that master's programs in student affairs should be regularly reviewed in order to ensure that they are pertinent and effective in preparing leaders to meet the challenges of the future (DeWitt, 1991; Goodchild & Fife; Johnson & Sandeen).

The future success of institutions of higher education depends on their ability to attract and retain effective leaders and administrators. Therefore, the quality of these leaders and the ways in which they are trained are issues of crucial concern.

> To debate the question of professional preparation is to insist that it continue to be responsive to changes in students, to change in the role and function of practitioners, to changes in society, and to changes in the art of education for the helping profession"
>
> (Pruitt, 1979, cited in Johnson and Sandeen, 1987, p.79).

Indeed, a continuing dialogue about what constitutes relevant and essential preparation in student affairs is crucial to the ability of the profession to meet the changing needs of higher education.

References

Bloland, P.A. (1979). Student personnel training for the chief student affairs officer: Essential or unnecessary? *NASPA Journal, 17*(2), 57–62.

Davis, T.M., Faith, E.S., & Murrell, P.H. (1991). Missions of higher education doctoral programs: Corollaries, constraints, and cultures. In L.F. Goodchild and J.D. Fife (Eds.), *Administration as a profession, New Directions for Higher Education*, No. 76 (pp. 47–67). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

DeWitt, R.C. (1991). Managing a student affairs team: It's a new ball game. *NASPA Journal, 28*(2), 185–188. Goodchild, L.F., & Fife, J.D. (Eds.) (1991). *Administration as a profession, New Directions for Higher Education*, no. 76 (pp. 1–3, 115–116). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Johnson C.S., & Sandeen, A. (1987). Relationship of guidelines and standards of student affairs preparation programs to current and future trends. In R.B. Young & L.V. Moore (Eds). *The state of the art of professional education and practice* (pp. 79–89). American College Personnel Association.

Keim, M.C. (1991). Student personnel preparation programs: A longitudinal study. *NASPA Journal, 28*(3), 231–242.

Penn, J.R., & Trow, J.J. (1987). Expanding graduate education. In L.V. Moore and R.B. Young (Eds.), *Expanding opportunities for professional education, New Directions for Student Services*, No. 37 (pp. 39–51). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lisa Lorden is a second-year master's student in College Student Personnel Administration. After receiving a B.A. in Psychology from the University of California, Santa Barbara in 1988, she worked in human resources, retail management, and as a singer/actress. Lisa is a Graduate Assistant in the Career Development Center and also works with the MBA program in the Graduate School of Business. After completing her degree, she plans to continue her work in student affairs.

The Barriers of Race and Gender: The Experience of African-American Women in Higher Education

Deanna Jordan

In her famous "And arn't I am woman" speech, Sojourner Truth addresses the compromising position experienced by many African-American women in today's society (Hudson-Weems, 1989). The predicament of this population in higher education, especially at traditionally white universities, reflects similar sentiments. In addition to sharing many of the same racial prejudices as their male counterparts, African-American women also experience the prejudices that beset their gender. Although the number of opportunities in higher education, for both women and African-Americans, has increased over the past several decades, current enrollment statistics indicate that African-American women are not taking enough advantage of these opportunities (Guy-Sheftal & Bell-Scott, 1989).

In an effort to learn more about the experiences of being a "double minority," three African-American women from the Indiana University-Bloomington campus (IU) helped shed light upon the experiences of their population. This paper will discuss previously reviewed literature and propose recommendations for student affairs professionals in regards to working with African-American women.

As student affairs professionals, it is important to acknowledge our personal stereotypes about different student populations. Through challenging our underlying beliefs, we can educate ourselves to better serve these populations. These interviews provided an opportunity for me to examine my own underlying beliefs about African-American women, as well as the image portrayed by society through sources such as the media.

Literature Review

Much of the recent literature reflects the belief that African-American women are deficient in academic preparation for college (Lindsay, 1984; Garibaldi, 1990). Numerous researchers argue that "the quality of academic instruction in many urban schools attended by African-American girls is not comparable to that in many white suburban schools" (Lindsay, 1984, p. 142). Programs such as Upward Bound provide African-Americans from disadvantaged school systems access to an education and college preparatory skills otherwise unavailable.

Researchers address the lack of appropriate guidance and counseling services at both the high school and college levels. When discussing factors that influence the success of African-American women in college, all three women concurred regarding a lack of support from their high school guidance counselors.

This frustration continues at the college level. Small academic programs can create a

fishbowl effect for the minority students in that program. One respondent commented, "It amazes me that teachers I haven't even had know me. It's like I'm an anomaly or oddball or something" (personal communication, Nov. 20, 1992). Sedlacek's (1987) research suggests that this singling out of African-American students, lowering expectations of African-American students, and providing overly positive response to academic work constitute prejudice.

A lack of role models at the university level also plagues African-American female college students (Sedlacek, 1987). The lack of African-American professors, and women in particular, at the university level is evident at many universities, including IU African-American students also frequently feel intimidated by white professors (Sedlacek, 1987). The assumption that they will not be understood or accepted leads many African-American students to avoid personal interactions with their professors in spite of the fact that they may need their help.

Many studies have indicated that African-American women involved in extracurricular and co-curricular activities are happier and more successful at the college level (Guy-Sheftal & Bell-Scott, 1989; Lindsay, 1984; Sedlacek, 1987). All three respondents seemed to support these findings. Researchers such as Sedlacek and Brooks (1976), Astin (1982) and Tracey and Sedlacek (1984, 1985, 1987) have found that identification with an institution is an important factor in retention of African-American students. While numerous African-American students also report that predominantly white campuses feel socially alienating, and only 38% of African-American students say that they feel like a part of the campus, these three women are involved in organizations that provide them with a social network, a community of peers and an opportunity for involvement on the IU campus (Blake, 1987).

Another theme in the literature is that African-American women experience higher levels of stress in college, including feelings of tension, alienation and non-acceptance (Guy-Sheftal & Bell-Scott, 1989; Lindsay, 1984; Parham & Helms, 1985). The obvious combination of sexism and racism seems to be the underlying factor in all of these barriers. According to Hudson-Weems (1989), the African-American woman's experiences are so different from those of white women, their needs must be prioritized to address both issues of gender and race. One specific obstruction is the classroom environment. The issue of a "chilly" classroom environment is experienced by many women, especially African-Americans. Lack of attention from professors, discounting of ideas contributed during discussion, and lowered expectations are all examples of factors which create this unwelcome atmosphere in the classroom.

Smith and Witt's study (1990) indicates that African-American women consider skin color a greater source of discrimination than gender. These findings were further supported by the respondents. A study by Gooley (1989) reveals that African-American women have a stronger gender consciousness, as well as a strong race consciousness. Too often African-American women are seen on the same level as African-American men in the struggle for racial equality; their gender issues are minimized. One woman stated, "Being a black woman is more of a challenge. People look past the fact that I'm a woman and see my color first" (personal communication, Nov. 30, 1992).

Recommendations

African-American women are trying to find a niche in traditionally white institutions of higher education despite many challenges. American colleges and universities, and specifically student affairs professionals, need to examine more thoroughly their response to the needs of African-American women.

One recommendation towards this goal is an institutional commitment to a diverse faculty and staff population. Based on the research and the responses of the three women interviewed, IU and many other campuses across the country do not have a faculty and staff that is representative of the African-American population. This denies African-American women not only professors that they can feel comfortable with, but also role models that they can look to for guidance and support.

Included in this diverse faculty and staff should be guidance and counseling services professionals specifically trained to recognize and meet the needs of African-American women. African-American women, as evidenced by the literature and the interviews, experience many stressors in college that can be overlooked or misunderstood by professionals. Providing support groups and special programs specifically for African-American women can aid in establishing a sense of support within the university.

Hughes (1987) found that student development programming specifically for African-American students is not being provided at colleges and universities. Student affairs professionals need to educate themselves about the specific developmental needs of African-American women and work to incorporate this knowledge into purposeful programs and interventions for this student population.

Educating students on campus about diversity, and specifically racism, is also important. Campuses should not continually look to the African-American student population to educate the rest of the campus about racism; rather, this programming should come from a wide variety of sources and receive the support of administrators on campus. Helping to create a learning environment where every student feels valued and able to learn should be the primary focus of this programming.

Another recommendation is stronger support of traditionally African-American student organizations, specifically those joined by African-American women. Traditionally African-American organizations provide a source of community and support, as well as a social outlet, for African-American women. These organizations need to be encouraged to participate on campus and recognized as an important aspect of campus life.

A final recommendation is for student affairs professionals at all levels to continue to examine their beliefs and challenge their paradigms about African-American women. Underlying assumptions affect our interactions with students. Realizing our own limitations makes us better prepared to help the students that rely on us for fair and equitable treatment.

