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) 856-8362/8364

1997-98 JOURNAL STAFF

IUSPA Officers 1996-97

President	John Jobson
Vice President	Darin Junck
Secretary	Stacey Price
Treasurer	Claibourne Patty
Dir./Development	DeEttra Kudera
Dir./Outreach	Eunice Cabacungan
	Amy Oldfield
Dir./Prof. Dev.	Jennifer Forbes
Dir./Programming	Shannon Brown
	Kristen Heine
Dir./Relations	Patricia Alvarez

IUSPA Officers 1997-98

President	Sarah Thompson
Vice President	Meredith Curtin
Secretary	Rob Andrews
Treasurer	Eric Maguire
Dir./Development	John Lawler
	Sarah Waters
Dir./Outreach	Bob Brown
	Daletha McRae
	Tania Mitchell
	Josh Nolan
Dir./Prof. Dev.	Myrna Hernandez
Dir./Programming	Jessica Osit
Dir./Relations	Mike Eikenberry
	Deanna Peck

The *Journal of the Indiana University Student Personnel Association* is published annually by the Indiana University Student Personnel Association with support from the Higher Education and Student Affairs (HESA) Program. The *Journal* is produced expressly to provide an opportunity for HESA master's students to publish articles pertinent to the field of student affairs. The primary sources of funding for this year's *Journal* are alumni donations and student and departmental support. The important role that each of these contributors has played in the production of this edition is gratefully acknowledged and appreciated.

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	1990-1996
Dr. Bruce Jacobs	1996-1997
Dr. Teresa Hall	1997-1998

Editors

Ann Paloney, 1967
Michael J. Wiener, 1967
Marily Liechty, 1968
Dallas Bauman, 1969
George C. Dehne, 1971
Jane A. Lundahl, 1972
Helen Mamarchev, 1973
Winnifred Weeks, 1973
Elizabeth Brannon, 1974
Robert Cieslicki, 1974
Barbara Moudy, 1974
David Stacy, 1974
Dann Lobsinger, 1974, 1975
Ann Deborah Alter, 1975
Dianne Burnside, 1976
Richard Scott, 1976
Susan Hopp, 1977
Frank Araiolo, 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
Alison B. Block, 1993, 1994
Melody M. Snyder, 1994, 1995
Lisa P. Lourden, 1995
John Bean, 1995, 1996
Kelli Kaputska Smith, 1995, 1996
Suzanne J. Mendoza, 1997
Alan Rose, 1997
Jennifer Forbes, 1997, 1998
Ryan A. Forsythe, 1998

Journal of the Indiana University Student Personnel Association

Spring 1998 Edition

Contents

Editors' Comments 4
Jennifer Forbes, Ryan A. Forsythe

State of the Program 5
Teresa L. Hall, Ph.D.

Awards and Honors & Call for Nominations 6

Learning Leadership, Developing Leaders: Will the Student Affairs Profession Embrace the Challenge? 7
Lynn D. W. Luckow, Christopher R. Turner

The Effects of Fraternity Involvement 14
Patricia L. Alvarez, Eunice A. Cabacungan, John E. Jobson, DeEttra L. Kudera

History, Execution, and Opposition: Restructuring Higher Education 24
Ian Crone

A Study of the Effects of Academic Community Floors 29
Amanda Denton, Jennifer Forbes, Danny King, Claibourne Patty

Assessment of Student-Athlete Involvement in a University Residence Hall 39
Heather Diaz, Bob Gonyea, Darin L. Junck, Emily Ward

The Role of Women's Colleges in the Leadership Development of Female Students 50
Jennifer Forbes

International Students: An Introduction 57
Elizabeth James

Editor's Comments

Jennifer Forbes, Ryan A. Forsythe

Hello and welcome to the Spring 1998 edition of the *Journal of the Indiana University Student Personnel Association.* We are proud to present this latest edition which is representative of the contributions our program continues to make to the field of student affairs.

Annually we invite an esteemed graduate of our program to provide insight on the field through a featured article. This year, Lynn D. W. Luckow ('74), president and chief executive officer for Jossey-Bass, addresses the role of student affairs professionals in leadership development. This special interview, "Learning Leadership, Developing Leaders: Will the Student Affairs Profession Embrace the Challenge?", is our lead article. Each of our six remaining articles examine areas of interest or concern for the student affairs community. "The Effects of Fraternity Involvement" studies the impact alcohol use and member attitude has on academic performance. In the face of budgetary challenges, "History, Execution, and Opposition: Restructuring Higher Education" examines different methods of restructuring. In "A Study of the Effects of Academic Community Floors," information is presented regarding academic sub-environments of residence halls. "Assessment of Student-Athlete Involvement in a University Residence Hall" indicates the depth of involvement student athletes have on residence hall floors. Recommendations for how coeducational universities can better serve women students are offered in "The Role of Women's Colleges in the Leadership Development of Female Students." Finally, "International Students: An Introduction" reviews the issues surrounding and facing international students.

This edition of the *Journal* is only possible due to the dedicated efforts and support of the *Journal* Review Board; Teri Hall, our advisor; and Joyce Regester in the HESA department. We would also like to thank the Indiana University Student Personnel Association (IUSPA) and our generous alumni for their critical financial support of our publication.

Finally, this year's efforts in producing the *Journal* are a success thanks to the involvement of our first year co-editors, Nariah Broadus and Christopher Turner. We thank you and wish you the same support and dedication with which you have provided us.

Please enjoy this edition of the *Journal*!

Jennifer Forbes graduated from Indiana University with a Master's in Higher Education and Student Affairs in May 1998. While at IU, she served as an academic advisor with the Honors Division. She graduated from Carnegie Mellon University with a B.S. in Biological Science in 1994.

Ryan A. Forsythe graduated from the HESA program at Indiana University in 1998. He received his Bachelor of Arts in English and his Bachelor of Science in Psychology from The Ohio State University in 1996. At IU, Ryan worked as an Assistant Coordinator of Residence Life, most recently in Wright Quadrangle.

State of the Program

Teresa L. Hall, Ph.D.
Masters Program Coordinator

Spring has arrived in Bloomington — tulips are in bloom, Little 500 bike riders are training, and second year master's students are seeking employment. Spring also signals the end to another successful year in the Higher Education and Student Affairs Masters Program.

Interest in the masters program remains strong. This year over 600 students requested information about our program and assistantships. We were pleased to offer a centralized scheduling process for the two recruitment weekends. Prospective students sent resumes to each of the assistantship providers and a ranking sheet to the HESA department. Assistantship providers informed the department of the candidates they wished to interview and their available times. We then coordinated the scheduling process and students received a schedule which included important recruitment weekend activities as well as faculty and assistantship interview appointments. We intend to refine the process for next year.

We are working to increase the communication and cooperation between the HESA department and the student affairs practitioners on campus. The centralized scheduling process for the recruitment weekends is just one example of this. In addition, student affairs staff members served as practicum seminar discussion group leaders. Our goal is to better connect the learning experiences for our students from the classroom to the work setting.

Our faculty continue to be a strong asset for our program. Sarah Westfall, Ph.D. '95, was granted adjunct faculty status this year. Sarah has taught several classes for us including Administrative Practices, Introduction to Student Affairs, and Small Colleges. Sarah is an incredible teacher, practitioner, and mentor; we are fortunate that she will continue to work with the program. We are very proud of the fact that Fran Stage and Don Hossler were inducted as ACPA Senior Scholars this year; rarely have two individuals from the same institution been inducted at the same time.

The quality of work included in this publication is a testament to the continued strength of our program. As you know, the *Journal of the Indiana University Student Personnel Association* is self-supported and student-driven. We believe the *Journal* is one of the attributes that makes our program distinctive.

We know that it is the good work of and referrals from our graduates that contributes to the reputation of our program. Please continue to refer your best and brightest students to us. We welcome any suggestions or thoughts you may have on preparing students for roles in the challenging field of higher education and student affairs administration. We look forward to hearing from you.

Awards and Honors

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

Kathryn E. Goddard	1998 Elizabeth A. Greenleaf Distinguished Alumni Award
Helen L. Mamarchev	1998 Elizabeth A. Greenleaf Distinguished Alumni Award
Gary L. McGrath	1998 Robert H. Shaffer Distinguished Alumni Award
Tania Mitchell	1998 Elizabeth A. Greenleaf Fellowship Award
Sarah Thompson	1998 Elizabeth A. Greenleaf Fellowship Award
Jillian Kinzie	1998 August and Ann Eberle Fellowship Award
Heather Cummings	1998 Robert H. Wade II Fellowship
Timothy Stockton	1998 Kate Hevner Mueller Award
George Kuh	1998 Faculty Merit Award, Campus Life Division
Teresa Hall	1998 Professional Staff Award, Campus Life Division
Fran Stage	1998 ACPA Senior Scholar Inductee
Don Hossler	1998 ACPA Senior Scholar Inductee, NASPA Contribution to Research and Literature Award, and NASPA Region IV Graduate Faculty Member Award.

Call for Nominations

Nominations of individuals for the 1999 Elizabeth A. Greenleaf and Robert H. Shaffer Awards 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 Louis Stamatakos, Phyllis Mable, James Lyons, Paula Rooney, Joanne Trow, Carol Cummins-Collier, Thomas Miller, Frank Ardaiolo, Deborah Hunter, Vernon Wall, William Bryan, Terry Williams, Marilyn McEwen, Gregory Blimling, Lawrence Miltenberger, and Jamie Washington.

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 L. "Sandy" McLean, Thomas Hennessy, Jimmy Lewis Ross, Robert Ackerman, Don G. Creamer, Nell Bailey, Alice Manicur, Rodger Summers, Caryl Smith, and Donald Mikesell.

Nominations for both awards close February 2, 1999. The awards will be presented at the 1999 NASPA and ACPA conferences. Please direct your nominations and supporting materials (e.g., vita) to Teresa Hall, W.W. Wright Education Building, Room 4228, 201 N. Rose Avenue, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN 47405. Thank you.

Learning Leadership, Developing Leaders: Will the Student Affairs Profession Embrace the Challenge?

Lynn D. W. Luckow, Christopher R. Turner

This article is based on an interview with Lynn D. W. Luckow centered around leadership development training. The piece begins by exploring definitions of leadership, expectations of incoming students, the role student affairs plays in leadership development training, and what leadership skills are crucial for student affairs professionals. The article also examines whether student affairs preparation programs are responsive to the current need for leadership development training. In conclusion, suggestions are given for preparation programs and for student affairs practitioners or faculty members wishing to strengthen themselves in the area of leadership development.

Lynn D. W. Luckow is president and chief executive officer of Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers. After serving as an outside advisor for four years, Mr. Luckow joined the company in 1984 as Editor, Higher Education. This position was followed by increasingly responsible editorial and management positions, culminating in his present position in 1991.

Prior to entering publishing Mr. Luckow had been a leader in executive, professional and career education. He had developed and managed over 1,000 seminars, conferences and institutes, attended by over 75,000 participants.

Mr. Luckow is also extremely active in voluntary, philanthropic and leadership initiatives across the country. His involvements include: chair of the National 4-H Council's board of trustees, endowment and advisory board member for the musical group Chanticleer, past board member and chairman for Project Open Hand, past board member for the National AIDS Fund, and currently the national chair for Indiana University's Library Endowment Campaign.

Since we are going to be focusing on leadership development, what would you give as your personal definition of what leadership is?

Mr. Luckow — My whole life is devoted to leading organizations. Leadership for me has a lot to do with authenticity, in who I am as a person. It's about being able to create a clear vision that others are willing and interested in following. For me, it is having and communicating a sense of purpose, and being able to encourage and reward others. Leadership is building a team type of effort.

There are so many ways of thinking about leadership. For me, it's about vision, purpose, authenticity, communication and credibility with a constituency. It is about having place as a person. In some ways it's like a calling.

What experiences have you had that have shaped this definition?

It has really been shaped over a long period of time, from early years in scouting and as student body president in high school, to running student organizations in college and serving as president of my fraternity. After that it has been

shaped by being board chair of a number of nonprofits, studying and teaching leadership, heading Jossey-Bass, and leading parts of the company before I became president.

You do several speaking engagements each year, staying in contact with the youth of this country. What would you say are their expectations of higher education in the area of leadership development?

I would say their expectations are high. In the youth I see today, they expect that they will have opportunities to lead once they enter higher education. They also have very high expectations relating to the type of course work or experiences they will have available to them in order to learn more about leadership. And it's not that past generations have not been strong and interested in leadership, but I see an extraordinarily strong and vibrant new generation about to enter our colleges and universities.

Much of my work recently has been with 14, 15, and 16 year-olds, watching them create some of their own organizations locally and even nationally. There is a rapidly emerging movement for their voices to be heard, and not just voice for voice's sake, but these youth are very smart and articulate. They really do want to affect change, and to affect change takes leadership, acumen, and experience.

In discussing the formation of this article you wanted to focus on leadership development on campus. What are the responsibilities of student affairs professionals in this process?

If you look across the university and say "where should leadership development reside," you will find a few students taking classes in the business school because they believe that is where their life career is, but for the vast majority of students they are not going to the business school to take a class. So, where should responsibility reside? I believe it should reside with the office of student affairs. This is a key area where student affairs professionals can do their work, become involved, and actually take the lead.