Conclusion

The success of African-American women on traditionally white campuses, as exemplified by the respondents of this study, continues to evolve. However, these three successful women should not be the exception for their population on college campuses. Student affairs professionals need to help African-American women reach their potential by assisting them in finding their niche on predominantly white college campuses.

References

Blake, E. (1987). Equality for blacks: Another lost decade or another new surge forward? *Change, 19*(3) 28–31.

Garibaldi, A. M. (1990). Blacks in college. In University of Massachusetts (Ed.), *The Education of African-Americans* (pp. 91–97). Boston: William Monroe Trotter Institute.

Guy-Sheftal, B., & Bell-Scott, P. (1989). Finding a way: Black women students and the academy. In C. Pearson, D. Shavlik & J. Touchton (Eds.), *Educating the majority: Women challenge tradition in higher education* (pp. 47–56). New York: American Council on Education and Macmillan Publishing Co.

Gooley, R. L. (1989). The role of black women in change. *Western Journal of Black Studies, 13*(4) 165–172.

Hudson-Weems, C. (1989). Cultural and agenda conflicts in academia: Critical issues for Africana women's studies. *Western Journal of Black Studies, 13*(4), 185–189.

Hughes, M.S. (1987). Black students' participation in higher education. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 28*(3), 532–545.

Lindsay, B. (1984). African-American undergraduates in the United States: The case of African-American women. In S. Acker, J. Megarry, S. Nisbet, & E. Hoyle (Eds.), *The world yearbook of education: Women and education* (pp. 139–150). New York, New York: Kogan Page Publishing Co.

Parham, T. A., & Helms, J. E. (1985). Attitudes of racial identity and self-esteem of black students: An exploratory investigation. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 26*(2), 143–147.

Sedlacek, W.E. (1987). Black students on white campuses: 20 years of research. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 28*(3), 484–495.

Smith, E., & Witt, S. (1990). Black faculty and affirmative action at predominantly white institutions. *Western Journal of Black Studies*, 14(1), 9–13.

Deanna Jordan received her B.S. in Psychology from Loyola University of Chicago in 1992, and her M.S. in CSPA in May of 1994. She was an Assistant Coordinator in McNutt Residence Center for two years and is currently a Resident Director at Wake Forest University in Winston-Salem, North Carolina.

Changing Sexual Behaviors of College Students

Max Davis O'Guinn

Although most college students are aware of the deadly nature of HIV, many believe that HIV infection is not an issue of personal concern. According to the American College Health Association, one in every 500 American college students is presently infected with human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) and this number is rising. One of the major reasons students do not fear AIDS is because they do not see fellow college students infected with the disease. Because of the disease's long incubation period, symptoms, in some cases, can take up to ten years to become visible (Wickens, 1994). With an absence of an effective vaccine or treatment for AIDS, health professionals must capitalize upon the proactive role of education to stem the tide of this epidemic.

Many health educators and student affairs administrators assume that they are not responsible for informing students about AIDS. As Walters suggests, "it is a common fallacy that if educators provide the facts about HIV and AIDS, then students will reduce high-risk sexual behavior" (Walters, 1992). According to Kathryn Brown, an Indiana University Medical Center health educator, although the level of awareness is extremely high in college in terms of knowledge of AIDS, there is also a feeling that college students cannot get AIDS (Hahn, 1994, p.7). According to Weinstein, Rosen, and Atwood (1991), a large number of programs need to be actively directed toward altering risky behaviors of college students. The purpose of this paper is to suggest additional interventions by student affairs professionals and college administrators that focus on changing attitudes in order to reduce sexual behavior among college students, and therefore, reduce the transmission of HIV.

Several recent studies addressing AIDS knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors among college students have reported a dramatic increase in understanding of the disease. Two studies conducted at a private university in the South reported that, as a result of a vigorous AIDS prevention program sponsored by the university's student health center, students earned excellent scores on an AIDS knowledge test administered on campus. Unfortunately, however, the students believed that they were not very susceptible to AIDS and were unlikely to practice safe sex (Manning, Barenberg, Gallese, & Rice, 1989; Manning, Balson, Barenberg, & Moore, 1989).

A study by Weinstein, Rosen, and Atwood (1991) of 465 college and high school students resulted in similar conclusions. Although students involved in this study had gained substantial knowledge about AIDS, less than half reported a corresponding change in sexual behaviors. In addition, the number of partners with whom they were sexually involved since learning about AIDs had not decreased—3.5 (the number of sexual partners that respondents reported ever having) compared to 3.3 (sexual partners reported since learning about AIDS). "Thus, in general, knowledge about the disease, the immune system, and how AIDS is contracted is well known, but there is insufficient behavior change" (Weinstein, 1991, pp. 317–318).

Brown (1989) recognizes that college students' increased knowledge will not necessarily

prevent AIDS. The reasons for insufficient behavior change and for underestimating personal risk are diverse. Complex psychological factors are involved, including college students' illusions of invulnerability, the long incubation period of AIDS, drugs and sexual experimentation, underestimating partners' risky sexual behaviors, and acquaintance rape (Brown, 1989).

According to Walters (1992), "change in the behavior of individuals can occur if it is approached developmentally at the sensorimotor level" (p. 99). For example, couples who received information on eroticizing condoms by including them in foreplay had more positive attitudes toward using condoms than couples who were given condoms without instructions. This educational approach works as a positive intervention to risky sexual behavior.

Modeling is also a positive strategy for changing attitudes and behaviors. Women reported an increased willingness to have their partners use condoms after viewing a film where condoms were used (Walters, 1992). Educational interventions designed to help women decrease their inhibitions about possessing condoms, and/or increasing their influence in the sexual encounter will likely increase the frequency with which condoms are used during sexual intercourse (Sacco, 1991).

A highly effective way to incorporate such educational methods to change sexual attitudes and behaviors is through AIDS classes for college credit. According to a study by Strauss, Corless, Luckey, van der Horst, and Dennis (1992), a significant number of university students expressed interest in enrolling in credit-bearing courses on AIDS. The study proved that many positive and significant changes occurred in student knowledge and attitudes regarding AIDS during the time students were involved in such a course (Strauss et al., 1992).

An additional study of an AIDS course by Goertzel and Bluebond-Langner (1991) determined that all categories of college students learned more about AIDS by taking an AIDS class for college credit. Additionally, results included a modest decline in homophobic attitudes. Attitudes toward persons with AIDS were also improved and students gained a greater understanding of the gravity of the AIDS epidemic (Goertzel, 1991).

Studies have shown that interactions with persons with HIV or AIDS are the best means of changing students' behaviors. Indiana University-Bloomington, offers panel discussions with people that have had to live with someone who has succumbed to AIDS. Furthermore, Indiana University also offers an interactive program in which actors perform part of a skit and then ask for audience participation to determine the skit's conclusion. Audience suggestions are then incorporated into the skit.

Changes in sexual behavior involve the use of alcohol in conjunction with sexual behavior as well. Increased alcohol intake greatly reduces the likelihood of practicing safe sex. According to Butcher (1991), college course efforts to prevent HIV infection should address alcohol use and safer sex practices simultaneously and should make explicit the connection between these behaviors and risk of HIV infection.

Universities are presently utilizing a variety of educational methods, including university courses and information sessions, to help increase AIDS knowledge on their campuses. The next challenge is to significantly reduce AIDS-related or risky sexual behaviors. One approach which demands greater attention is the implementation of complex university credit-bearing courses that focus on different developmental levels appropriate for changing risky sexual behavior. Successfully reducing risky sexual behavior by college students can have a profound impact upon the direction of the AIDS epidemic on college campuses.

References

Brown, W. (1991). An AIDS prevention campaign: Effects on attitudes, beliefs, and communication behavior. *American Behavioral Scientist, 34*, 666–678.

Butcher, A., Manning, D., & O'Neil, E. (1991). HIV-Related sexual behaviors of college students. *Journal of American College Health, 40*, 115–119.

Goertzel, T., & Bluebond-Langner, M. (1991). What is the impact of a campus AIDS education course? *Journal of American College Health, 40*, 87–92.

Hahn, M. (1994). Students most at risk for any sexual disease. *The Bloomington voice*. February 16.

Manning, D., Barenberg, N., Gallese, L., & Rice, J. (1989). College students' knowledge and health beliefs about AIDS: Implications for education and prevention. *Journal of American College Health, 37*, 254–259.

Manning, D., Balson, P., Barenberg, N., & Moore, T. (1989). Susceptibility to AIDS: What college students do and don't believe. *Journal of American College Health, 38*, 67–73.

Painter, K. (1989, May). AIDS on college campuses. *USA Today*. p.23.

Sacco, W. (1991). *Gender differences in AIDS-relevant condom attitudes and condom use*. New York: Harpers.

Strauss, R., Corless, I., Luckey, J., van der Horst, C., & Dennis, B. (1992). Cognitive and attitudinal impacts of a university AIDS course: Interdisciplinary education as a public health intervention. *American Journal of Public Health, 82*, 569–572.

Walters, A., (1992). College students knowledge about AIDS and reported changes in sexual behavior. *NASPA Journal, 29*, 91–100.

Weinstein, E., Rosen, E., & Atwood, J. (1991). Adolescents' knowledge of AIDS and behavior change: Implications for education. *Journal of Health Education*, 22, 313–318.

Wickens, C. (1994). AIDS program focuses on education. *The Bloomington Voice*. February 16.

Max Davis O'Guinn received his B.A in political science from DePauw University in 1992, and his M.S. in CSPA in 1994. While at IU, Dave worked as a Programming Assistant for Program Services at the Indiana Memorial Union and also as a Graduate Assistant at the Student Employment Office. Dave is currently the Assistant Director of the Hansen Student Center and Student Activities at Quinnipiac College.

The Changing Student-Campus Relationship: In Loco Parentis in Transition

Michael Farley

From the late 1800s until the early 1960s, the relationship between a college and its students resembled that between a parent and child. Colleges stood *in loco parentis*, or "in place of the parent," and were the de facto and de jure guardians of their students' health, welfare, safety and morals (Gibbs & Szablewicz, 1987). This paper will describe current dilemmas facing the doctrine of in loco parentis and consider the historical and legal parameters that shaped them.

In loco parentis, an institution's right to limit the conduct of students as if it were their legal guardian, was articulated for the first time in the 1913 Kentucky Court of Appeals case, *Godd v. Berea College*. This decision gave colleges both the right and duty to act in place of parents in enforcing academic and nonacademic codes of conduct, as well as protecting the safety and welfare of its students (Thomas, 1991). For those who believe parents know best, this protection was acceptable or even desirable. However, for students craving the freedom to make their own choices, right or wrong, the regulations accompanying this form of nurturing incited resentment and rebellion rather than gratitude (Morrill & Mount, 1986).

In the wake of growing student activism during the 1960s, the legal concept of in loco parentis began to erode as a number of federal court cases provided new rights and freedoms for college students. This new body of case law was accompanied by a reduction in the accepted age of majority, a national increase in student enrollment numbers, a broader and more diverse student population in terms of ages and backgrounds, as well as other factors that decreased the applicability of in loco parentis on comtemporary college campuses (Ballou & Gregory, 1986). At the same time, the court demonstrated in *Bradshaw v. Rawlings* that higher education no longer had complete authority to discipline its students without the constraints of First Amendment protection and due process rights or fear of judicial intervention on the students' behalf.

As the idealistic and socially conscious 60's gave way to the "me-isms" of the cynical '70s and the competitive consumerism of the '80s, students and parents alike began to question the value of higher education and seek certain services that guaranteed retention and future success (Morrill & Mount, 1986). Some of these demands included a well-organized orientation to the collegiate community; more practical courses such as business, medicine and law; secured financial aid packages; academic advising and progress reporting; a growing desire for early career counseling and job placement services; enhanced leadership training; and opportunities for personal growth such as internships and study abroad.

These elements led colleges in general, and student affairs staffs in particular, to the realization that their energies should be refocused to create positive models of intellectual and psychosocial development outside the classroom. The student affairs philosophy ad-

vocating the application of human development concepts in post-secondary settings became widespread, and the definition of the college student not as a child or a consumer, but as a responsible adult member of the educational community became more accepted (Morrill & Mount, 1986).

In spite of its necessary bureaucratic features, the institutional community can assume a familial character without reverting to the traditional in loco parentis model. Through a shared system of decision making and planning, a basic environment of trust and mutual respect can exist. Above all, those who work directly with students should perceive themselves as educators and facilitators of personal growth, primarily concerned with helping to shape the environment in which students live. According to Morrill and Mount (1986), this also includes a sensitivity to the organizational dynamics of the community, an awareness of the developmental issues facing students, and the ability to support and strengthen student leaders in the exercise of their responsibilities.

While the "whole student" philosophy has garnered support in the higher education profession, American campuses in the last two decades have become increasingly litigious, adversarial, and contractual (Morrill & Mount, 1986). Prior to the 1960's, students had little chance of pursuing their grievances against a college in the judicial system because of the doctrines of sovereign and charitable immunity. Since then, courts have increasingly held colleges liable for damages in suits brought on by students. These decisions have set new precedents under contract, negligence and constitutional tort theory that will continue to have an impact on campus policy making and enforcement (Gibbs & Szablewicz, 1987).

Many court cases have been based either upon a vaguely defined special relationship between the student and institution or on the voluntary assumption of responsibility by either party. In most of these decisions, students claimed that the administration had not intervened enough to ensure their personal safety and welfare. This phenomena was evidence of the growing conservative sentiment that students were more willing to support rules, regulations, and restrictions on negative individual behavior than in the previous decade.

Although the call for more control by today's students might seem to invite the former doctrine of in loco parentis, it is, in fact, an illustration of the ambiguity of the student-campus relationship. Members of the administration, faculty, parents, and students have gradually accepted the notion that the proper function of the college is to assist intellectual and moral development rather than to direct it, and to advise rather than control it. Some contemporary professionals call this the "arms-length" version of in loco parentis (Fass, 1986).

To some observers and historians, current legal trends and campus climates have created a new form of in loco parentis under which colleges must protect students from physical harm but are not empowered to police or control their morals (Gibbs & Szablewicz, 1987). While a strict interpretation of in loco parentis may be outdated, these new tenets have emerged to take their place in the philosophical foundations of higher education. Included in this new definition is both a broader legal responsibility and a new nurturing and developmental function only suggested in the past.

Institutions of higher education today are both held accountable for the actions of their students and mandated to provide a full range of services and programs deemed essential to students' intellectual and psychosocial maturation (Ballou & Gregory, 1986). Because of the legal, ethical and developmental expectations and demands placed upon institutions,

it will become increasingly important for all segments of higher education to share in the responsibility of campus governance.

As Thomas (1991) illustrated, the changes in attitudes beginning in the 1960s have redefined the relationship between institutions and their students. Although no court has explicitly resurrected the doctrine of in loco parentis since the *Bradshaw v. Rawlings* decision, higher education faces complex new obligations and liabilities due to expanded theories of negligence, contract and guest/host laws. College administrators must walk a fine line between providing too much or too little regulation and protection, while remaining exposed to potential liability in both cases (Thomas, 1991).

Still, many members of the student affairs profession agree that the parenting function will continue to be a significant issue in higher education, no matter how or by whom it is defined. The success of future student affairs staff could hinge on how this new student-campus relationship is managed, making it vital to know and understand the capricious nature of college climates and developing roles.

References

Ballou, R. A., & Gregory, D. E. (1986). In loco parentis reinventis: Is there a parenting function in higher education? *NASPA Journal, 24*(2), 28–31.

Fass. R. A. (1986, January/February). In loco parentis revisited? *Change*, pp. 34–40.

Gibbs, A. & Szablewicz, J. J. (1987). Colleges' increasing exposure to liability: The new in loco parentis. *Journal of Law and Education*, 453–465.

Morrill, R. L., & Mount, C. E. (1986, January/February). In loco parentis revisited? *Change*, pp. 34–41.

Thomas, N. L. (1991, September/October). The new in loco parentis. *Change*, pp. 33–39.

Michael Farley graduated from the CSPA program in 1994. He earned his bachelor's degree in public relations at the University of Florida in 1992. At IU, Michael served as the Building Manager of the Indiana Memorial Union and the Graduate Advisor to the Interfraternity Council. Michael is currently a National Coordinator of educational and leadership programs for the National Interfraternity Council.

Indiana Memorial Union: An Environmental Assessment

Stephanie Danes
Deanna Jordan
J. Ritchie Morrow
William Woodward

The union of a university has long been seen as the campus center; the place where all constituents of the university can come to find a common meeting ground, and a sense of identification and comfort. The traditional union mission "emphasizes its contribution to the institution's educational goals; the union is a unifying force, building campus community" (Blackburn, 1990, p.15). The union provides "an oasis of quiet freedom, splendid activity, and simple pleasure" (Burdick, 1987, p.1). The Indiana Memorial Union (IMU) incorporates these ideas into its guiding philosophy. According to the mission statement, the IMU exists ". . . To serve as the community center for all members of the Indiana University community . . . To provide the services, conveniences, and amenities which are needed in daily campus life . . . and to serve as a point of identification—a unifying force—in the life of Indiana University" (Indiana Memorial Union, 1993, p. 1).

The analogy for the union as the front porch of the university is often used. The Director of the IMU describes the union as an integral place where members of the neighborhood —the university community—can spend time with each other, share ideas and concerns, feel like part of a community, and have their needs met.