I am not saying that campuses are not doing this, as I know a number of them are, but I think leadership development programming needs to be done in a more overt way. For example, one school developing some cutting-edge leadership development programs is the University of California- Berkeley. *[Ed. note: More information on this program follows the interview.]* These types of programs not only benefit current campus organizations, but also the future of our organizations in this country. When students leave, if they can attribute some of their own leadership development back to the campus experience, and the overtness with which the office of student affairs provided leadership training and development opportunities, it will not only improve the benefits to that university in terms of creating healthy alumni, but it will create a healthier society as well because we have better leaders.

What skills do you think are crucial for every student affairs professional to possess?

To me, much of leadership starts interpersonally, or actually intrapersonally. Many people think that leadership is just a skill set, and the key to learn how to be more effective at time management, or strategic planning, or whatever. There certainly are a variety of those skills, but over and over what we know about effective leadership is that it comes from learning to know one's self. Gaining confidence in one's self. Being authentic. Understanding more of why you, as an individual, happen to be on this earth at this time. Understanding one's own passion and purpose. Understanding how one makes a commitment to something, or does not make a commitment to something. Leadership has a lot to do with a sense of what one would like to change in an organization or in the world. So many of these things come out of an individual internally.

Thus, to know thyself is a key skill, and then to determine what types of programs could lead to that knowledge in others. There are a number of different things to engage in to accomplish this, from therapy to individual coaching programs. These are things that are a little riskier than most universities are willing to take on, to get people to really look inside, be honest with each other, tell the truth, things that are a bit more experiential. Some of the best leadership development programs act almost like group therapy. But anything at all that a student affairs professional can do to become more authentic and self-aware of himself or herself would be helpful to encourage this same journey in student leaders.

Another skill has to do with being able to establish a clear vision or draw from other people in order to create a vision for an organization. To me, vision, mission, organization, and strategic planning all work together. This said, the skill of authenticity and knowing one's self forms a very helpful foundation for the visioning skill. From a strong personal base, it is then easier to draw other people out, and have insights into what is possible for an organization or what kind of mission might be developed to light the pathway to create change, or whatever. So, there is a skill set around establishing a clear vision and mission and engaging in strategic planning, and I think there are a number of straightforward courses and workshops where this skill set can be acquired.

Another skill set is around communication. A leader must be able to articulate and communicate his or her dreams, hopes and aspirations. Because when you look back to the original idea of knowing one's self, what you are really knowing is values. It takes well-honed communication skills to have the ability to articulate and communicate your own value set, the value set you see in a particular organization, or where you would like the organization to go.

Another skill set coupled with all of those mentioned above is facilitation. There is a rich literature that is beginning to emerge around facilitative leadership. We are seeing that dreams do not always emerge out of one leader full-blown, they often come through that leader or someone else facilitating a group. Through dialogues and discussions, consensus can be built, bringing people to a common sense of purpose. Because of this, understanding and being able to

practice facilitation and consensus building is a key skill set.

Lastly, as I briefly mentioned earlier, leadership has to do with interpersonal skills in general. A part of this is being able to encourage other people. A reward structure is more common in a business organization, but even in a student organization, leaders need to be able to encourage others. Encouragement in and of itself can be a reward. Leaders also need to know how to challenge others to be more of who they are.

What would you say are the responsibilities of higher education/student affairs preparation programs in developing new professionals in this area, and do you think these programs are responsive to the current need?

I think preparation programs have the ultimate responsibility to educate professionals in this arena. It's like, who else is going to do it? Leadership development is so fundamental to the success of every student, I don't see how student affairs professionals could avoid knowledge and skill in it. All students need some involvement in leadership. Life requires leadership at home, at work, in the community, and college and university graduates are most definitely expected to take on leadership roles when they leave higher education.

Higher education needs to be more honest and involved and less passive in this area. It needs to be more strategic and clear about this being a part of its role and responsibility. I have only heard a deep commitment in this area from a few universities. It certainly does not seem to permeate the student life literature, even though over the past decade we have learned so much about leadership.

Some still believe either you are a born leader or not, and that is such a mistake. Warren Bennis shocked an audience once by saying that leadership cannot be taught, it must be learned. In essence, he was saying there is a certain locus of control for becoming a leader, and that comes from within. What higher education needs to do is make a commitment that those opportunities and encouragement to learn leadership will be available not only through student organizations, but through an active program of leadership development as well.

What types of things would you recommend doing in these graduate programs to better equip student affairs professionals?

Student affairs preparation programs ought to be preparing leaders by including a strong leadership development component in the graduate curriculum. If preparation programs offered professionals-in-the-making opportunities to engage in leadership development and the types of experiential labs essential to self-knowledge, more professionals would be better able to bring this base to campus when they return. Many times people who have had no training in leadership development are asked to formulate leadership development programs, and there is a huge gap in their ability to do so.

I think student affairs/higher education preparation programs need to take more risks in developing leadership knowledge and skill. They should create courses in the curriculum that lead to greater self-reflection and prepare professionals for more experiential types of work. Common sense tells us that these additions will lead to more effective leadership by student affairs professionals in colleges and universities and thus, more experimentation and comfort with student leadership development.

The last time I was back on campus (Indiana University, Bloomington) I was visiting with a strong and intelligent group of faculty members. I turned to them and said, "How many university presidents do you know in the country that are effective leaders, and leaders that you admire?" Not one name surfaced. We have a lot of work to do in leadership development in our own profession.

The student affairs profession is extremely values based, in terms of always wanting the best for the student. This is a very heart-felt profession, and there is no better time than now to look at the importance of leadership development. The values of the student affairs profession and the leadership development profession are in synch, but the practices of each are not. I am reminded of the words of James O'Toole who said that leading at any time ought not be by push, but by the pull of inspiring values. As a values-based profession, student affairs professionals are at a great point in history to make changes in their own preparation and provide leadership. Ultimately, leadership development needs to be at the core of the student affairs curriculum and for that matter the undergraduate curriculum. It is not an elective in anyone's life, it is of the essence.

What advice would you give a student affairs practitioner or faculty member wanting to fill a gap in the area of leadership development?

I would tell them to acquire books that speak to the heart of leadership. The literature can be daunting, but Jossey-Bass recently began publishing "Leader to Leader," a quarterly that really distills leadership to its essence. There are also terrific weekend and week-long programs all over the country. A key part of leadership development is to model the way, and this can best be done by engaging in those activities ourselves. I would tell them try to get out there and participate in experientially-based leadership development programs.

There is the Center for Creative Leadership in Greensboro, North Carolina for example. Through the program, participants receive 360 degree feedback. Materials are completed anonymously by peers, people who report to you and by your supervisor(s). The feedback is discussed in small groups and everyone learns from that setting. It acts sort of like group therapy. This would be a great program to enroll in.

I would tell them to take the risk of getting involved in group therapy. Too many leadership development programs are seen as feeding the brain, but so much of authentic leadership is about feeding the soul and heart, and knowing one's own values and ideas. To be effective, leaders need the ability to be vulnerable.

Several years ago I taught a class called *The Human Condition 2,000 A.D.* We looked at life and key concepts. It did not take long to realize that there is no way we can accurately predict the future, but that we will be in better shape

if we have a strong sense of self, and the ability to draw people together and draw them out. Leadership is so much about personal stuff, so I often wonder why do we keep ignoring it?

Do you have any additional comments in conclusion?

I continue to be perplexed at the lack of awareness for the need for leadership development in the preparation of the student affairs professionals. It is clearly such a key element of a professional's own success in higher education, but moreover, it is equally essential in being able to offer students leadership development opportunities. I believe strongly that the graduate curriculum in student affairs needs an overhaul, and that leadership development should be placed at its core. And for those student affairs professionals already practicing, the leadership development journey will be one of the most rewarding ever, if they dare take it.

Additional information about Jossey-Bass can be found at* ***http://www.jbp.com/index.html*

Additional information on the Center for Creative Leadership in Greensboro can be found through their web site at* ***http://www.ccl.org/*

Supplemental information on the aforementioned University of California, Berkeley leadership development program.

All information below was provided through personal communications with Thomas F. Durein on April 20, 1998. Durein is a Student Affairs Officer in the Office of Student Activities and Services at the University of California, Berkeley, Course Facilitator for one of the LEAD classes, and Co-Coordinator of the LEAD Institute.

The LEAD (Leadership Education and Development) program, unique to Berkeley, is sponsored through a grant from the Hewlett Foundation. The focus of the program is undergraduate students, and is "aimed at community building and leadership development across differences. This particular program is not just targeted at teaching leadership, but developing leadership across all types of cultural, social and economic boundaries."

This program is student affairs driven, in conjunction with the Office of Residential and Family Living. All student affairs staff members are involved in the LEAD program in some way, parallel to Luckow's suggestions above. There are a number of individual programs under the umbrella of LEAD, but there are two important classes involved in the program. The first class is marketed to anyone across campus, teaching basic leadership skills. The second class is geared to upper-division students that have significant leadership experience. "This class takes leadership one step further... by studying theories and models, and discussing how they relate across cultural differences."

Other components involved in the LEAD program are the LEAD Task Force, the LEAD Institute, a workshop series, and a minigrant program. The Task Force is a student driven committee that steers the overall LEAD program,

while the Institute is responsible for highly concentrated weekend conferences centered around using intergroup leadership to transcend differences. The workshop series is comprised of two-hour workshops presented throughout the year on several different leadership topics. Finally, the minigrant program allocates funds for smaller, more specific student leadership programs.

Visibility and the overtness Luckow mentioned in his interview are also key components in this program. "We do everything we possibly can to get it (publicity and information about the program) out there."

Additional information on the LEAD program can be found through their web site at* ***http://www.uga.berkeley.edu/sas/leadhome.htm*

Lynn D. W. Luckow holds a 1971 Bachelor of Arts degree from the University of North Dakota, and a 1974 Master's degree in higher education administration from Indiana University, Bloomington, where he was recently awarded the 1997 Distinguished Alumni Award for Outstanding Achievement in the Field of Education. He has received several other awards for his service, including an honorary Doctor of Humane Letters degree from Golden Gate University in San Francisco, and is currently a member of the Stanford University Publishing Course faculty.

Christopher R. Turner is a student in the Higher Education and Student Affairs Program at Indiana University, Bloomington where he is currently an Assistant Coordinator at Foster Quad Residence Center and a Marketing Associate in the Office of Communications and Marketing. He holds a Bachelor's degree from Wichita State University, and served for two years as a residence hall director.

The Effects of Fraternity Involvement

Patricia L. Alvarez, Eunice C. Cabacungan,
John E. Jobson, DeEttra L. Kudera

The article illustrates the findings of a study assessing the effects of fraternity involvement on the academic performance of the members of two all-male social fraternities. The fraternities studied are both Greek letter organizations at a large Midwestern research institution. One of the fraternities was selected based on its high chapter-wide academic achievement. The other fraternity examined in this study was selected on the basis of its poor chapter-wide academic performance. The current study found results that are consistent with previous literature. Specifically, relationships were found to exist between the academic performance of the chapters and such measures as alcohol usage and a peer environment that was supportive of academic performance by the individual members.

There has been significant literature in higher education regarding the effects that the campus environment has on the development of college students. In recent years, many articles (Parker & Gade, 1981; Pennington, Zvonkovic & Wilson, 1989; Winston, Hutson & McCaffrey, 1980) have focused on the Greek system as a sub-environment of colleges and universities. This sub-environment has been studied in order to assess the effects that fraternity involvement has on members.

Assessing the effects of the peer environment, as well as alcohol use in fraternities, is important because of the number of colleges and universities that maintain active Greek systems. In recent years, the Greek systems at many colleges and universities have been criticized for having a negative effect on their members (Kuh & Lyons, 1990). However, the Greek system should not be generalized as having only negative effects. The results of this study support previous literature, which asserts that fraternities do positively affect their members (Parker & Gade, 1981; Pennington, et al., 1989).

The purpose of this study is to examine the peer environments of two fraternities and how the environments affect members' academic performance. The objective of this paper is to discuss aspects of the fraternity peer environments that have both positive and negative effects on the academic performance of its members, as measured by grade point average (GPA). This paper will begin with a literature review discussing the peer environment, as well as the relationship between alcohol use and grade point average. The method section will then provide information regarding the sample and the procedure used for this study. Next, the results section will provide information obtained through this study. Finally, this paper concludes with a discussion and implications section that will tie information in the literature review to the results of this study.

Literature Review/Theoretical Framework

Peer Environment

The study will assess components of the fraternity peer environment to determine potential effects on members' academic performance. Astin (1993), in noting the influence of the peer environment in regard to the behavior of individual students, stated, "the student's peer environment is the single most potent source of influence on growth and development during the undergraduate years" (p. 398).

Peer interaction in the fraternity environment is different from most other peer environments on a college campus. In order for potential fraternity members to become fully involved, they must first engage in an initial pledging period. Engaging in pledging has been cited as having a negative effect on the academic performance of the participants. Bowker (1994) noted, because pledging is a time consuming activity, "students undergoing the pledge process perform at lower academic levels than their non-pledging colleagues" (pp. 268-269). In addition, students pledging take fewer credits during the pledging semester than their non-Greek peers and "have higher drop rates for the classes that they do take" (Bowker, p. 269).

Despite this potential for negative effects associated with pledging, Butler (1959) found that fraternities where current members (actives) gave a large amount of support and encouragement to the pledges were more likely to experience increased academic achievement. Butler also found that pledges of high achieving fraternities considered the expectations of the actives to be reasonable and that pledges were provided with an opportunity to closely observe academically successful members. Based on this finding, it was noted, "if the active demonstrated an intellectually curious attitude and an interest in supporting group activities, then the pledge would tend to imitate this behavior" (Butler, p. 139).

A study by Winston, Hutson and McCaffrey (1980) also lent support to the belief that the relationship between active and pledge held significant influence in regard to the academic performance of new members. They offered that fraternities which value academic achievement have pledges who "tended to adopt that attitude and contribute to maintaining relatively high grades for the whole group" (Winston, et al., p. 450). Conversely, fraternities that did not value academic achievement "tended to remain at the bottom of the list of fraternity grade point averages and to transmit those attitudes from student generation to generation" (Winston, et al., p. 450).

Another study which specifically addressed involvement in the Greek system and the impact of peer influence on academic achievement was conducted by Binder, (as cited in Lord, 1997), who examined factors that shape the first-year GPA of fraternity members. He found three significant variables — one of which was the chapter GPA. As Binder states, "If the chapter has high grades, the student's grades will go up, but if he joins a group where people don't give a flip about scholarship, his grades go down" (as cited in Lord, p. 96). Binder's findings reinforce previous research, which supports the notion of peer group influ-

ence on academic achievement.

Relationship between Alcohol Use and Grade Point Average

Much research (Engs & Hanson, 1989; Hill & Bugen, 1979; Maney, 1990) has indicated that students who drink alcohol, particularly heavy drinkers, earn lower GPAs than students who do not consume alcohol. Alcohol use is of particular importance when assessing the Greek environment, in light of Tampke's (1990) finding that Greeks, in general, experience higher consumption levels of alcohol in comparison to non-Greek students. Additionally, Maisel (1990) noted that alcohol abuse was a problem frequently associated with Greeks.

Rapaport and others (1984) utilized a sample of 927 undergraduate students in a study that examined the frequency of alcohol consumption and the negative consequences of students' drinking. The results indicated that higher GPAs tended to be associated with lower amounts of drinking.

The study holds two hypotheses. The first is that a positive correlation will exist between the importance that a fraternity places on the academic performance of its members and the fraternity-wide performance as measured by the chapter's GPA. Second, it is held that a negative relationship will exist between the use of alcohol by fraternity chapters and their academic performance.

Method

Sample

The sample size for this study consisted of 85 males from two predominately White fraternities at a large, public research institution in the Midwest. The fraternities were chosen based on their academic ranking as determined by a list of self-reported GPAs compiled by the Office of Student Activities at the institution. The rankings on this list were based on each fraternity's overall college GPA. Fraternity A was selected from the seven fraternities on the list having the highest average GPAs and Fraternity B was selected from the seven chapters on the list having the lowest average GPAs.

The president and scholarship chairman from each chapter were interviewed. These men were selected to be interviewed due to their leadership positions within the house. The remaining participants in our sample population (the general membership of Fraternity A and Fraternity B) completed a survey.

Procedure

The presidents from both fraternities were contacted and asked for their cooperation. The researchers met with each president and explained the purpose of the study and the methods to be employed. After receiving confirmation from each fraternity president regarding their willingness to participate in the study, appointments were made by the researchers to visit and observe the physical and peer environment of the fraternity, to distribute the survey at a chapter meeting, and to interview the presidents and scholarship chairmen.

The interviews with the president and scholarship chairman from each fraternity lasted approximately 30-45 minutes each. The main purposes of the interviews was to clarify information gathered from the survey and to assess the

interests and values of the individuals who have a significant influence on the fraternity environment.

Survey responses were compiled in an effort to gain an understanding of the perceptions held by the general membership in regard to academics in the fraternity. Survey response rates for Fraternity A and Fraternity B were 60% and 58% respectively. This instrument helped to assess the academic behavior of the fraternity members. The survey also helped researchers gain a better understanding about the peer environments of the two fraternities. The peer environment was important to assess based on Astin's (1993) assertion that peer group has a strong influence on college students' growth and development. The survey instrument contained yes/no questions and questions using a Likert scale about academics and alcohol use, and open-ended questions about academics.

Analysis

Data gathered from the surveys were analyzed using SPSS. T-tests were used to compare means from the surveys of Fraternity A to means from the surveys of Fraternity B. This enabled the researchers to compare the views of members from the two fraternity houses regarding how they perceive the effect of their physical and peer environment on their academic performance.

Chi-square analyses were used to determine whether physical and/or peer environment bear a statistically significant relationship to academic performance, as measured by GPA. Descriptive statistics, such as percentages and means, were also used to analyze the data. Correlations were used to try to identify relationships between certain variables and GPA.

Open-ended responses were tallied and categorized into themes. Percentages were then calculated from this information. The percentages were then used to further support quantitative data.

Limitations

There are several limitations to this study. The timeframe in which the study was conducted served as a limitation because there was not time to gather additional data as additional questions arose. The majority of data in support of the hypotheses was obtained from the surveys and interviews. In addition, open-ended questions concerning alcohol use were not used in the survey due to an oversight by the researchers compiling the instrument. Without this, researchers were limited in the data that could be obtained concerning the relationship between alcohol use and academic performance. Finally, some of the results may have revealed a weakness — fraternity members' not having a clear understanding of the chapter's expectations or unclear wording of the items contained in the survey.

Results

Peer Environment

Fraternity A members tended to perceive that their fraternity placed a higher priority on academic success, therefore suggesting that a peer environ-

ment which places value on academic performance will result in the high academic performance of individuals in that environment. Since Fraternity A had a higher GPA and placed a significantly higher priority on academic success, this provides support for our hypothesis that a peer environment which placed value on academic performance will have a higher GPA. Table 1 shows the fraternity GPAs. Chi-square analyses indicate that the GPAs for members of Fraternity A are significantly higher than the GPAs for members of Fraternity B at the $p<.05$ level.

Table 2 displays the mean differences and standard deviations between Fraternity A and Fraternity B. Illustrating a peer environment that values high academic performance, the members of Fraternity A tend to engage in academically related activities in the fraternity house to a greater degree than Fraternity B. In addition, the members of Fraternity A were more likely to have mandatory and designated study hours, receive tutoring from their peers, and spend more hours outside of class studying. The mean differences for these factors were found to be statistically significant and resulted in higher means for Fraternity A.

Responses obtained from the open-ended questions of the Fraternity Survey were also analyzed in order to gain a more thorough understanding of issues regarding fraternity peer environment. This information was used to further support the quantitative results and the hypotheses of this study.

When asked, "What has been the effect, both positive and negative, for your fraternity experience on your academic performance?" the responses varied with members replying that their fraternity experience has been both positive and negative. A large majority of Fraternity A respondents, 98%, indicated that their fraternity experience has had a positive effect on their academic performance, while 19% of them indicated that their fraternity experience has been negative. One way in which the fraternity experience had positively affected members' academic performance was that 18% of them indicated that their experience had helped them to develop their study skills. One aspect of their fraternity experience that 16% of Fraternity A respondents listed as having a negative effect on their academic performance was that the house provided distractions.

In contrast, the majority of Fraternity B respondents, 89%, indicated that their fraternity experience had a negative effect on their academic performance while 35% of respondents stated that their fraternity experience had no effect. Of the respondents, 12% listed distractions as having a negative effect on their academic performance.

This information may be tied to the t-test analysis, which showed that Fraternity A had significantly higher means for fraternity priority on academic success. In addition, the findings illustrate that there is a positive correlation, .39 ($p\leq.01$), between member perception of fraternity priority on academic success and GPA. This relationship indicates that members of Fraternity A perceived that their chapter places a high priority on academic performance, resulting in higher individual GPAs for the members of this fraternity.

Another question from the survey asked, "How have your fraternity members impacted your academic performance?" The response rate for Fraternity A was 100% and the majority of these members, 88%, responded that fellow fraternity members had a positive impact on their academic performance. One way in which fraternity members positively influenced each other included peer tutoring. Results of the Chi-square analyses show that the percentage of men who receive peer tutoring in Fraternity A is significantly higher than the number of men who receive peer tutoring in Fraternity B. Fraternity A reported that 87.5% of the members received peer tutoring, while only 16.4% of Fraternity B respondents received peer tutoring. In addition to peer tutoring, 6% of Fraternity A members reported that studying in groups had a positive influence on their academic performance.

The response rate for Fraternity B, to the question above, was also 100%. It was reported by 21% of the respondents that fellow fraternity members had a positive impact on their academic performance while 42% of the respondents indicated that their fraternity members had a negative impact on their academic performance. There was not a measurable percentage of responses which specified the factors that cause Fraternity B members to have a negative impact on each other's academic performance. For example, several members simply stated, "negative," "very negative," "bad," or "poorly." An additional 42% of these members stated that their fraternity brothers had little or no impact on their academic performance. These results may be used to further support the hypothesis that a fraternity, which places a higher value on academic performance, thus having a positive impact on its members, will have a higher house GPA. In contrast, a fraternity that does not place value on academic performance has a negative impact on its members, resulting in a lower GPA.

The final question that provided responses regarding peer environment asked, "What could you or your fraternity do to improve your academic performance?" In Fraternity A, 11% reported that mandatory study tables for everyone would improve academic performance. In addition, 8% stated that more mandatory quiet hours would improve academic performance while more tutoring was recommended by the same percentage of respondents. For Fraternity B, 32% of the respondents reported that incentives would improve academic performance. In addition, the suggestion of "simply studying more" was recommended by 26% of the members, while going to class was recommended by 16% of Fraternity B respondents.

In addition to responses obtained from the general membership by the survey, the presidents and scholarship chairmen of both fraternities were interviewed in order to obtain specific, detailed information regarding the peer environment. When asked, "Are there rewards or sanctions for academic performance?" both fraternities indicated that there were no sanctions for poor academic performance. Fraternity A explained that rewards given for high academic performance included a bulletin board listing members with a 3.0 or above GPA, a special dinner each semester for members holding a 3.0 or above GPA, nine $1000 scholarships for members with high GPAs, one $1000 scholarship for the member

with the most improved GPA, and preferred housing assignments. Fraternity B simply noted that they offered the reward of preferred housing for members with high GPAs.

Alcohol Use

Table 2 also reflects the mean differences and standard deviations between Fraternity A and Fraternity B in regard to alcohol use. In general, Fraternity B respondents did not attend class, missed assignments, and were underprepared for tests, as a result of alcohol use, more often than Fraternity A respondents. The means for these factors were found to be statistically significant.

The findings also illustrated that there was a statistically significant correlation, -.23 ($p \leq .05$), between current GPA and missed class as a result of alcohol use. Fraternity B respondents missed significantly more classes as a result of alcohol use; therefore it may be inferred that the low chapter GPA of Fraternity B could be a result of this behavior. Because Fraternity B members missed significantly more classes as a result of alcohol use and have a lower chapter GPA than Fraternity A, this data may support our hypothesis that there is a negative relationship between alcohol use by a fraternity chapter and academic performance, as measured by GPA.

Discussion and Implications

The results lend support to the study's two main hypotheses. First, it was believed that academic performance would be positively correlated with the importance placed on academic performance by the given chapter. Second, there would be a negative correlation between alcohol use by members and academic performance.

Peer Environment

As with the physical environment, the findings appear to be consistent with existing research. The correlation between member perception of fraternity priority on academic success and GPA is addressed by several sources (Butler, 1959; Winston et al., 1980). Butler (1959) discussed the relationships which exist between actives and pledges in the context of active members giving academic support to new members, which influenced the positive academic performance of the chapter.

Winston et al. (1980) also supported the relationship that existed between fraternity value placed on academics and academic performance. Like Butler (1959), the authors noted that new members who were exposed to an environment which valued academics tended to maintain a high level of academic performance throughout their undergraduate careers. They then became members who were responsible for the transmission of the fraternity's value on academics to future members, thus this value continued to remain a priority from year to year within the chapter.

Our research found that importance placed on academic performance by fraternities was visible in many programs designed to assist members in their

academic pursuits. This is apparent in the usage of chapter mandated and designated study hours, as well as hours spent studying. These programs are addressed in Barker's (as cited in Walsh, 1978) notion of behavior settings. Barker noted that a behavior setting imposes its behavior pattern on the individuals interacting in the setting. In regard to chapter mandated and designated study hours, for example, the behavior setting of study hours serves as an impetus for individual members to engage in academic preparation.

Peer tutoring can also be considered an indication of the importance placed on academic performance by the fraternity and has been addressed specifically in existing literature. Astin (1993) noted, "General education outcomes are thus enhanced ... when they (peers) serve as tutors for each other" (p. 425).

Based on our research, as well as existing literature, fraternities who wish to facilitate the academic performance of their members should be cognizant of the following suggestions related to the peer environment: place a chapter-wide priority on academic performance of members in which this priority should be recognized by all members of the chapter; provide an opportunity for peer tutoring; promote the value of out-of-class study; and mandate chapter study hours.