The IMU's ideal sense of community is reflected through its history, constitution, mission, and values statement, all of which have been recently posted throughout the IMU. The history speaks to creating a welcome atmosphere bringing students, faculty, staff and alumni together. A primary purpose of the IMU is described in its constitution as bringing about a greater spirit of unity and cooperation among all students. Included within the mission of the IMU are the following two concepts: serve as the community center, and provide a point of identification—a unifying force—in the life of Indiana University.

The purpose of this study is to investigate students perceptions of the IMU and determine if their perceptions are consistent with the union's mission and front porch analogy. For the purposes of this study, the idea of the union as the front porch was assessed as follows: how comfortable students feel in the union, whether they feel a sense of identity with IU through the union, whether the union meets their needs, and if students are generally satisfied with the union. The frequency of participation in various activities and use of specific areas were also examined. Finally, the relationship between feeling a sense of identity and overall satisfaction with the IMU was compared to the respondents class year and ethnicity.

Blackburn states that how a union is perceived can impact its effectiveness and its objectives (1990). Therefore, this study uses the perceptual approach to research the

questions stated above. According to Strange (1991), perceptual models, "acknowledge that a critical element in understanding how individuals experience an environment is their subjective interpretation of that environment" (p. 161). In other words, students perceptions of the IMU will define the environment of the IMU, and evaluate whether or not the Union does as its mission guides. Additionally, the characteristics of age, gender, class standing, race, and housing of the respondents will be examined.

This study is important for several reasons. First, it will provide insight into what students actually do or want to do at the union. In addition, the study will serve as an avenue through which students can communicate their concerns, suggestions, feelings and perceptions about the IMU; all of which are especially significant in light of the recent and ongoing renovations. Finally, this study will provide feedback to the IMU staff about how well their efforts match students perceptions of these efforts.

Review of the Literature

Research has shown that the primary function of a union is that of a community center. Burdick claims that the university community "rests on the union foundation" (1987, p.1). While the literature also describes the union as part of the total education of students, as a programming center and as a provider of necessary amenities, it seems evident that the union's most important role is that of a community gathering place. Thus, as Butts suggests, "the union may have its highest value as a community center, a center which serves not just as a sheltering building structure, but as a unifying force in the university . . ." (Butts, 1987, p. 31).

If the union truly serves as a community center for all members of the university community, it is important to investigate how comfortable and welcome different populations feel at the union. Do all students feel as if they can go to the union for various purposes, or is there something about it that feels exclusionary? According to Fagan (1989), "Special efforts must be made to ensure that every subpopulation on campus (minority students, non-traditional age students) feels comfortable" (p. 36). Fagan draws an analogy between the union and a living room, describing both as places where people can gather, explore and discuss: "It is everybody's turf" (p. 35). She describes the union as ". . . a place that belongs to everyone, feels comfortable to all, and alienates no one" (p. 35).

Another theme common to the literature is the union as a place that addresses student needs. The union provides students with a place to study, eat, socialize, sleep, or buy books; in addition to having meeting rooms available for student organizations. In her living room analogy, Fagan (1989) describes the union as a place which, ". . . meets primary needs that are requisites to growth" (p.35). As Norman F. Moore, Vice Chancellor for Student Services at Louisiana State University notes, "Students still want what we call community. They need it and want it" (Think Tank , 1991). Above all, the union strives to meet the diverse wants and needs of the students.

Assumptions

Prior to conducting the study, the assessment team made several predictions based on pre-study observations in the IMU and discussion with the Director of the IMU. These included:

1. The ethnic ratio of those answering the survey would reflect the campus population.
2. Those respondents with majors housed in close proximity to the IMU would comprise a higher percentage of the respondents.
3. More upper-class students (juniors and seniors) who typically live off-campus would be more likely to utilize the union.
4. The ongoing construction in the union would be reflected in respondents comments.
5. Overall, respondents would be satisfied with the IMU and feel their needs were being met.
6. The IMU would be seen, according to the definition used in this study, as the front porch of Indiana University.

Methods

The discussion of methods for the assessment is divided into three sections: setting and participants, instrument, and data analysis.

Setting and Participants

Students using four different areas of the IMU participated in the study. These four areas were two study lounges, the Commons (a cafeteria setting used as an informal meeting area), and the seats located in a high traffic area on the Mezzanine floor. These specific environments were chosen because they are representative of frequently used areas which serve a variety of purposes.

A random sample consisting of 1% of the approximately 18,000 daily users of the union was surveyed. (This small percentage of respondents was manageable for a four-member assessment team conducting surveys.) Members of the assessment team distributed the questionnaires randomly to students in the four areas over the course of four days (Monday through Thursday) during specific time slots: 7:00–10:00 AM, 10:00 AM–1:00 PM, 1:00–4:00 PM, 4:00–7:00 PM, and 10:00 PM–2:00 AM. The total number of subjects who declined to participate in the study was 37. Before completing the questionnaires, subjects signed a consent form. The questionnaires were completed by the subjects and immediately collected by the assessment team member.

Instrument

The assessment team developed the questionnaire based on the literature review and a review of the College Student Experiences Questionnaire (CSEQ) by Dr. Robert Pace of UCLA. Items addressed on the questionnaire included: demographics of the student (age, class, major, race, sex, and housing); frequency of participation in specific activities (e.g. studying, eating, relaxing); and frequency of utilizing specific areas within the IMU.

Additionally, a Likert scale was used to determine level of satisfaction with five items that relate to the front porch description. These items were: comfort of the facilities; whether the union meets the needs of the respondent; whether the union provides a sense of identity with Indiana University; whether the union provides a sense of being part of the university community; and overall satisfaction with the IMU.

Data Analysis

The data from the questionnaire was analyzed by tallying the frequency of responses for each section in the demographics. Values were also found for frequency of participation in each of the specific activities listed, as well as specific areas utilized within the IMU.

Numerical values were assigned to each response on the Likert scale. The responses ranged from strongly agree (a value of 1) to strongly disagree (a value of 5). A response value equal to three was interpreted as neutral. Response values of one and two were combined, as were response values of four and five. A percentage for each of these three values was then calculated. A mean overall satisfaction score was also calculated. Written comments from the open comments sections were tallied and analyzed for recurring themes.

Results

The five Likert scale items were evaluated to determine the perceptions of the respondents. Frequencies of the demographic characteristics, participation in specific activities, and frequent areas used were also evaluated. These results are outlined in this section, followed by a discussion.

Demographics

The gender of respondents was 63% female and 36% male, with 1% not answering. The mean age was 21, with a range of 17 to 46 years. Forty-six percent of the respondents live off-campus, 27% on-campus, and 12% in greek housing, with 15% giving no response. Ethnicity of the respondents was found to be 67% white, 4% black, and 4% other. No response was given by 25% of the respondents.

The largest representation by class was senior, comprising 29% of the respondents. Sophomores comprised 22.3%, juniors 20%, freshmen 12.8%, and graduate students 10.6%. An additional 4.4% responded other, and .6% gave no response. Types of majors represented varied greatly, with the largest numbers being 22 Business majors, 15 Education majors, 10 Psychology majors, and 8 Journalism majors.

Participation In Specific Activities and Frequently Used Areas

Activities described by respondents as occurring very often included the following: meeting friends to socialize (22.5%), meals and snacks (21.9%), and participated in various activities (21.4%). Those described as occurring occasionally include: saw a film, concert or other special event (58.8%), played games (50.0%) and looked at bulletin boards for notices about campus events (46.6%).

Respondents listed the commons (36.9%), the South lounge (24%) and Sugar-n-Spice (17.9%) as areas described as being used very often. Areas the respondents most often described as being used occasionally include the bookstore (50.8%), the cafeteria (49.7%) and Whittenberger Auditorium (46.4%).

Perceptions of Respondents

The salient perceptions of the respondents were analyzed according to the following aspects.

Comfortable Facilities and Meeting Needs. Overall, 84% of those surveyed described the union as having comfortable facilities. Although many commented on the lack of comfortable furniture and inadequate lighting, only 6% indicated dissatisfaction with the comfort of the facilities, and 7% offered no opinion. Eighty-seven percent of respondents felt that the IMU was meeting their needs, with only 5% indicating dissatisfaction with this aspect. Five percent of respondents indicated no opinion.

Sense of Identity. Sixty percent of respondents indicated that they felt a sense of identity with Indiana University through the Indiana Memorial Union. Only 7% disagreed with this statement, while 30% offered no opinion.

Correlation coefficients were calculated to examine any possible relationship between respondents ethnicity and sense of identity. No significant relationship was found.