Alcohol Use

The study found that a negative correlation existed between missing class as a result of alcohol use and academic performance as measured by GPA. Additionally, our research found statistically significant mean differences in other alcohol-related academic concerns, such as missed class, missed assignments, and being underprepared for a test. These findings are consistent with existing research which noted the negative impact that alcohol has on academic performance (Engs & Hanson, 1989; Hill & Bugen, 1979; Maney, 1990). Based on these findings, the implications for fraternities attempting to improve the climate for academic performance is quite clear. First, fraternities should decrease the number of social functions that utilize alcohol as a principal component. Additionally, the chapters should decrease the alcohol consumption by the members.

This study focused on the effects of the peer environment and alcohol use within two fraternities. Based on the literature review and results section of this study, it is clear that being a member of a fraternity has an impact upon the college experience. There is potential for fraternity membership to have both a positive and negative effect on academic performance.

Table 1. Percentages of GPA Distribution

Variables	Fraternity A N=66	Fraternity B N=19
1.5-2.0	2%	6%
2.0-2.49	5%	11%
2.5-3.0	30%	66%
3.0-3.49	28%	11%
3.5-4.0	35%	6%

All are significant at the $p \leq .05$ level for chi square analysis.

Table 2. Means and Standard Deviation of Variables by Fraternity

Variables	Fraternity A N=66		Fraternity B N=19	
	Mean	**St. Dev.**	**Mean**	**St.Dev.**
Physical Environment				
Chapter-owned Computer	1.00***	.00	1.83***	.38
Study Rooms Available	1.00***	.00	1.17***	.38
Study in Library	.67	.92	.47	1.23
Study in Personal Room	1.31	1.99	1.15	1.07
Study in Friend's Room	.13	.34	.12	.33
Study in Chapter Study Room	2.39***	1.71	5.882E-02	.24
Study in Academic Building	2.04***	1.63	.68***	.88
Study in Chapter House	2.54**	3.13	.50**	.79
Peer Environment				
Designated Study Hours	1.22***	.41	1.89***	.32
Mandatory Study Hours	1.44***	.50	1.88***	.34
Peer Tutoring	1.13**	.33	1.39**	.50
Out-of-class Study (reading, group projects, etc.)	4.14**	2.82	2.11**	2.19
Fraternity Priority on Acad. Success (self-perceived)	1.03***	.17	2.61***	.50
Alcohol				
Social Functions Attended	2.68*	.87	2.17*	.51
Social Func. Attended W/ Alcohol	1.77	.56	1.94	.42
Drinks Consumed	15.75	11.34	21.59	13.06
Missed Class as a Result of Alcohol	2.78***	.80	3.78***	.55
Missed Assign. as a Result of Alcohol	1.98**	.87	2.83**	1.09
Underprepared for Test as a Result of Alcohol	2.25***	.79	3.44***	.86

*p ≤ .05; **p ≤ .01; ***p ≤ .001 for t-test analyses

References

Astin, A. W. (1993). *What matters in college: Four critical years revisited*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bowker, R. G. (1994). Correlates of pledging and academic performance in an introductory biology course. *NASPA Journal, 31,* 263-270.

Butler, W. T. (1959). Factors associated with scholastic achievement in high and low achieving fraternities. *Personnel and Guidance Journal, 38* (2), 134-141.

Engs, R. & Hanson, D. (1989). The alcohol knowledge and drinking myths of a national sample of university students. *Journal of College Student Development, 30* (2), 180-182.

Hill, F. & Bugen, L. (1979). A survey of drinking behavior among college students. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 20* (3), 236-243.

Kuh. G. D. & Lyons, J. W. (1990). Fraternities and sororities: Lessons from the college experience study. *NASPA Journal, 28* (1), 20-29.

Lord, L. (1997, September 1). From party hearty to party hardly? *U.S. News & World Report, 123,* 96-97.

Maisel, J .M. (1990). Social fraternities and sororities are not conducive to the educational process. *NASPA Journal, 28* (1), 8-11.

Maney, D. (1990). Predicting university students' use of alcoholic beverages. *Journal of College Student Development, 31* (1), 23-32.

Parker, D. & Gade. (1981). Fraternity and sorority perceptions of their residence environment. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 22,* 358-362.

Pennington, D .C., Zvonkovic, A. M., & Wilson, S. L. (1989). Changes in college satisfaction across an academic term. *Journal of College Student Development, 30,* 528-535.

Rapaport, R. J. & Others (1984). *Student alcohol misuse: The negative effects of drinking in college* (Report No. CG 017-950). Mt. Pleasant, Michigan: Central Michigan University.

Tampke, D. R. (1990). Alcohol behavior, risk perception, and fraternity and sorority membership. *NASPA Journal, 28* (1), 71-77.

Walsh, W. B. (1978). Person/Environment interaction. *Journal of College Student Development, 34,* 36-46.

Winston, R., Hutson, G., & McCaffrey, S. (1980). Environmental influences on fraternity academic achievement. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 21,* 449-455.

Patricia L. Alvarez received her Master's degree in Higher Education and Student Affairs from Indiana University in May 1998. She received her Bachelor's degree in Criminal Justice in May 1996 from Indiana University.

Eunice A. Cabacungan received her Master's degree in Higher Education and Student Affairs from Indiana University in May 1998. She received her Bachelor's degree in Psychology in March 1994 from the University of California, Los Angeles.

John E. Jobson received his Master's degree in Higher Education and Student Affairs from Indiana University in May 1998. He received his Bachelor's degree in Political Science in December 1995 from Hope College.

DeEttra L. Kudera received her Master's degree in Higher Education and Student Affairs from Indiana University in May 1998. She received her Bachelor's degree in English in May 1996 from California Lutheran University.

History, Execution, and Opposition: Restructuring Higher Education

Ian Crone

Faced with heightened costs and scarce resources, higher education in the United States has been forced to revisit many traditional philosophies of staffing, organization, and budget allocation. This paper will discuss the events that have led many colleges and universities to consider institutional restructuring, and will describe several methods of reorganization. These methods include retrenchment and radical restructuring; re-engineering and reorganization; and consolidation. For each approach, the means of implementation will be discussed, as well as respective strengths and challenges.

Given the increasing competition for limited resources and the heightened demand for quality and accountability, higher education in the United States has been forced to reevaluate its role and administration on an unprecedented scale. Calling it the most significant crisis in over 40 years, Guskin (1994) noted that colleges and universities now face expenses that exceed revenue and charge tuition that surpasses students' ability or willingness to pay. In an environment where projected tuition increases will soon exclude all but the wealthy, where nearly half of all public universities routinely suffer mid-year budget cuts, and where federal cuts force private institutions to devote nearly 40% of tuition receipts to financial-aid tuition discounting; higher education can survive only with significant, even radical, changes in how it organizes its administrative structures and educates students (Guskin, 1994).

Today, this radical change, or restructuring, has become a reality at over 200 colleges and universities (Guskin, 1996). Ranging from active decentralization to stringent consolidation, the manner in which institutions have undertaken the process of change varies in rigor and philosophy. Many have suggested patterning change upon the corporate model for organizational streamlining (Bruegman, 1995). Others, who argue the parity of knowledge, assert that any academic inquiry merits support and struggle to apportion scarce resources among competing missions (Benjamin & Carroll, 1996).

This paper will address the challenge of restructuring the small, private university. After briefly reviewing the events and culture which necessitate university restructuring, three approaches to restructuring will be described. The three methods of restructuring will be delineated and their respective inherent challenges will be discussed. These methods are retrenchment and radical restructuring; re-engineering and reorganization; and consolidation.

Commenting on the events and culture that necessitated university restructuring, Bruegman (1995) described the $213 billion-a-year academic industry as Byzantine and a textbook candidate for sweeping re-engineering. Origins of today's textbook candidate predate World War II, when growth of higher education resources matched the gradual increase in demand for student enrollment (Benjamin & Carroll, 1995). Faced with skyrocketing enrollment pressure and

increased mission differentiation, post-war institutions could not develop strategy or criteria to distinguish academic productivity or apportion resources (Benjamin & Carroll). Massive institutional growth and increased spending ensued.

During the 1980s, the booming economy gave higher education little reason not to increase spending (Dunn, 1992). Higher education had become an idea factory demanding increasingly more money to support evolving disciplines, scientific and technological advances, administrative proliferation, and competitive faculty salaries (Dunn). By the early 1990s however, as institutional expenses and tuition increased far faster than typical family incomes, prospective students and the federal government began to question the cost of higher education (Dunn). The need to restructure had become apparent.

Radical Restructuring

Adopting methods of organizational change used by corporate business, higher education developed several strategies to address this need for restructuring. One of these strategies is retrenchment and radical restructuring. Balderston (1995) describes retrenchment as, "a set of short-term responses to adverse conditions...typically designed to be adopted and implemented quickly" (p. 329). Following the initial stages of containing immediate overspending and securing cash flow, an institution's chief executive officer may elect to conduct radical restructuring (Balderston). Radical restructuring is primarily a top down approach to restructuring higher education, with emphasis placed on drastically limiting expenditures, severe administrative and support staff elimination and active assessment of a university unit's overall worth (Balderston).

Given what Balderston (1995) called the culture of permanence and strong sense of community existing on small private universities, such drastic cuts are frequently met with active and vocal resistance. Guskin (1996) sought to explain the foundation for this challenge to radical restructuring, noting that resistance to change occurs when a leader challenges the comfort of the group; the members' satisfaction with the established level of their power, prestige, privileges, position; and satisfaction with who they are, what they believe, and what they cherish. In other words, members of a higher education community feel threatened when they perceive the fundamental benefits of their position stripped away by external, uncontrollable, and unanticipated forces (Balderston, 1995).

Yet another obstacle opposing radical restructuring is what Balderston (1995) described as the lack of agreement concerning academic quality and how to achieve and sustain it. An academic department's direct, or an administrative unit's indirect, productivity is hard to quantify (Benjamin & Carroll, 1996). In fact, Benjamin and Carroll explain that this absence of criteria for delineating the comparative value of academic fields significantly contributed to the proliferation of competing academic departments and established an educational environment of uncontrolled growth. To combat the concept that all academic fields are equally important, Benjamin and Carroll suggest the development of specific criteria, such as quality of faculty achievement, centrality to institutional mission, and demand exhibited by community. This will enable a chief executive officer to

identify how to best allocate limited resources and eliminate unproductive units during radical restructuring.

Balderston (1995) notes that such an approach to restructuring is only suggested in extreme cases of financial desperation because of the significant obstacles opposing retrenchment and radical restructuring, and the subsequent damage that can come from depreciating institutional morale.

Re-engineering and reorganization

Re-engineering and reorganization is one alternative that seeks to avoid this community resistance and confusion about relative academic productivity (Balderston, 1995). Focusing on long term savings and growth rather than immediate financial crisis, re-engineering and reorganization seeks to achieve more and better outcomes for given resources and requires the active involvement of faculty, administration, and students (Balderston). Unlike radical restructuring, re-engineering and reorganization requires a strong chief executive officer to communicate the urgent need to change, enlist a leadership team, foster collaboration, and establish a vision for the future (Guskin, 1996).

Guskin (1996) explained that re-engineering and reorganization at a small, private university would seek to capitalize on innovative integration of technology and faculty productivity. However, Balderston (1995) noted that integration of technology could not simply fill the role of faculty, and that comprehensive redesign of each organizational unit and the tasks performed by it is what justifies the term re-engineering. In other words, re-engineering and reorganization requires investments in time, money, and human resources to assure that faculty and administrators can make the most of a networked information system.

Encompassing up to five years, re-engineering and reorganization would likely require a process which first requires development of a working consensus regarding the urgent need to restructure, wherein the chief executive officer would overcome the culture of permanence and establishes an understanding of the need for change (Guskin, 1996). Then the re-engineering and reorganization effort would require a working consensus around a vision of the institution's future (Guskin). In this instance, the leadership must communicate an understanding of what restructuring will lead to: heightened viability and better service to students. The leadership of the restructuring university should seek out those people who are supportive of the change effort and work with them (Guskin). Doing this will reduce opposition and expand the base of innovative ideas and support available to re-engineering. Finally, leaders of the restructuring process will discover that the restructured institution does not emerge whole at once; rather, it is implemented in a series of phases that evolve over time (Guskin).

While re-engineering and reorganization is designed to involve much of the institutional community and focus on deliberative improvement geared toward student learning, Guskin (1996) does note that obstacles still exist. Should changes take too long, or impact the learning process too little, true re-engineering is not taking place (Guskin).

Consolidation

While both retrenchment and re-engineering are methods of enacting change, a third approach to restructuring, consolidation, focuses on the results of organization redesign. Balderston (1996) explains that consolidation, or the combination of academic or administrative functions, generally entails short-term transition costs, which are more than offset by long-term performance improvements and cost savings. Benjamin and Carroll (1996) suggest one form of consolidation could involve sharing of infrastructure among urban institutions or using distance technology to reduce redundant general education course offerings. Nicklin (1996) provides an example of the former when she describes the formation of the Colleges of the Fenway, a partnership established by the Massachusetts College of Pharmacy and Allied Health Sciences, the Wentworth Institute of Technology, and Wheelock College. Within this consolidation, small private universities share class offering, student events, and facilities, while maintaining the individual identity of each (Nicklin). Bruegman (1995) also suggests consolidating the decision making authority within a smaller number of chief operating officers who maintain the educational mission of the university while outsourcing support functions. In both, the combination of academic or administrative functions can lead to long-term performance improvements and cost savings.