Feeling Part of the University Community. Sixty-five percent of respondents agreed that the union makes them feel like a part of the university community. Seven percent disagree, and 25% indicated no opinion. Several respondents commented about meeting friends at the union, seeing others while studying at the union and enjoying the operating hours.

Overall Satisfaction

Overall, 90% indicated that they were satisfied with the Indiana Memorial Union. The overall mean satisfaction score calculated equaled 1.74. Correlation coefficients were calculated for undergraduate respondents to examine any possible relationship between respondents class year and overall satisfaction. Also, ethnicity and overall satisfaction were examined for a possible relationship. For class year and overall satisfaction, no significant relationship was found. For ethnicity and overall satisfaction, no significant relationship was found.

Discussion

The following is a discussion of the findings as they relate to the front porch analogy. The discussion will address the perceptual model, the demographics of the respondents and their perceptions of the IMU. It is the perceptions of the IMU that will determine if the front porch analogy has been achieved. Following the discussion section, the assessment team examines the limitations of the study and concludes with recommendations.

Perceptual Model

The assessment team used the perceptual model to evaluate the environment of the IMU. This was used as a guide in developing the assessment tool. Also, the theoretical model was used to evaluate if the analogy of the front porch was being supported by the facilities and services provided.

Demographics

The majority of the respondents were female. The gender ratio of the Indiana University-Bloomington campus, according to the registrar is 52.7% female, and 47.3% male. As compared to the percentages found in the study, the results are representative of the male to female ratio at IU. The average age of the respondents (21) reflects the traditional-aged

student population at Indiana University. It also supports the assumption that more upper class students use the union.

The ethnicity of the sample reflects the campus ratio. These ratios obtained from the registrar at the Indiana University-Bloomington campus are 84.1% white, 4% black, and 11.9% other. The ratio of respondents were similar, with 25% giving no answer. While accounting for the 25% no answer category, the assessment team determined that the sample was representative of the campus population.

The class standing with the most representation was seniors. The combined percentages for juniors and seniors reflects that these students use the union more than the combined numbers of sophomores and freshmen. Since more upperclassmen typically live off-campus, this finding supports the assumption that more off-campus students utilize the IMU.

The final assumption was that majors housed in buildings in close proximity to the IMU will utilize it more. The highest represented major was Business, followed by Education, Psychology, and Journalism. This did not support the assessment teams assumptions. In addition to the fact that the IMU is a good meeting place for on- and off-campus students, the team decided that the best represented majors are those which have many group projects.

Applicability of Front Porch Analogy

Based on the assessment team's original definition of the front porch and the results of the study, it would appear that the IMU generally meets this definition. The results indicated that, although the union meets the students needs, provides comfortable facilities, and offers a wide variety of services, a strong sense of identity or community may be lacking.

The issue needs to be raised, however, of how applicable the concept of a front porch is to a campus as large as Indiana University. Although students felt that their needs were being met, they did not seem to include feeling a sense of identity with Indiana University as one of their needs. The frequency of agree responses to this question was less than other issues that were being measured. This may be due to the size of the institution and perhaps the size of the IMU itself. Students frequent the union for specific reasons, and while they are there may take advantage of the variety of services offered.

Perceptions

Facilities Are Comfortable. A large majority of the respondents were satisfied with the facilities. However, the open comments reflected a theme of dissatisfaction with the furniture and lack of adequate lighting in the lounge areas.

IMU Meets Respondents Needs. The majority of the respondents felt the IMU met their needs. The respondents frequently engaged in a variety of activities. Also, the respondents indicated that they use a variety of services that are provided at the IMU.

Sense of Identity. Over 60% of the respondents felt the IMU created a sense of identity with the university community, with 30% indicating no opinion. Also, no ethnic correlation was found for this response, indicating that in this study, students of color felt a sense of identity with IU through the union as often as white students.

Part of the University Community. Of the respondents, more that half agreed that the IMU made them feel like a part of the university community. One quarter of the respondents, however, responded that they had no opinion. Based on the no opinion responses, the assessment team hypothesized that the respondents did not understand the question.

Overall Satisfaction. Overall, the respondents were very satisfied with the IMU. The respondents may not perceive a strong sense of identity with the university and a sense of community as being important to overall satisfaction.

Limitations

The assessment team sampled a small percentage of respondents over a two week period of time in four specific areas of the IMU, therefore limiting the number of observations. Given the large number of people who use the union each day, it was not feasible for a major percentage of this population to be sampled. People who do not use the IMU, or who did not use one of the four areas sampled during the two week period could not be included in the sample.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are offered as suggestions for the union staff to help students gain a better sense of community and identity with Indiana University through the IMU.

Further Study

Continued research should be conducted that would include a wider sampling of the population that uses the union on a regular basis. Implementation of this extended survey should include students who are utilizing facilities in the union other than the four focused on in this study. Also, sending a campus wide survey would enable staff of the union to obtain information about students who do not use the union at all or on an infrequent basis. By analyzing this data, more could be done to attract people to the union to utilize its services.

Renovation

For any union with the tradition and history of the IMU, construction and renovations are inevitable. Several of the respondents in this study commented about the construction as a distraction, especially in the areas in which students normally study. One recommendation pertaining to this situation would be to post or publish a timeline for the construction. It is also recommended that signs are posted outside of the areas where construction or renovation is about to begin. This would give the students advance notice so that they could find alternate places to study or meet.

Sense of Community

Increasing the sense of community could best be accomplished through creating a sense of connectedness with others who are utilizing the union. There should be more programming that will first draw the people to the union, and then give a chance for more interaction among those who are there. Another suggestion would be to put more of an emphasis on publicizing the union's events in the residence halls so that the community that is felt in the halls can be brought with them to events in the union.

Student Related Concerns

Throughout the surveys, students offered many of their own suggestions for improvements that could be helpful for staff members who are interested in creating a more comfortable and welcoming environment for the students of the campus. One area in which students wished to see improvements is in the lighting of various study areas. Although increased lighting may alienate those who are accustomed to the dimmer lighting, concessions could be made in certain areas of those lounges. Another recommendation would involve keeping more rooms open in the evenings to create additional study spaces.

Another area in which students would like to see improvements is in the food selection. Comments were made about wanting to see more of a variety of foods in the Commons.

Conclusion

The research results reflect the need for further research on students perceptions of the IMU, and perhaps other unions. Overall, results indicate that students are satisfied with the IMU and the services that it provides. It can be stated from the research findings that the mission of the IMU is being achieved.

References

Blackburn, R. D. (1988). Back to basics: Unions reaffirms their campus roles. *ACU-I-Bulletin, 56*(2), 12–16.

Blackburn, R.D. (1990). Here's looking at you. The decade reviewed. *ACU-I-Bulletin, 58*(2), 8–15.

Burdick, C. (1987). Dialogue. *ACU-I-Bulletin, 55*(2), 1, 27.

Butts, P. (1987). The union as a community center. *ACU-I-Bulletin, 55*(6), 30–31.

Fagan, A.F. (1989). The college union: The living room of the campus. *ACU-I-Bulletin, 57*(1), 35–37.

Indiana Memorial Union. Indiana University publication, designed and distributed by the Indiana Memorial Union Director's Office, revised June, 1993.

Strange, C. C. (1991). Managing college environments: Theory and practice. In T.K. Miller and R.B. Winston, Jr. (Eds.), *Administration and leadership in student affairs* (pp. 159–198). Muncie: Accelerated Development.

Think tank report: Communicating how unions contribute to community. (1991) *ACU-I-Bulletin, 59*(2), 18–30.

Webster, D.W., & Sedlacek, W.E. (1982). The differential impact of a university student union on campus subgroups. *NASPA Journal, 19*(4), 48–52.

Stephanie Danes, a 1994 graduate of the CSPA program, earned a degree from the University of Michigan at Dearborn. Stephanie's assistantship was with Phi Mu sorority as a live-in scholarship advisor. She plans to pursue a career in the career services field.

Deanna Jordan received her B.S. in psychology from Loyola University in Chicago in 1992, and her M.S. in CSPA in 1994. She was an Assistant Coordinator in McNutt Residence Center for two years and is currently a Resident Director at Wake Forest University at Winston-Salem, North Carolina.

J. Ritchie Morrow graduated from the CSPA program in 1994. He earned a B.S. in Education from the University of Nebraska at Kearney. During graduate school, Ritchie worked as a financial aid counselor in the Office of Student Financial Assistance. Ritchie is currently a Financial Aid Counselor and Scholarship Coordinator at the University of Nebraska at Kearney.

William Woodward graduated from the CSPA program in 1994. He received a degree in Geography from the State University of New York at Albany. Bill was an Assistant Coordinator in Willkie Residence Center. He is currently the Coordinator for Residence Life at Eastern Carolina University.