While Guskin (1996) has said that within 10 years nearly all institutions of higher education will need to restructure, it appears that change at many small private universities has begun. Throughout higher education, methods of addressing increasing costs and limited resources are being tested, and several approaches to institutional restructuring have come to light. Each of the three methods of restructuring discussed, retrenchment and radical restructuring; re-engineering and reorganization; and consolidation, have their respective strengths and weaknesses. Success varies according to institutional culture and no quick solutions appear to exist. Will these approaches to restructuring redress the financial crisis of higher education? Only time and innovative higher education administrators will decide.

References

Benjamin, R. & Carroll, S.J. (1996, December) Impediments and imperatives in restructuring higher education. *Educational Administration Quarterly,* 705-719.

Balderston, F. E. (1995). *Managing today's universities: Strategies for viability, change, and excellence* (2nd Ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bruegman, D. C. (1995, November). An organizational model for the 21st century: Adopting the corporate model for higher education. *NACUBO Business Officer*, 28-31.

Dunn, J. A. (1992, Fall). Retrench or else: Public and private institutional responses. *New Directions for Institutional Research,* 5-22.

Guskin, A. E. (1994) Reducing student costs and enhancing student learn-

ing: The university challenge of the 1990s. *Change, 26* (4), 23-29.

Guskin, A. E. (1996) Facing the future: The change process for restructuring universities. *Change, 28* (4), 26-37.

Nicklin, J. L. (1996, November 1). Five Boston colleges join forces to seek economies of scale. *The Chronicle of Higher Education,* pp. A37-39.

Ian Crone plans to graduate from the Higher Education Student Affairs program at Indiana University, Bloomington in May 1999. He received a B.A. in English/ Secondary Education from Valparaiso University, where he was active in the Valparaiso Union Board and helped guide renovation of the Valparaiso Union. At IUB, Ian has served as program advisor for the Indiana Memorial Union Board.

A Study of the Effects of Academic Community Floors

Amanda Denton, Jennifer Forbes, Danny King, Claibourne Patty

Student affairs professionals have designed residential programs to enhance students' learning. One program is the academic community floor. This study examines the impact of the academic community floor on student perception of the effect the floor environment has on academic achievement. The study found that students living on the academic community floors generally had higher predicted GPAs and were more satisfied with the floor environment as it related to academics.

Introduction and Literature Review

In response to the changing role of student affairs professionals, residential facilities have set new goals for enhancing student development. Residential staff hypothesize that by establishing a productive social climate, a sense of community will develop within living areas (Blimling & Schuh, 1981). Buckner (1977) viewed residence halls as the ultimate resource for creating a comprehensive educational experience. The basic premise is that integrating education into the living environment will promote student achievement and feelings of overall satisfaction with the campus. These were some of the ideas that spawned the creation of academic residence halls. Residence life can play an important role in supporting the academic mission of the university. Because students spend a great deal of time in their residence halls, they are ideal places to develop programming that supports academic achievement (Blimling, 1993).

This study looks at the academic community floors in the residence halls at a large Research I public university in the Midwest. These academic community floors are designed and marketed as floors for students who are committed to the academic experience. The students are expected to, as a floor unit, decide how and when to create study hours and to extend quiet hours. The resident assistants for these floors may also serve to create an academic environment by enforcing quiet and study hours and by creating programming to enhance the academic experience, such as tutoring or study tables.

Past studies have concluded that residence halls contribute to students' overall campus experience and enhance college persistence when compared to students who live off-campus or commute from their parents' homes (Astin, 1975). It is critical that student affairs professionals investigate and acknowledge the potential that academic community floors could add to residential living. This study proposes to investigate whether or not these academic community floors enhance student satisfaction with their residence hall environment. By surveying students, the researchers hope to assess the climate of the floor and to determine if the students perceive the environment to be conducive to learning.

Literature Review

Nowack and Hanson (1985) examined 1,302 first-year residence hall students and 740 non-residence hall students. Academic achievement was mea-

sured by calculating the mean grade point average (GPA). Academic difficulty was defined as the mean number of students placed on academic probation anytime during the school year studied in the project. By comparing GPAs at the end of the study, Nowack and Hanson found that residence hall students obtained a higher grade point average than non-residence hall students. However, when including the individual variables high school GPA and SAT scores, it was found that residence hall students showed a slight increase in their GPAs over the non-residence halls students. The number of students experiencing academic difficulty was much greater among students living off- campus (Nowack & Hanson).

Astin (1993) found that the most value from the residential experience comes from peer interaction. He asserted that universities have yet to take advantage of the possibility of residence halls and that they need to do more to increase their involvement in students' academic careers inside the residence halls (Astin).

Peer interaction is a key aspect to the benefits of the residence halls. The effect of the residents' collective personalities is vital to sustaining the community. Another perspective is that the personalities of a group of people determine the type of the environment in which they exist. Holland (1973) said, "the pairing of persons and environments leads to outcomes that we can predict and understand from our knowledge of the personality types and environmental models" (p. 2). For the purposes of this study, these outcomes might include a person's social behavior, educational choice and achievement, and sensitivity to influence. For these reasons, a student may be inclined to choose to live in an academic unit.

Buckner (1977) considered residence halls to be highly under-used learning laboratories. He proposed the restructuring of residence hall staff and the development of educational programs to stimulate personal and intellectual growth. This project resulted in numerous residential programs, including faculty-led discussions, academic advising and career workshops, voter education programs, leadership and assertiveness training, health clinics and tutoring. After the third semester of the program's activation, a questionnaire was completed regarding student satisfaction with residence life. Level of satisfaction averaged 3.5 on a scale of 1-5, with 5 being most satisfied and 1 being least satisfied. The results of this study suggest a positive outcome of educational programming within residence halls (Buckner).

Students who like to take advantage of tutoring programs, quiet hours, and study groups are reinforced in learning communities. Students are likely to feel supported and content in environments that resemble their personality pattern. "The more congruent a person's environment is with his personality pattern, the more likely he will exhibit the social and avocational behaviors hypothesized from his personality pattern. In contrast, the more incongruent his environment, the greater the likelihood that the person will not participate or exhibit these behaviors" (Holland, 1973, p.44). Based on Holland's findings we hypothesize that students living on academic community floors will have higher grades and higher levels of satisfaction with the academic environment of their floor than students living on non-academic community floors. We also hypothesize

that students will pick a residence hall and want certain rules based on the students' personality types.

Method

Sample

This study was conducted at a large, public Research I institution in the Midwest with a large residential population. The majority of residence centers have academic community floors. These academic community floors offer extended quiet hours, study times and some additional programming for their residents. Students self-select for the academic community floors. For this study, we focused on two centers. The sample for this study was eight floors in the two centers — two female academic community floors, two male academic community floors, two female non-academic community floors, and two male non-academic community floors.

These centers were selected because they have a higher retention rate than other centers on the campus. The higher retention rate indicated that we would find a mix of students from different classes. Having upperclass students in the study allowed a comparison between the academic community floor and previous living arrangements. Women's and men's floors were chosen to see if gender made a difference in the students' perceptions of the floor environment based on Nowack and Hanson's (1985) findings that residential settings can have different impacts on men and women. For the comparison group of non-academic community floors, floors were chosen in the same residence center and usually the same wing so the experiences of the students would be similar in as many ways possible with the exception of the variable being studied — living on an academic community floor.

The number of students surveyed was 148. The response rate was 39.8% with 80 (54.1%) females and 68 (45.9%) males. The academic community floors had a response rate of 40.6%. The non-academic community floors had a response rate of 38.9%. The class breakdown was 50% first year students, 40.5% sophomores, 6.8% juniors, and 2.7% seniors. The racial/ethnic mix was 1.4% African-American, 8.8% Asian-American, 83.8% Caucasian, 2.7% Latino/Latina, and 1.4% Native American.

Procedure

A survey was created to measure the students' perceptions of the floor environment, using a Likert-type scale for most questions and some open-ended questions for additional student input. The survey looked at specific topics including programming, academic achievement, peer interaction, involvement, rules and regulations, and choice of hall. Programming was included because Terenzini, Pascarella and Blimling (1996) suggested that residential programming could be designed to promote academic development. The peer group and involvement was examined because Astin (1993) said that the peer group has the greatest impact on students and the involvement of students determines how much an experience will impact the students. Residence hall and rules and regulations

were included as Holland (1973) hypothesized that a student will pick a hall and want certain rules based on the student's personality type.

The surveys were distributed to students at a floor meeting called by the floor's resident assistant. Two members of the research team distributed the survey. Students returned the surveys to the researchers during the meeting. This procedure was the same for academic community floors and non-academic community floors.

Analysis

The data were analyzed to compute the mean, median and standard deviation and to look for differences in the responses of students on academic community floors from the students on the non-academic community floors for all questions. Statistical analyses were done on the survey results to determine significance. Z-tests were used to compare the means of the responses from the academic community floors and the non-academic community floors. T-tests were used to analyze the data for differences in the responses based on class standing and gender both within the academic community floors and between the academic community floors and non-academic community floors.

Limitations

This study has a few limitations that are important to recognize. First, the response rate was low. Since only students who came to the floor meeting participated in the survey, the response may have been more positive than that of the floor in general. Secondly, the students were in a group setting while answering the survey so there might have been some discussion among the students about how to respond. Thirdly, for some of our questions, there was a high level of variance in the answers. Since the reliability of the survey instrument was not able to be tested, it is unknown if these questions are unreliable or if there is a lot of variance among students. Finally, because the academic community floors are unique to this university, it would be difficult to generalize these results to other universities.

Results

The findings can be divided into four sections: reasons students chose to live on academic community floors; aspects of the academic community floors that promote academic achievement; aspects of the academic community floors that are not distinct from non-academic community floors; and the overall GPA differences among academic and non-academic community floors. Overall, there is an indication that students living on academic community floors exhibit higher academic success and dedication to academics than students on non-academic community floors. Table 1 summarizes the results.

Rationale for Living on Academic Community Floors

When asked to cite reasons that they chose to live on their floors, academic community floor residents agreed, on average, that their floor encourages academic achievement, whereas the agreement among non-academic community

floor residents was not as consistent (means: 3.09 v. 2.56). This sentiment was echoed in the open-ended responses. When academic community floor residents were asked why they chose to live in their area, 25.7% wanted to live on an academic community floor; 21.4% lived on the floor the previous year (and indicated by their return, they presumably had a positive experience); 17.1% expected floormates to be motivated, studious, or have other academic-related attributes; and 11.4% expected the floor to be quiet. Residents of the non-academic community floors, however, cited the following reasons for living on their floors: placed there by room assignments (47.6%), location of the center (19%), friends lived on the floor (11.1%), they wanted to live in that specific residence center (11.1%), and they lived on the floor the previous year (9.5%).

Aspects that Promote Academic Achievement

The following areas demonstrate the dedication among students on academic community floors, including study habits and floor environment. Socializing is also discussed with the floor environment, but it is used to demonstrate a key difference between the academic and non-academic community floors.

Amount of Time Spent Studying, Studying Alone, and Helping Others with Assignments.

The amount of time spent studying is identified as being higher on the academic community floors (means: 8.3 v. 7.59). The average time spent studying per week on the academic community floor is over eight hours per week, whereas non-academic community residents study, on average, seven hours per week. Although the significance may be small in the short run, the amount of time dedicated to studying accumulates over the course of the semester. The variance among the academic community residents, however, is larger than that of the non-academic community residents, indicating a more diverse amount of time devoted to studying.

More academic community residents identified studying alone as a frequent activity on their floor, whereas non-academic community residents did not study alone as much (means: 3.97 v. 3.64). Additionally, the variance among academic residents was lower than that of non-academic residents (0.59 v. 0.97), indicating a greater consistency of time allotted for studying alone among academic community residents. However, when asked about how the floor academic environment could be improved, twice as many academic community floor residents as non-academic community floor residents indicated that study groups would be useful.

Academic community residents were more inclined to view helping others as promoting academic achievement, identifying this area as one that is a recognizable benefit of living on an academic community floor (means: 2.86 v. 2.69).

Floor Environment and Socializing

On average, residents of the academic community floors more strongly identified the floor environment as supportive of academic achievement (means: 3.11 v. 2.81). This supports the contention that academic community floors will

promote academic achievement more than non-academic community floors.

Socializing was the one area of the survey in which non-academic community floors had a higher mean than the academic community floors (means: 4.13 v. 3.86). In other words, non-academic community residents engaged in socializing more frequently than academic community residents.

The idea that the academic community floors support academic achievement in general is also supported by answers to an open-ended question, which cited supportive aspects of the environment. The top four responses by academic community residents were the lack of noise on the floor (52.9%); residents helping each other (20%); residents work/study hard (15.7%); and residents respect each other (11.4%). Comparable responses from non-academic community residents occurred with the following frequency: the floor is quiet (30.8%); residents are respectful/considerate (13.8%); residents study a lot (10.8%); and students are helpful/help each other (7.7%).

Indistinct Aspects of Academic Community Floors

The residents surveyed also revealed that many aspects of the academic community floor environment either did not support academic achievement or were not advantageous compared to the non-academic community floors. Intentional efforts at programming on academic community floors were not perceived by the students to affect their floor environment. In addition to programming, the support of a resident assistant on the academic community floors was not recognized as promoting academic achievement, with approximately half of the residents agreeing that the RA promotes academic achievement and the other half disagreeing.

The perceptions among the academic and non-academic community floors regarding the enforcement of quiet hours were not significantly different ($p>.10$) and the means were very similar (2.75 v. 2.64). In other words, residents on both types of floors tended to agree that enforcement of quiet hours promotes academic achievement. In the open-ended questions, many academic community floor residents listed more effective enforcement of quiet hours as a way to improve the floor's academic environment.

Another assumption regarding the academic community floors was that they would give students the opportunity to help each other and receive help with academic problems. Although on average, academic community residents agreed that receiving help enhanced the academic environment, non-academic community residents also agreed that receiving help benefited their academic achievement (means: 2.71 v. 2.67). Although respondents from both groups benefited from receiving help, residents of academic and non-academic community floors indicated that they rarely participate in study groups in their living units (means: 1.8 v. 1.83) or studied with floormates (means: 2.3 v. 2.25).

Grade Point Averages

The residents of academic community floors had higher high school GPAs than non-academic community floor residents. The actual difference was approximately a third of a grade (e.g. an A- versus a B+). Similar to the high school GPAs, the predicted semester GPAs on academic community floors tended to be a third of a grade higher than those on non-academic community floor (e.g. a B+ versus a B). Assuming that assigned grades are one way of demonstrating academic dedication, this indicates that academic community floor residents are more academically motivated.

The mean difference between high school GPA and the predicted GPA for the fall 1997 semester was lower on the academic community floors (means: .82 v. 1.21). This indicates that, on average, residents on academic community floors maintained a more consistent GPA from high school to college. On non-academic community floors, there tended to be a greater drop from high school GPA to current semester GPA. Additionally, there is a lower variance for the mean on the academic community floors, indicating the range among grade variations was smaller and the grades attained were more consistent than non-academic residents.

Discussion

Ultimately, the study indicated the tendency of students to seek out an environment congruent with their needs. Students who are more focused on studying may be more likely to select an academic community floor than other students. This could account for the personality traits of the students living on the academic community floors and their seriousness about their studies. Holland's theory would suggest that one would find these types of students on academic community floors. Holland suggested that people with a certain personality would tend to seek out an environment that is congruent with their personality (Walsh, 1978).

When asked in the survey why they wanted to live on an academic community floor, the responses focused on academics and accounted for a majority of the students who answered this question. On the non-academic community floors, however, none of the respondents gave an academically related reason for living on the floor. This implies that the students who are living on the academic community floors are more academically focused than the non-academic community floor students. The academic community floor students are seeking out an environment that is comfortable for them: supportive, quiet and conducive to studying. They have found such an environment on the academic community floor.

A comparison of the GPAs among the floors also provides a means of analysis. It was found in this study that the mean GPA of the students on the academic community floors was about one third of a letter grade higher than those students who lived on non-academic community floors (B+ for academic community floors as compared to B for the non-academic community floors). Also, when comparing the variables for GPA difference, one can see a distinct difference. One finds that the drop in GPA from high school to college is less for a student living on an academic community floor than for a student living on a non-academic community floor. The students on the academic community floors also had a high school GPA that was approximately a third of a letter grade

higher than non-academic community floor students. This supports Astin's IEO model, in the sense that the inputs (I), or students' experiences prior to college, can affect their experiences in college (Astin, 1993). In other words, students who were academically successful in high school may be predisposed to choose an academic community floor. This also reflects Holland's (1973) theory regarding person-environment congruence; i.e. students who are academically inclined will seek out environments that encourage academic achievement.

While similar numbers of students on academic and non-academic community floors claimed to receive help, many more people on academic community floors said that they had given help to others during the semester. Additionally, a more significant percentage of students on academic community floors identified their interaction with peers on the floor as helping them in their academic achievement. One student stated, "in general, the environment is good. Not only for studying, but for having intelligent conversations." Astin (1993) reported student to student interaction had substantial positive correlation with Overall Academic Development. The positive intellectual interaction occurring on floors can have a direct impact on students' academic development (Astin). In response to the question "How can the floor environment be improved?", twice as many students on the academic community floors answered this question with requests for study groups on the floor than did students on the non-academic community floors. This highlights the academic mindset of the academic community floor residents.

Since the environment on academic community floors is expected to be more conducive to academic pursuits, one would expect that quiet hours would be enforced more strictly. In actuality, students on these floors reported no real difference in quiet hour enforcement. In fact, several students on the academic community floors suggested that one way to improve the floor environment was to enforce quiet hours more effectively. This deviation from the theory can be explained by the academic community floor students' desire for a quieter living environment. These students may be wishing that quiet hours were enforced more, even though the overall environment on the academic community floor is considerably quieter than the environment of a non-academic community floor.

Implications

A few key areas are still in need of further research to completely understand the impact and effectiveness of the academic community floor environment on students' academic achievement. One of these areas is programming. It is necessary to examine the types of programs being presented on the floor and program attendance. Research should focus on how programs are developed on these floors and how these sorts of programs are meeting the needs of the students.

Another area of research for the academic community floor is the role of the Resident Assistant in the academic development of the students on the floor. The research should look at the qualities of successful RAs on the academic community floors and how those qualities affect the community and academic environment of the floor.

One final area of further research is that of retention on the academic community floor. It would seem that if students' needs are better met on an academic community floor, the academic community floors would have greater retention rates. The research should focus on retention figures on the academic community floors and how they compare with the non-academic community floors and should determine the major reasons why students stay on the floors and why they might leave.

No research was found that assessed academic communities in residence halls. Extensive research was found regarding Living Learning Centers (LLCs) and their benefits to an academic environment. This study shows that substantial benefits can arise from implementing the much simpler academic community floors. LLCs require a great deal of capital and institutional supports that may not be available to all institutions. The academic community floors are programs that residence life departments could establish in order to better serve students.

This study has concluded that the academic community floor students tended to have a slightly higher grade point average than the non-academic community floor students. This study does not imply, however, that the academic community floor environment would produce these same results for every individual that might live there. Holland's (1973) theory states that congruence between the person's personality type and the environment's type should exist. If this match between personality and environment is not made, then the effects may not occur either. However, there is enough evidence of increased satisfaction with the academic environment on the academic community floors to warrant further investigation into their effectiveness.

Table 1: Results of Survey

Survey Question	Acad. Floor Mean	Non-Acad. Floor Mean	p value
Time spent studying	8.3	7.59	p<.03
Time spent studying alone	3.97	3.64	p<.01
Helping others promotes academic achievement	2.86	2.69	p<.05
The floor supports academic achievement	3.11	2.81	p<.0001
How often do you socialize?	3.86	4.13	p<.02
Programs benefits academic achievement	2.39	2.23	p<.25
RA promotes academic achievement	2.56	2.54	p<.45
Enforcement of quiet hours aids academic achievement	2.75	2.64	p<.19
Receiving study help benefited academic achievement	2.71	2.67	p<.27
How often do you participate in study groups?	1.8	1.83	p<.43
How often do you study with floormates?	2.3	2.25	p<.29
GPA difference (high school GPA - predicted college GPA)	.81	1.23	p<.05

References

Astin, A. W. (1993). *What matters in college? Four critical years revisited.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Astin, A. W. (1975). *Preventing students from dropping out.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Blimling, G. S. (1993). The influence of college residence halls on students. In J. S. Smart (Ed.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research.* (Vol. 9, pp. 248-307). New York: Agathon.

Blimling, G., & Schuh, J. (1981). Increasing the educational role of residence, *New Directions for Student Services.* #13. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Buckner, D. R. (1977). Restructuring residence hall programming: Residence hall educators with a curriculum. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 18,* 389-392.

Holland, J. (1973). *Making vocational choices: A theory of careers.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Nowack, K. M. & Hanson, A. J. (1985). Academic achievement of freshmen as a function of residence hall housing. *National Association of Student Personnel Administrators Journal, 22* (3), 22-28.

Terenzini, P. T., Pascarella E. T., and Blimling, G.S. (1996). Students' out-of-class experiences and their influence on learning and cognitive development: A literature review. *Journal of College Student Development 37,* 149-162.

Walsh, W. B. (1978). Person/Environment interaction. In G. D. Kuh, J. P. Bean, D. Hossler and F. K. Stage (Eds.). *ASHE Reader on College Students.* Needham Heights, MA: Ginn Press.

Amanda Denton graduated from Ball State University with a B.A. in 1996. She then went on to attend Indiana University where she received an M.S. in Higher Education and Student Affairs in 1998. While pursuing her coursework she worked as a client counselor at the Office of Student Financial Assistance.

Jennifer Forbes graduated from Indiana University with a Masters in Higher Education and Student Affairs in May 1998. While at IU, she served as an academic advisor with the Honors Division. She graduated from Carnegie Mellon University with a B.S. in Biological Science in 1994.

Danny King will receive his Masters degree in Higher Education and Student Affairs from Indiana University in May 1999. He is currently an Assistant Hall Manager with Housing and Food Services at Purdue University.

Claibourne Patty graduated from Indiana University in 1998 with an M.S. in Higher Education and Student Affairs. While at IU, he was an Assistant Coordinator at Ashton Residence Center. He graduated from Grinnell College in 1994 with a B.A. in Political Science.

Assessment of Student-Athlete Involvement in a University Residence Hall

Heather Diaz, Bob Gonyea, Darin L. Junck, Emily Ward

The purpose of this study is to investigate the involvement of student-athletes in residence hall communities. Survey results were collected from nine floors of a residence hall center at a large public Midwestern research university. Several significant findings are reported which indicate that student-athletes are not as involved in the life of the residence hall community as non-athletes. Implications of the findings suggest that there may be an opportunity for student affairs professionals to involve student-athletes in the residence halls through increased peer educator programming and through a special emphasis on resident-RA relationships on floors with student-athletes.

Introduction

> An institution may not provide an on-campus or off-campus housing benefit for student-athletes that is not available on the same basis to the general student body. (NCAA Proposal No. 30 as quoted by Sperber, 1990, p. 256)

In January 1991, the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) passed Proposal No. 30 on Athletics Housing which phased out the "athletic dorm" as of 1996. One rationale for abolishing the athletic residence hall was to provide student-athletes with a more traditional college experience. The student-athlete population had been isolated from mainstream campus life in the past in order to maintain a more controlled environment, which could cater to their unique needs. In doing so, however, they had not been afforded the benefits of interacting with the general residence hall population.

Now, as a result of the NCAA ruling, coaches like Georgia Tech's Bobby Ross, are saying that athletes, by living in the residence halls with non-athletic students, "relate better to the student body...and the students get to know [the athlete] as more than a number" (Wolff, 1991, p.53). However, Engstrom & Sedlacek (1991) suggest that athletes be considered a part of their own culture with problems unique to their situation.

The student-athlete population appears to be, as a whole, a strongly supported group within the college environment. Student-athletes have a predetermined social group, their teammates or other athletes, within the residence hall. Student-athletes spend much of their time attending classes with other student-athletes and participating in athletic-related activities. Such a situation creates college experiences that are unique to student-athletes (Sowa & Gressard, 1983). Holland (1973) suggests that people with like interests and behaviors will tend to gravitate toward one another; and that people will search for an environment which is consistent with their values.

The purpose of this study was to investigate whether student-athletes who lived in the residence halls of a large, public, Midwestern research university

were involved in the general residence hall community. This was accomplished by identifying how student-athletes spent their social and study time and examining their level of participation in residence hall programming and activities. It was hypothesized that student-athletes would not show significant levels of involvement with non-athletes in the residence halls, nor with residence hall activities and programs. Additionally, it was hypothesized that non-athletes would identify student-athletes as a population that was not involved in the residence hall community and might exhibit anti-social behaviors such as violating quiet hours or causing vandalism in the residence hall environment.

This paper begins with a review of the literature regarding the benefits of residence halls on the success and development of student-athletes on campus and how that may conflict with Astin's (1984) notion of student involvement. Next, the methods, limitations, results and discussion of the current study are presented. Finally, implications and conclusions are given with regards to student-athlete involvement on campus.

Literature Review

Residence halls have been shown to have a significant impact on the success and development of college students (Astin, 1984; Chickering, 1993; Thompson, Samiratedu, & Rafter, 1993; Williams & Reilley, 1972). Researchers find that on-campus students show higher performance, greater academic progress, and higher retention than their counterparts who live off-campus (Blimling, 1989; Thompson et al., 1993). Astin (1993) concludes that the experience of first year students in the residence halls is the most important factor associated with graduation and retention rates. Chickering notes that residence hall arrangements are important environmental conditions that affect development. He lists close friendships, contact with important reference groups, and general attitudes and values carried by the hall as environmental factors that impact college student development.

Athletic residence halls are reported to have had both negative and positive attributes. Parker & Reese (1991) point out that some individuals believe that it is best to house all student-athletes together in one location. Some of the reasons for this are that the student-athletes know each other, have similar schedules, possess common motivations and understand each other because of similar day-to-day challenges. However, Parker & Reese also indicate that this type of arrangement may not necessarily be the appropriate answer. Such a system may actually restrict rather than widen the opportunities, perspectives, and alternatives for student-athletes (Remer, Tongate, & Watson, 1978 in Parker & Reese). Claims are also made that student-athletes in athletic housing are more isolated and destructive (Sperber, 1990).