Student Affairs: A Return to a More Certain Future

Louis C. Stamatakos
Professor Emeritus of Higher Education Administration, Michigan State University

"It is not the answer that enlightens, but the question."—Eugene Ionesco

Reforming Student Affairs

During the past quarter century, student affairs accompanied by an element of hubris heretofore never associated with its espoused altruism, decided to take control over its campus role, a role that, historically, was created in response to the changing needs of collegiate institutions and students and faculty abrogation of many of their traditional responsibilities (Mueller, 1951; Williamson, 1951). Contributing to the field's dissatisfaction during the decade of the 1960s, were problems associated with the sexual and social evolution which challenged collegiate institutions' traditional authority and control functions and students affairs' oversight responsibilities for on and off-campus student behavior. Also contributing to what many felt to be a compelling need for change were calls made for redefinition of *student personnel work* (Berdie, 1966), and a growing body of research and theories regarding student growth and development which appeared to lend itself to the essential educational and service work of the field.

The leaders of this *reform movement* called *student development*, believed that through the acceptance and successful application of developmental theory in student affairs work, the field would affect desirable developmental changes in students and, as ancillary or secondary consequences, the field would rid itself of what some perceived to be repugnant control and service responsibilities —while achieving its manifest destiny —that of acquiring the status of a *profession*, and overdue respect for its campus practitioners. Waving the "proactive" (sic) student development banner, we asserted, or certainly implied by our actions and publications (Brown, 1972; Crookston, 1972; COSPA, 1975; Miller & Prince, 1976), that we would discard some of the more onerous aspects of our subordinate role as support staff to the faculty and academic mission of our colleges (ACE, 1949), and become co-equal with the faculty.

Through our application and testing of developmental theory in the co-curriculum, and by establishing our own turf, so to speak, as "experts"' on college students' growth and development, the faculty would accept us as equal and collaborating colleagues (Stamatakos & Rogers, 1984). However, altruistic (or selfishly pragmatic) our intentions, we certainly could have justly been accused of the sin of vain-gloriousness!

Despite the lack of an agreed-upon philosophy of the field (Stamatakos & Rogers, 1984), or evidence of acceptance and agreement by the rank-and-file practitioners of student development's potency for affecting desirable changes in students, the apostles of student development began to build the foundations of our professional house on a sea of sand.

Rather than first addressing and reaching profession-wide agreement about student affairs philosophy (the foundations of a profession), student development's adherents plunged forward as if they possessed truths revealed to them in communion with the Absolute.

The document, Student Development Services in Post-Secondary Education (SDSPSE), (COSPA, 1975) laid the foundations for the content and directions of the reform movement. Later, a code of ethics (ACPA, 1981), and standards of professional preparation and practice (Council for the Advancement of Standards, 1986), were created to satisfy some of the criteria of a profession (Stamatakos, 1981), enhance our image as a *profession*, and improve our self-esteem by removing the stigma of being just *student personnel worker* or support staff. We encouraged the application of theory in practice, supported research and the creation of instruments to measure student growth, advocated creativity in organizational restructuring (Crookston, 1972), and urged developmental programming in the out-of-class environments of college students. Generally, and most unfortunately, most all of these activities were conducted in service areas and the co-curriculum, in isolation from the faculty and the basic instructional program of the college.

Hundreds of books and learned articles were published, and thousands of conference presentations were made exhorting student affairs practitioners and graduate students to be *developmental*. To be in vogue, almost overnight, or so it seemed, great numbers of programs sponsored by the American College Personnel Association's national conferences included the signal word *development* or *developmental*, while on campuses traditional programs and activities were renamed to include the term *developmental*, whether or not they actually included developmental components. Chief student affairs officers changed their titles and those of their divisions to reflect understanding, acceptance, and commitment to student development —even though there was ample reason to believe that: (1) the concept (or model) was not really very clear, at least not to many, (2) the faculty in preparation programs were not, as a whole, interested, or knowledgeable enough to teach it, (3) the theories were not proven valid, broadly applicable or well understood for correct application in the wide variety of collegiate settings and populations comprising American higher education, and (4) the more typical student affairs worker did not possess the understandings, skills, competencies to actually apply its theories with any degree of sophistication and confidence in actual practice.

To compound the unacknowledged confusion in the ranks about the concept or paradigm as it was championed and promulgated by its protagonists, *student development* was used to identify a model, a philosophy, a theory, a process, and an outcome. As well, as in the case of the term, "OK", it was used as a noun, adjective, and verb.

Simultaneously, we proudly addressed ourselves as applied behavioral scientists, specialists, consultants, collaborators, and facilitators of this increasingly amorphous something called student development, all the while being fully aware of the fact that few practitioners and theoreticians in the field of student affairs actually possessed the preparation, training, discipline, and experience for its successful application in the environment of the typical college.

Interestingly, throughout this twenty-five year span of advocacies, proliferation of literature, leadership at the national levels, and promulgation of student development's merits, very few voices were raised or heard which questioned or challenged the *new orthodoxy* of student affairs (Rhatigan, 1974; Bloland, 1986a and 1986b; Stamatakos, 1987a). Those who

did challenge or question its validity and viability were dismissed as obdurate, inflexible, heretics, or, humorously, 'the unwashed'. For all practical purposes their voices were as ineffective as if they had been shouting into the wilderness, for the converts to the *reform movement* were too consumed by the zealousness which often accompanies conversion to listen to the voices of experience, reason, or healthy and needed skepticism. Student development had been elevated to a divine status; it had achieved apotheosis!

Student development has had twenty-five or so years during which to be: (1) accepted as being the undisputed foundation of our work—philosophy and theory base, (2) taught as an *essential* component of the field's professional preparation programs, (3) proven appropriate for application in the work environment, (4) considered as being the basic content of our literature, (5) supported by quality research and evaluation findings proving successful application and efficacy within student affairs divisions and for securing continued administrative support, and (6) effective in returning student affairs to the academy (Brown, 1974). In other words, to 'make its case'.

A number of articles have been published about the student development movement in the past decade, most historical or anecdotal in nature and intended to encourage the faithful. Recently, however, a more comprehensive and systematic examination regarding its role, performance and future as an appropriate and valid rasion d'etre for student affairs has been published (Bloland, Stamatakos & Rogers, 1994). And, not too surprisingly to some of the movement's critics and growing body of skeptics within the field, evidence reveals that student development's glowing promises for reforming the field's methods, practices, outcomes and its role and place in student affairs and higher education, have fallen far short of such promises.

Analysis

1. As a philosophy, student development secured wide acceptance within the American College Personnel Association (ACPA). Among Chief Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA), however, it was not greeted with similar enthusiasm. NASPA's conference programs over the years will reveal a predominance of programs attending to daily bread-and-butter administrative matters. In its "New Century" report, NASPA (1987) addressed student development as an essential goal, but hardly in a manner comparable with ACPA's statements. Having been subjected to careful analysis using established criteria (Stamatakos & Rogers, 1984), student development as philosophy was found to be deficient and inadequate as compared with the Student Personnel Point of View (SPPV), (ACE, 1949). Student development (COSPA, 1975), was found to have disregarded or ignored the missions and goals of higher education, as well as cast the student's development as an end in itself —apart from the institution's curriculum and societal expectations of its educated citizens.

2. As an essential component of graduate professional programs, it has yet to be shown that the majority of the field's approximately one hundred programs have attempted, let alone qualified for certification using CAS standards which require a substantial component of student development theory and application. Significant additions to the curricula in recent years appear to have been those dealing with pragmatic subjects such as finance and budgeting, the law of higher education, planning, and the like.

3. As for being proven as appropriate for application in the work environment of the practitioner's field, student development theory has been found badly wanting (Bloland, Stamatakos & Rogers, 1994) in its ability to satisfy common denominators of good theory (Gergin, 1969; Hardy, 1973, 1978; Schrag, 1976). Student development theory is not a theory at all, but a disparate collection of theoretical perspectives, some far from having been proven adequate for the kind of application envisaged and advocated by developmentalists. Lacking an overall meta-theory to provide practice with guidance in application has compounded its inherent problems and will continue to mire the field with theoretical concepts lacking empirical bases, and prevent it from achieving accurate assessments of the effects of its interventions. This same inadequacy has reflected itself within the classrooms of graduate programs as faculty attempt to teach theory, as they try to help students translate theory into pragmatic and operational formats for workplace application, and as students attempt to apply theory in practica and internship settings which are not receptive and sometimes hostile to student development.

4. Any revolutionary movement within a profession would be expected, eventually, to reflect its importance in the profession's literature. A careful and systematic review of student affairs literature over the past twenty years, especially that literature which is more permanent and most likely read (hard and soft covered books and monographs), reveals that student development as the central theme or as a significant component, accounted for only approximately 9% of that literature. Of apparently far greater importance to the field's practitioners and consumers of its publications was literature on the overall administration of student affairs programs, enrollment management budgets and financing, multicultural and minority issues, law, alcohol and substance abuse, campus violence, and other practical matters (Bloland, Stamatakos & Rogers, 1994).