The experience of student-athletes in residence halls can also be viewed negatively in terms of Astin's (1984) theory of involvement. His theory defines student involvement as "...the amount of physical and psychological energy that the student devotes to the academic experience" (Astin, p. 297). Specifically, a

student who is highly involved is one who devotes considerable time studying, spending time on campus, becoming active in student organizations and interacting on a regular basis with faculty members and other students. In simple terms, the more students get involved on campus, the more learning and development they achieve (Astin, 1984).

While involvement is desirable, student-athletes surveyed by Stone & Strange (1989) report less involvement on campus than do non-athletes. Stone & Strange presume this to be the result of the student-athlete's limited time and freedom to explore campus organizations, services, and interactions with faculty. Their research found that "...varsity competition does adversely affect participation in the traditional sources of campus involvement (i.e., clubs and organizations, residence halls, and fraternity/sorority life)" (Stone & Strange, p. 153). Likewise, Lewis (1993) found that student-athletes who have limited contact and low satisfactory interactions with non-athletes are less likely to do well academically. Within the context of Astin's (1984) theory of student involvement, this is problematic.

However, intercollegiate athletic participation can be considered a form of student involvement. Ryan (1989) reports that "...modest, additional benefits are accruing to student participants" (p. 128) who are involved in intercollegiate athletics. Ryan notes that this confirms Astin's notion of student involvement which "attributes beneficial outcomes to high levels of student involvement in various collegiate environments" (Astin, 1984 as cited in Ryan, p. 128).

Residence halls may be the best environments for encouraging involvement among students. They typically have trained live-in professional and paraprofessional resource staff, study lounges, developmental programs, social networks and activities, student organizations, and occasional visits by faculty. Many also have libraries, computer labs, in-room computers, tutoring and advising centers, and other conveniences. Having all of these amenities close at hand paves the way for students to make efficient use of their time, which is, according to Astin (1984), "the most precious institutional resource" (p. 301).

It has been discussed that student-athletes have a much different schedule than non-athletes, which tends to inhibit them from becoming involved with non-athletes. Jordan & Denson (1990) note that student-athletes operate on schedules that have very limited flexibility. Because of this limited flexibility, it is difficult for the student-athlete to find time to interact with non-athletes and attend floor or campus-wide functions. Generally, these student-oriented services occur when student-athletes are in practice or games, and therefore cannot attend. Parham (1993) also mentions that student-athletes simply do not have enough time in the day to fit in all of the activities in which they want to participate. Parham finds that time constraints and the inability to participate in social and leisure activities lead to feelings of estrangement for the student-athlete.

Negative attitudes among the general student population towards student-athletes are an additional obstacle to student-athlete involvement in the residence halls (Engstrom & Sedlacek, 1991). These negative attitudes toward stu-

dent-athletes highlight the need for student-athletes to be involved in the campus community. It is through this involvement, particularly in the residence halls, that non-athletes gain the opportunity to confront and question their stereotypes of student-athletes (Engstrom & Sedlacek).

Methodology

Participants

The participants in this study were chosen from a single residence hall center at a large public Midwestern research university. Surveys were distributed to 463 students on nine floors of the residence hall and 153 surveys were returned. These nine floors were chosen because of the high percentage of student-athletes in the residence hall, which ranged from 10 to 30% per floor. The participants were 34.6% male and 63.4% female with 2% not responding. In addition, 90.2% of the participants were White, 5.9% Non-White and 3.9% did not respond. Non-White participants include African-American, Asian/Pacific Islanders, Mexican-American, Latino (Hispanic), and others.

Instrumentation

The survey used for gathering the data was drafted specifically for the purposes of this study, although certain items from the College Student Experiences Questionnaire (CSEQ) were used with permission (Pace, 1994). For example, many of the items in sections I and III were borrowed from the CSEQ and modified to fit the present study. In addition, most of the demographic items in section V were taken directly from the CSEQ. The team of investigators drafted the remainder of the instrument.

The survey instrument was pretested to assess its utility in studying student-athlete involvement in the residence hall. Adjustments to the instrument were made based on comments and results from the participants of the pretest. Questions were reworded and the order of sections in the survey was rearranged for better clarity.

Section I of the survey assesses the students' frequency of interactions within the residence hall community. Section II examines the amount of time the student spends engaged in various activities on the floor. Section III of the survey inquires about the participants' perceptions of the involvement of their floor community, and their sense of belonging within that community. Section IV includes eight items designed to reveal the types of students with whom the participants are interacting. Finally, section V reports demographic information.

Analysis

Data from the survey were analyzed using both descriptive and inferential statistics, and were computed with the assistance of SPSS 7.5. Sections I, II and III of the survey are numeric data. For these items means and standard deviations were calculated, and significance was determined using t-test analyses. Variables in sections IV and V are categorical and were therefore analyzed using the Chi-square test.

Limitations

There are several limitations to this study that need to be mentioned. First, although the residence hall was selected because of the high number of athletes living there, there was a low response rate by athletes. In addition, the selection of residence hall floors with higher proportions of varsity athletes living on them may have skewed the results. This is because these athletes had greater opportunities to interact only with other athletes. Unfortunately, this study is not able to draw out those comparisons.

Second, there was an over-sampling of females in the non-athlete group and an over-sampling of males in the athlete group. This may have had an impact on the results reported by those groups. That is, it is possible that they represent attitudes of gender-bias more so than athletic group-bias.

Third, there was no differentiation made between fall and spring athletic participation. Since the survey was conducted in the late fall, it is likely that athletes who participate in the spring would have responded differently had the survey been conducted in the spring.

Finally, the survey instrument used in this study asked for information regarding peer group interaction in section IV. These items allowed for multiple responses, which are potentially ambiguous. For example, if a non-athlete rooms with an athlete, it is hoped that the non-athlete roommate would check *both* of the corresponding boxes in section IV which would indicate one for varsity athletes and one for roommate. Other items in this section can be similarly criticized.

Results

Table 1 shows the sample means and standard deviations of numerical variables from sections I, II, and III of the survey, sorted by athletic status. Almost entirely, student-athletes responses are lower than non-athletes, with six of the items showing significant mean differences. In section I, student-athletes (M=3.48) report a significantly lower frequency than do non-athletes (M=4.03) on the scale which gauges "hanging out with other students late at night", $t(142) = -2.183$, $p<.05$. Student-athletes (M=1.44) are also less likely than non-athletes (M=1.96) to attend planned programs in the residence hall, $t(141) = -3.589$, $p<.01$.

The open-ended responses on section II yields results which show athletes (M=.011) report significantly fewer hours than non-athletes (M=.085) working per weekday, $t(137) = -2.809$, $p<.01$. This result should, however, be considered with caution since there is a NCAA rule that prohibits full-scholarship student-athletes from working in paying jobs during the academic year. Since there is no indication of how many student-athlete participants are receiving a full-scholarship, this finding may not show a significant difference in student-athletes versus non-athletes' working behavior.

Consistently lower mean ratings are observed by student-athletes on the first three items of section III, designed to measure the students perceptions of their acceptance and involvement in their own floor communities. Specifically, student-athletes know fewer floormates by name, $t(142) = -5.118$, $p<.001$, and

like fewer of them as well, $t(141) = -3.142$, $p<.005$. Student-athletes also believe that fewer of their floormates know their names, $t(141) = -2.138$, $p<.05$.

Numbers and frequencies on the categorical variables in section IV of the survey are reported in Table 2. Chi-square analyses find the first five items to have significant differences. Of these, the first four items show a larger proportion of athletes preferring to eat (46.2%), spend time together informally (42.3%), go out to social events (46.2%), and study with athletes. Interestingly, the fifth item "of whom do you ask assistance" shows a break in this trend. On this item the largest portion of student-athletes (51.9%) seeks the assistance of non-athletes.

Discussion

The six items with significant mean differences in Table 1 show some interesting trends. These items indicate that student-athletes do not seem to be spending much time engaged with their floormates. These findings support the earlier research of Jordan & Denson (1990), Stone & Strange (1989), and Parham (1993) which indicate that student-athletes have a schedule with limited flexibility that makes it difficult for them to find time to interact with non-athletes and attend floor or campus wide functions.

On the other hand, the majority of the items in Table 1 show no significant differences between athletes and non-athletes in involvement behaviors. Therefore, one may interpret these data to mean that student-athletes are having similar involvements in the residence hall. The question is, with whom are these individuals involving themselves?

As stated previously, section IV (Table 2) reveals the types of students with whom the participants are interacting. The largest proportion of student-athletes report choosing to eat meals, spend time together informally late at night, and attend social events with other student-athletes. The reasons for this low level of involvement with non-athletes are not clear from these data. However, one must consider that the average number of residents per floor was 51, and the average number of student-athletes within that floor population was nine. Therefore, one would expect student-athletes to have fewer opportunities for involvement with other athletes, and more opportunities for involvement with non-athletes. This low level of involvement with non-athletes also supports the research that shows a lack of flexibility in student-athletes' schedules which make it difficult for them to fit in more than their required activities (Jordan & Denson, 1990; Parham, 1993).

On those same three items the number of student-athletes that choose to be involved with non-athletes only ranges from 15% to 27%. In addition, the number of student-athletes that choose to be involved with both student-athletes and non-athletes ranges from 27% to 38%. Combined, these numbers indicate that about 50% of student-athletes are actually involved with non-athletes, despite the unique demands on their time. These findings support the NCAA's rationale for eliminating athletic residence halls, which was to increase the involvement of student-athletes with non-athletes.

On the fourth significant item, while 37% of the student-athletes responded that they usually study with only other student-athletes, it must be noted that varsity athletes at this institution are required to attend academic study tables which are run by the athletic academic advising staff.

Contrary to the first four items, the fifth item of significance shows that a majority of student-athletes ask only non-athletes for assistance. Perhaps student-athletes prefer to ask non-athletes for assistance in an effort to avoid appearing vulnerable to other athletes. Perhaps it is because they are including other individuals in the non-athletes category, such as resident assistants, academic tutors, trainers, coaches, and faculty.

Implications

The implications of this investigation are interesting for student affairs professionals. The results indicate that mixing student-athletes with non-athletes in the residence halls does not necessarily result in significant interaction between the two groups. While student-athletes indicate involvement in activities and the campus community, this involvement does not seem to include many non-athletes. Possible questions to pursue in future research are: What are the student-athletes' and non-athletes' perceptions of this situation? Do they mind? Are they aware of the situation? Are the members of each group still learning and developing despite the lack of involvement with each other?

The results of this study also indicate an opportunity for student affairs professionals to increase the involvement of student-athletes in the residence halls by capitalizing on their tendency to ask non-athletes for assistance. This could be done through increased peer educator programming and through a special emphasis on resident-resident advisor (RA) relationships on floors with student-athletes. It would be useful for further research to investigate exactly whom student-athletes are asking for assistance. This information would provide a clearer indication of whether student affairs professionals can tap into the tendency of student-athletes to ask non-athletes for assistance.

Conclusion

The purpose of the NCAA decision to phase out athlete-only residence halls by 1996 was to provide student-athletes with a more traditional college experience. It was hoped that student-athletes would benefit more from their involvement in mainstream residence halls, than in privileged, separated environments with other student-athletes, coaches, and trainers. This study was designed, therefore, to explore the types and levels of involvement of student-athletes in one particular residence hall community. By use of a survey instrument, the investigators compared student-athletes and non-athletes in terms of their involvement activities within the residence hall, how they spend their time, and how well they are fitting in to their floor communities. The study also asked with whom the respondents were generally interacting — student-athletes or non-athletes.

Results indicate that student-athletes have lower levels of involvement in the residence hall community and less frequent interactions with non-athletes. This suggests that the decision to house athletes in the mainstream residence halls may not have the full effect intended by the NCAA ruling. More deliberate interventions on the part of student affairs professionals and athletic program staff may be necessary to foster the types and levels of involvement hoped for in the integrated living environments. It is recommended that future studies focus more on specifics of the student-athletes' experience and developmental outcomes based on the quality of their living arrangements.