In applying five criteria to the student development literature which has been published, it was found that: (a) it was, in most instances, written with the student and practitioner in mind, and avoided highly technical matters, jargon, and pedantry; (b) conveyed a reasonable number of ideas and examples of relevant utility for the sophisticated practitioner, but ignored or did not take into account the level of professional preparation and experiential backgrounds of the *majority* of practitioners who, it can be said, are "paraprofessionals"; (c) was occasionally seriously flawed or negatively affected because of opinion, over-generalization, and paucity of easily implemented program models understandable to the typical practitioner; (d) ignored or easily dismissed the need for knowledge of educational philosophy, learning theory and processes necessary for successful practice; (e) confused the meaning of the term *development* through multiple interpretations (noun, verb, adjective, philosophy, paradigm, mission, goal, theory, process, and outcome); (f) too often provided theories for application which lacked adequate methodologies for assessment; (g) met only some of the five criteria of professional literature for affecting practice (Bloland, Stamatakos, & Rogers, 1994).

5. One of the hallmarks of the validity of any movement within a profession is the degree to which the field has: (a) translated that the movement's tenets and theories into workable formats for successful application in the field, and (b) secured the continued confidence of and support from the collegiate institution's officers and trustees. Unfortunately, student development's early promises have yet to reach fruition in any significant or convincing manner, given the findings of research on this subject (Bloland, Stamatakos & Rogers, 1994; Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991; Thrasher & Bloland, 1989).

There is a paucity of research conducted to empirically measure various facets of intentional student development (approximately 12.5% of a total of 128 journal articles, of which only 4 could be classified as either quasi or true experimental designs). Absent are control and comparison groups, a high number of studies reported significant results—results that beg the application of rival hypotheses that contend that the deliberate intervention may not have caused the significant result. All too many studies employed 'opportunity samples' as representative of larger populations, thus lacking external validity and throwing their results into serious doubt. Too much of the little research that has been conducted has been done independently, thus limiting the production of findings which can contribute to unified and coherent knowledge and understandings essential for developing a coherent field of knowledge and for developing a *profession* (Bloland, Stamatakos & Rogers, 1994).

Given these observations, it is hardly surprising that after decades of exhortations, advocacies, endorsements, commitments, and attempts to justify the efficacy of student development, and to validate the work of student affairs, there is no published record of significant numbers of Chief Student Affairs Officers (CSAO) compiling annual reports (for the review of executive officers and trustees) who have relied essentially upon the outcomes of intentional student development interventions. Reports continue to contain the more common compilations of numbers of students served and data revealing reductions in undesirable behavior.

6. In 1972, Brown envisaged a collegiate environment of the future in which faculty and student affairs (development) specialists would be essentially hand-maidens of the self-actualizing, individuating, ego-integrating or behaviorally developing individual student (Stamatakos & Rogers, 1984). Student development specialists, supposedly armed with their highly sophisticated knowledge of student growth and behavior, and skilled and knowledgeable about counseling, psychological foundations and dynamics, and intervention techniques, would be sought by faculty for the purpose of collaboratively and cooperatively affecting student development within and outside of the classroom.

Crookston (1972, 1976), Brown (1972); COSPA (1975), and Miller and Prince (1976) rarely mentioned some other major goals of colleges, such as education (Whitehead, 1929), research, service, and the development of responsible citizenship. Through such omissions the readers were left to infer that the student's wholistic development was higher education's, the faculty's and student affairs' only purpose! Unfortunately, it has taken us two decades or more to come to the realization (if at all among the faithful) that the movement intended to *reform* student affairs (some proclaimed, *reform higher education*), has not, in any significant way, affected either the essential practice, responsibilities, or accountability of student affairs, or, for that matter, affected the faculty's perceptions and expectations of student affairs workers as being anything other than administrators and paraprofessionals responsible for a host of essential support services and out of class educational and co-curricular activities. For evidence supporting the notion that student development practice has significantly affected: (1) the collegiate curriculum, (2) the integration of student affairs' developmental concerns into course syllabi, (3) faculty perceptions of student affairs professionals as co-equal colleagues, and (4) faculty involvement in student affairs work, one need not look into the major literature (excluding our own journals) of higher education covering the last two decades. To do so would be an exercise in futility. This finding should not be at all surprising since most students and

practitioners in the field would admit, candidly, that the majority of developmental programming administered by student affairs has occurred within the co-curriculum, not in the main tent of the college, the classroom, or in collaboration with faculty. Thus, it cannot be said that through the vehicle of student development student affairs ever returned to the academy in any manner similar to that envisaged by Brown (1972), COSPA (1975), Miller and Prince (1976), Crookston (1976) and others.

Since the early vestiges of the student development reform movement in the late 1960s, student affairs workers have shared confused notions about their role and place in higher education. On one hand, they have been subject to a top-down cascade of association-sponsored literature and papers written by student development advocates intended to persuade them to accept its tenets and to practice and promulgate the essential ideas, ideals, and methodologies of the student development reform movement as professionally qualified applied behavioral scientists. On the other hand, cynicism has developed among students and practitioners as confusion has been compounded by the inadequacies of their own professional preparation as a foundation for 'doing' student development, from the outcomes of their own experiences as practitioners, and by the absence of persuasive evidence of wide and successful application of student development theory.

In this sense, many of the visions, promises and benefits of student development for reforming student affairs practice and professionalizing the field were in many instances unproven, erroneous, and possibly overstated.

Indeed, the evidence is very persuasive in leading us to the conclusion that the student affairs house is not in very good order. That after more than two decades of unquestioned assertions, indoctrination, unchallenged organizational politics, policies and commitments, and major but well-intentioned experimentation upon unsuspecting college students, the halcyon days, if there really were any, are over. That a major reconceptualization of the role and place of student development as a major paradigm within and driving the practice of student affairs work may be quite overdue. If so, the perspicacious reader will ask, "toward what end?"

Some Observations and Recommendations

Seven years ago this writer (Stamatakos, 1987b), contended that by subscribing to a student development agenda, student affairs had distanced itself from rather than returning to the academy (Brown, 1972), and that the major precipitating factors leading to this unanticipated and unfortunate consequence were: (1) encouraging the abandonment of student affairs' traditional commitment to its *service and educational* support roles as subscribed to in the SPPV (ACE, 1949), by substituting *student development* as the field's raison d'etre, and (2) the insistence of student *developmentalists* in directing our training and practice in the manner of behavioral science experts, and the exercise of its applications in a manner generally disassociated from the instructional and roles of the faculty, the curriculum, and the classroom.

It was in this context that the writer recommended that student affairs give careful consideration to the comprehensive educational and developmental potency and proven viability of the general education curriculum of the college (Hickerson, 1981; Bloland,

Stamatakos & Rogers, 1994), as core and content of those learnings essential for the intellectual, social, spiritual, and emotional growth of college students. The writer contended that the profession's basic premises (first principles), values, roles and functions, and identity, had evolved and had been established through a century of valued service and educational work in colleges and universities, and were further confirmed by the SPPV (ACE, 1949). Furthermore, he contended that student affairs' future as a service and *educational* instrument of the college would certainly be assured only insofar as it reconceptualized its present self-image of developmentalists into a commitment to the basic tenets of the SPPV, and exercised its *educational* responsibilities in a manner which supported and enhanced the achievement of the goals of the general education program and curriculum of the college and university.

In this context he suggested that student affairs should continue to conduct its fine educational activities within the co-curriculum while simultaneously developing working relationships with the faculty which would result in the development of co-curricular educational programs and activities which intentionally support, enhance and reinforce those critically important core concepts, principles, values, learnings central to the general education program and the goals of the college. It would be through such educational activities and intentional relationships and the educational experiences of the student in the classroom and out-of-class life, that a high degree of congruence and impact could be reasonably assured.

If the profession is reasonably convinced that it is time to examine critically the actual record of student development's performance as its appropriate paradigm, and if it is reasonably convinced that student development is wanting, and that a reconceptualization of student affairs is in order, then it is morally obligated to confront its record willingly, openly and honestly. Organizational politics and priorities, personal and professional commitments, and fear of embarrassment should not continue to overwhelm facts and experience if the profession is ever to come to its collective senses.

For those who are willing to be circumspect, and in some respects daring, the following questions and issues will need to be addressed through discussions and debates in open forums of our professional associations at the national, regional, and state levels, and in our professional journals, graduate programs, and divisional staff meetings (Bloland, Stamatakos & Rogers, 1994).

1. The profession has before it two major documents which are purported to represent its philosophy, the SPPV (ACE, 1949), and the SDSPSE (COSPA, 1975). Can or should the profession continue to function as one, and with some degree of unity among its major associations, without resolving the differences, omissions, and conflicts between them? If not, then who should attempt to write or re-write the profession's philosophy? Should a joint task force be formed representative of the profession, co-sponsored and supported by our major associations for the purpose of reaching consensus about what the profession holds as basic principles (first principles), values, roles and functions (Stamatakos & Rogers, 1982), and to determine in what ways these philosophical elements contribute to its identity, and to its contributions to the achievement of the missions and goals of colleges? If not, then who should attempt to do the job? If the work is accomplished, then through what means should the philosophy receive careful review, and profession-wide approval?

Should discussions about a professional philosophy include concerns about (a) the generally accepted missions, purposes, and goals of higher education; (b) the extent and nature of student affairs contributions to the achievement of institutional goals; (c) the importance and significance of contributions student affairs can make; and (d) how student affairs can make those contributions?

2. If the general education curriculum of higher education best represents the colleges' core values, as those values are expected to become manifest in the educational process and students, in what respects are these educational values held important by student affairs? Assuming a high degree of congruence between the core values of the college and those of student affairs, in what ways can student affairs develop its out-of-class curriculum of valued learnings which will compliment and enhance the intended impact of classroom instruction?

If student affairs views its mission as essentially service and education-based, what is student affairs to teach? What would constitute its curriculum and syllabi? Would student development theory be helpful in developing instructional strategies and methodologies? Should student affairs seek the consultation, cooperative and support of the faculty in creating and administering its curriculum, syllabi, out-of-class and instructional methodologies and programs of educational intervention? If so, what knowledge, pedagogical understandings and techniques do the faculty possess for assisting student affairs in this manner? What would the faculty have to gain through such assistance and collaboration?

3. What kinds of experience, knowledge, and understandings does student affairs actually possess which can assist the faculty in making its general education curriculum and syllabi more vital and responsive to contemporary student needs, while keeping the intended learnings of the curriculum inviolate?

4. If student affairs were to respond to the call for its return to the academy through a commitment to the importance of general education, what role can the profession's knowledge and experience with student development theory and programming play in effecting the achievement of wholistic educational goals as those goals are reflected in the curriculum of general education, and, as well, in the co-curriculum and various support and service activities?

5. In what ways should the professional preparation standards of student affairs graduate programs (CAS, 1986) be altered to accommodate for student affairs' subscription to and alliance with the general education program of the college? Should learning theory and pedagogy receive attention in equal measure as that of student development? Should philosophy of higher education be a required component of the curriculum? Should practica and internships in formal and informal instructional settings be included in equal measure as those opportunities provided for student activities, service programs and developmental experiences?

There are a host of other questions which would need to be addressed before the task of student affairs' reconceptualization would approach completeness. For example, what effects would a reconceived concept have upon: in-service staff development, priorities and commitments of its professional associations, national, state and regional conference workshops and programs, professional publications, organizational arrangements and alliances across various administrative units of the college, organizational structure of student affairs divisions, and, lastly, although not completely, research and evaluation measures for determining student affairs' effectiveness?

Conclusion

The purpose of this paper has been to stimulate the serious consideration of the graduate student, practitioner, and professorate in student affairs administration in a manner which encourages healthy and needed skepticism, critical thinking, and questioning of student affairs' current commitments, priorities, practices and performance in contemporary higher education. Hopefully, the readers will soon be contributing to the needed and purposeful questioning, discussion and debate that has been relatively absent over the past quarter century.

In the best of all possible worlds, discussion and debate will lead to purposeful and concerted action on the part of all who have made a commitment to dedicate some part of their lives toward the improvement of their profession. And, it follows logically that improvement of the profession must ultimately benefit the quality of services we provide and the educational experiences of college students.

References

American College Student Personnel Association, (1981). Statement of ethical and professional standards. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 22,* 184–189.

American Council on Education (ACE), (1949). *The student personnel point of view.* American Council on Education Studies (Series VI, Vol. XIV, No. 13). Washington, DC: Author.

Bloland, P. A., (1986a). Student development: The new orthodoxy. (Part I) *ACPA Developments, 13*(3) 1, 13.

Bloland, P. A., (1986b). Student development: The new orthodoxy? (Part II). *ACPA Developments, 13*(4), 1, 22.

Bloland, P. A., Stamatakos, L. C., & Rogers, R. R. (1994). *Reform in student affairs: A critique of student development.* Greensboro, NC: ERIC Counseling and Student Services Clearinghouse.

Boyer, E. L. (1987). *College: The undergraduate experience in America.* New York: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Harper & Row.

Brown, R. D. (1972). *Student development in tomorrow's higher education: A return to the academy.* Student Personnel Series No. 16. Washington DC: American College Personnel Association.

Berdie, R. F. (1966). Student personnel work: Definition and redefinition. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 7,* 131–136.

Crookston, B. B. (1972). An organizational model for student development. *NASPA Journal 10*(1), 3–13.

Crookston, B. B. (1976). Student personnel: All hail and farewell. *Personnel and Guidance Journal, 55*(1), 26–29.

Council for the Advancement of Standards for Student Services/Developmental Programs (CAS), (1986). *CAS standards and guidelines for student services-developmental programs.* Consortium of Student Affairs Professional Associations.

Council of Student Personnel Associations in Higher Education (COSPA), (1975). Student development services in post-secondary education. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 16,* 528–542.

Gergen, K., (1969) *The psychology of behavior exchange.* Reading, MA: New York: Free Press.

Hardy, M. E., (1973). *Theoretical foundations for nursing.* New York: MSS Information Systems.

Hardy, M. E., (1978). Perspectives on nursing theory. *Advances in Nursing Science, 1*(1), 37–48.

Hickerson, J. D. (1981, March). *General education: A new force in student development.* Paper presented at the national conference of the American College Personnel Association, Cincinnati, OH.

Miller, T. A., & Prince, J. S., (1976). *The future of student affairs.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Mueller, K. H. (1961). *Student personnel work in higher education.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA), (1987). *A perspective on student affairs.* (Report of the Plan for a New Century Committee). Washington, DC: Author.

Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (1991). *How college affects students: Findings and insights from twenty years of research.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Rhatigan, J. J., (1974). *Student services vs student development: Is there a difference?* Paper presented at the national conference of the National Association of Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors.

Schrag, C., (1967). Elements of theoretical analysis in sociology. In L. Gross (Ed), *Sociological theory: Inquiries and paradigms* (pp. 220–253). New York: Harper & Row.

Stamatakos, L. C., (1981). Student affairs progress toward professionalism: Recommenda-

tions for action. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, Part I, 22(2), 105–122, and Part II, 22(3), 197–207.

Stamatakos, L. C., & Rogers, R. R., (1984). Student affairs: A profession in search of a philosophy. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 25*(5), 400–411.

Stamatakos, L. C., (1987a). Student affairs' brass ring: An allegory. *ACPA Developments, 14*(3), 2,3. Washington, DC: American College Personnel Association.

Stamatakos, L C., (1987b). *Educational leadership in student affairs: An issue of values.* Paper presented at the Visiting Speaker Program in College Student Affairs Administration at Indiana University, Bloomington, IN.

Whitehead, A. N., (1929). *The aims of education and other essays.* New York: The Free Press.

Williamson, E. G., (1961). *Student personnel services in colleges and universities.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Louis C. Stamatakos is Professor Emeritus of Michigan State University. He received three degrees from Indiana University, including his doctorate. He has served in higher education for seventeen years as a student affairs administrator in five collegiate institutions prior to assuming responsibilities at Michigan State University in 1967. Throughout his professional career, he has published thirty-seven journal articles, chapters of books, and books. Stamatakos has received numerous citations and awards from a variety of organizations and institutions associated with higher education. Most recently, NASPA honored him with the "Contribution to Student Affairs Through Teaching Award." Also in 1992, the Indiana University School of Education presented him with the "Outstanding Alumni Award." Lou resides in Okemos, Michigan, with his wife Bess. They have three sons, Philip, Theodore, and Timothy.

The Alumni Relations Committee within the Indiana University Student Personnel Association (IUSPA) is attempting to locate our alumni to update our files of our graduates and their current place of employment.

If you have a change of employment/position title, or if you want your name and address removed from our files, please return the information below. Otherwise, we will assume that all information remains the same.

Thank you for your time and support,

The Indiana University Student Personnel Association

IUSPA ALUMNI INFORMATION

Name: _____

Graduation year: _____

Degree: _____

Current position title: _____

Vocation address: _____

Phone number: _____

Please delete my name and address from IUSPA files: YES NO

Please send the above information (by December 1, 1994) to:

IUSPA Alumni Relations Committee
School of Education, room #4228
Indiana University, Bloomington, IN 47406-1006