Table 1: Means, Standard Deviation, and Mean Difference of Numeric Variables by Athletic Status

Variable	Athletes N=27		Non-Athletes N=115		
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean Difference
Section I					
Have lively conversations with people	3.19	1.49	3.35	1.40	
Hang out with others late at night	3.48	1.19	4.03	1.16	*
Offer to help others with errands	3.07	1.44	3.50	1.27	
Ask others for assistance	2.93	1.27	3.08	1.24	
Borrow things from others	2.63	1.24	2.77	1.32	
Attend social events outside the residence hall	2.78	1.34	2.93	1.33	
Study with others	2.19	1.36	2.42	1.40	
Attend programs with others	1.44	.58	1.96	.95	**
Sum of Means of Section I	2.71	.91	3.00	.92	
Section II					
Hours spent per day sleeping	7.42	2.06	7.35	2.05	
Hours spent per day studying	2.65	2.62	2.85	2.03	
Hours spent per day socializing	3.68	4.43	5.00	3.42	
Hours spent per day working	.11	.58	.85	2.52	**
Section III					
No. of people who you know by first name	2.26	.81	3.17	.89	****
No. of people on the floor you like	2.22	1.05	2.91	.92	***
No. of people who know your name	2.67	.83	3.05	.89	*
How often your door is open	2.74	.90	2.91	.85	
How well people get along on your floor	3.11	.51	3.21	.60	
How well you fit in	3.04	.76	3.05	.76	
How often you go away on weekends	2.85	.99	2.96	.92	

*p≤.05; **p≤.01; ***p≤.005; ****p≤.001 for *t*-test analyses

Table 2: Numbers and Frequencies of Categorical Variables by Athletic Status

Variables	Athletes N	Percent	Non-Athletes N	Percent	Mean Difference
Section IV					
With whom do you usually eat meals?					*
Athletes only	12	46.2	0	0	
Non-athletes only	6	23.1	101	87.8	
Both athletes and non-athletes	7	26.9	9	7.8	
Alone/none	1	3.8	5	4.3	
With whom do you usually hang out late at night?					*
Athletes only	11	42.3	0	0	
Non-athletes only	7	26.9	99	86.8	
Both athletes and non-athletes	8	30.8	12	10.5	
Alone/none	0	0	3	2.6	
With whom do you usually go out to social events?					*
Athletes only	12	46.2	0	0	
Non-athletes only	4	15.4	96	87.3	
Both athletes and non-athletes	10	38.5	13	11.8	
Alone/none	0	0	1	.9	
With whom do you usually study?					*
Athletes only	10	37.0	0	0	
Non-athletes only	6	22.2	53	47.3	
Both athletes and non-athletes	3	11.1	2	1.8	
Alone	8	29.6	56	50.0	
None	0	0	1	.9	
Of whom do you usually ask for assistance?					*
Athletes only	4	14.8	1	.9	
Non-athletes only	14	51.9	98	86.7	
Both athletes and non-athletes	7	25.9	8	7.1	
Alone/none	2	7.4	6	5.3	
Who commits the most vandalism on the floor?					
Athletes only	2	7.7	9	9.1	
Non-athletes only	11	42.3	39	39.4	
Both athletes and non-athletes	0	0	5	5.1	
Alone/none	13	50	46	46.5	
Who violates quiet hours most often on the floor?					
Athletes only	3	11.1	12	11.3	
Non-athletes only	16	59.3	74	69.8	
Both athletes and non-athletes	0	0	8	7.5	
Alone/none	8	29.6	12	11.3	
What group does not participate in social activities ?					
Athletes only	6	25.0	22	21.6	
Non-athletes only	5	20.8	35	35.3	
Both athletes and non-athletes	2	8.3	14	13.7	
Alone/none	11	45.8	31	30.4	

*Asymp. Sig. ≤ .001 for chi-square analyses

References

Astin, A. W. (1993). *What matters in college?: Four critical years revisited.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Astin, A. W. (1984). Student involvement: A development theory for higher education. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 25,* 297-308.

Blimling, G. S. (1989). A meta-analysis of the influence of college resi-

dence halls on academic performance. *Journal of College Student Development, 30,* 298-308.

Chickering, A. W. (1993). *Education and identity* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Engstrom, C. M., & Sedlacek, W. E. (1991). A study of prejudice toward university student-athletes. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 70,* 189-193.

Holland, J. (1973). *Making vocational choices: A theory of careers.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall. J. M., & Denson, E. L. (1990). Student services for athletes: A model for enhancing the student-athlete experience. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 69,* 95-97.

Lewis, M. (1993). Athletes in college: Differing roles and conflicting expectations. *College Student Journal, 27,* 195-202.

Pace, C. R. (1994). *College student experiences questionnaire.* Bloomington, IN: Indiana University.

Parham, W. D. (1993). The intercollegiate athlete: A 1990's profile. *The Counseling Psychologist, 21,* 411-429.

Parker, R., & Reese, L. R. (1991). Improving the residence hall experience of student-athletes, resident advisors, and the university. In E. F. Etzel, A. P. Ferrante, & J. W. Pinkney (Eds.), *Counseling college student-athletes: Issues and interventions* (pp. 231-252). Morgantown, WV: Fitness Information Technology, Inc.

Ryan, F. J. (1989). Participation in intercollegiate athletics: Affective outcomes. *Journal of College Student Development, 30,* 122-128.

Sowa, C. J., & Gressard, C. F. (1983). Athletic participation: Its relationship to student development. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 24,* 236-239.

Sperber, M. (1990). *College sports inc.: The athletic department versus the university.* New York: Henry Holt.

Stone, J. A., & Strange, C. C. (1989). Quality of student experiences of freshman intercollegiate athletes. *Journal of College Student Development, 30,* 148-154.

Thompson, J., Samiratedu, V., & Rafter, J. (1993). The effects of on-campus residence on first-time college students. *NASPA Journal, 31,* 41-47.

Williams, D. E., & Reilley, R. R. (1972). The impact of residence halls on students. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 13,* 402-410.

Wolff, A. (1991). Upstairs, downstairs: Dormitories for college football players. *Sports Illustrated, 5,* 52-58.

Heather Diaz is currently a doctoral student in the Higher Education and Student Affairs program at Indiana University. She is completing her M.A. degree in French Literature at Indiana University. She received her B.A. in French from the University of Central Florida in 1993. Heather is currently working as an Assistant Coordinator in the Division of Residential Programs and Services at Indiana University.

Bob Gonyea is currently a doctoral student in the Higher Education and Student Affairs program at Indiana University. He received his Master's degree in Labor and Industrial Relations from Michigan State University. He worked in residence life positions at the University of San Francisco and the University of Wisconsin-Madison, and coordinated a leadership program at Northern Michigan University. For two years he was a guidance counselor at an international American school in Monterrey, Mexico.

Darin L. Junck is currently a Master's student in the Higher Education and Student Affairs program at Indiana University. He received his B.A. in German from the University of Northern Iowa. At Indiana University, he is currently Assistant Director of Technologies for the Office of Orientation Programs and Coordinator of Membership Services for the National Orientation Directors Association (NODA).

Emily Ward is currently a doctoral student in the Higher Education and Student Affairs program at Indiana University. She received her M.A. in Physical Education from the University of Northern Iowa and her B.S. in Physical Education from Springfield College. Emily worked in the Athletics Department at the State University of New York at Buffalo for 11 years, and most recently for two years at the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA).

The Role of Women's Colleges in the Leadership Development of Female Students

Jennifer Forbes

This paper examines the literature about women's leadership development at women's colleges. The benefits of women's colleges in terms of student success are reviewed. The role of the environment at women's colleges and the role of faculty and staff in creating the college environments are presented. Next discussed is leadership and other opportunities for involvement at women's colleges. Research into the benefits of women's colleges and implications for coeducational institutions are presented.

Introduction

Women are entering higher education at higher rates than in the past with most of them attending coeducational institutions (Sagaria, 1988). Of these women, approximately 96% are at coeducational institutions (Sebrechts, 1992). Although women's colleges enroll only a small portion of the women in college, they continue to graduate a disproportionate number of women with baccalaureate degrees (Ledman, Miller & Brown, 1995).

Several studies have examined the benefits of attending a women's college. It appears that several factors act on students at these institutions to encourage their growth. Women in single-sex institutions report feeling more involved in the college and experience growth in leadership skills which are often determining factors in persistence (Whitt, 1994).

On the other hand, women hold fewer leadership positions on coeducational campuses due to such reasons as traditional expectations of male and female roles, institutional obstacles, and self-doubt among the female students (Whitt, 1994). In coeducational schools, women's grades as well as their career aspirations and self-esteem tend to decrease from their first year to their senior year (Leonard & Sigall, 1989). Since women's colleges seem to offer better environments for involvement and leadership, they should be studied to determine what changes coeducational colleges and universities can make to enhance the college experience for women students (Whitt, 1994).

This paper will first give an overview of the benefits of women's colleges. Then the role of the environment at women's colleges will be described, followed by a description of the role faculty and staff play in creating college environments that encourage involvement. Next, leadership and other opportunities for involvement at women's colleges will be presented. For the remainder of the paper, the term "students" refers to female students at women's colleges.

The Role of Women's Colleges

Much of the literature on women's colleges and women's development involves examining the benefits of attending women's colleges, including post-college success, entry and retention in nontraditional fields, and satisfaction with

both college and themselves. In the seven decades between 1910 and 1979, 343 of every 10,000 graduates from women's colleges achieved measurable intellectual or career accomplishments compared to 116 out of every 10,000 women graduates from coeducational institutions (Tidball, 1989). "Women's colleges graduate women who attain a variety of measurable post-college accomplishments" (Tidball, p. 157). Graduates of women's colleges are more likely to be successful as indicated by appearing in lists of notable people and are also more likely to have obtained a graduate degree (Ledman et al., 1995; Smith, Wolf & Morrison, 1995). However, some studies that show differences in outcomes have been criticized for not controlling for other variables, such as students' socioeconomic status and the school's selectivity (Miller-Bernal, 1993). Other studies have indicated that selectivity and socioeconomic status were more important variables than the gender composition of the undergraduate school (Crosby, Allen, Culbertson, Wally, Morith, Hall, & Nunes, 1994).

Students at women's colleges are more likely to enter and stay in nontraditional fields, especially math and science (Sebrechts, 1992; Smith et al., 1995). They are "three times as likely to earn a baccalaureate degree in economics and one and a half times as likely to earn baccalaureate degrees in the life sciences, physical science, and mathematics at a women's college than at a coeducational institution" (Sebrechts, pp. 45-46). These women are also more likely to pursue doctoral work in math, science and engineering or go to medical school (Sebrechts). Since the students of these colleges are generally all female, the barriers of gender are not found in the college environment, making women more comfortable in pursing non-traditional fields of study such as science and math (Sebrechts). Faculty relationships are particularly influential with women studying science. Mentoring prepares the student for the type of knowledge she will need to succeed in the sciences (Sebrechts).

Environmental Factors

"[W]omen's colleges provide a uniquely supportive climate for women to explore themselves and other members of their gender in a wide range of intellectual and social leadership roles" (Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991, as cited in Smith, et al., 1995, p. 246). Bennett and Shayner (1988) agree that women's colleges provide an environment that recognizes and encourages leadership potential in its students. A holistic environment that incorporates academics, extracurricular and co-curricular activities is created by the women's colleges (Tidball, 1989). The experience for women at coeducational institutions is different. Many coeducational schools have been described as having a chilly climate for women (Miller-Bernal, 1993).

Another difference in the environment of women's colleges is their commitment to community. Students at women's colleges report a strong diversity orientation and are more likely to believe that their college values civic involvement and multiculturalism (Smith et al., 1995). The students view their commitment to leadership in a larger institutional context of service, feeling that they were "giving back" to their community by holding a leadership position (Whitt,

1994).

At women's colleges, the faculty and administrators express their high expectations for students and the lack of limits to their success, prompting the students to perceive their potential and become involved in research (Sebrechts, 1992; Whitt, 1994). Another study found that faculty contact with students was highest at women's colleges and this increased contact allows faculty to express their high expectations to the students (Komarovsky, 1985, as cited in Neff & Harwood, 1993).

These environmental differences may be related to the relationships developed at women's colleges. The students report that they believe the members of the college (faculty, staff and students) cared and valued their learning (Smith et al, 1995). Historically, women's colleges were created to value and assist with the development of women (Pearson, Touchton, & Shavlik, 1989). The colleges also include women's voices in the curriculum which create a sense of valuing women and themselves and may contribute to the students being more participatory in class settings (Miller-Bernal, 1993).

The Role of Faculty and Staff

Faculty and staff at women's colleges play an important role in aiding in the growth and leadership development of the students. Faculty and staff impact is thought to occur in numerous ways including awareness of their potential for impact, role modeling and mentoring, the composition of the faculty and staff, encouragement of women student leaders, and high expectations for students. Sagaria and Johnsrud (1988) emphasize that female administrators must be aware of their role in leadership development.

The faculty and staff are committed to encouraging female students to become involved in leadership opportunities (Whitt, 1994). Many of the women in Whitt's study indicate their involvement in leadership positions is due to encouragement from faculty and administrators at the college. Female students are also more likely to perceive the faculty and administrators as supportive of their needs at women's colleges. This creates an atmosphere where students are comfortable participating (Miller-Bernal, 1993). Whitt found that women students are taken seriously as leaders in women's colleges. The women administrators use a collaborative leadership style that allowed for student participation (Whitt).

Mentoring and role modeling are two ways that faculty, staff, and administrators can take an active role in impacting students. Role modeling is often intentional and designed to allow the students to see women achieving so they understand that they, too, can achieve (Whitt, 1994). The faculty are role models of women who continued their studies. Miller-Bernal's (1993) study confirms that women at women's colleges or coordinate colleges (colleges with a co-educational school and a women's college, like Harvard and Radcliffe) were more likely to have women role models than women at coeducational schools. Staff and administrators also have an impact as role models. Role models can also be advisors who work with student leaders in their student organizations. Some women students feel that leadership will be an isolating experience; role models and mentors play an important part in calming those fears and offering reassurance (Guido-DiBrito & Batchelor, 1988).

Leadership Opportunities

The environment at women's colleges and the faculty and staff combine to create opportunities for students to develop their leadership potential. Whitt (1994) suggests that "women's ways of leadership" which include "emphasis on relationships, decisions involving collaboration among all members of the organization, sharing of information and power, commitment to promoting self-esteem among all members, and 'values of duty, love and care'" (p. 198) are becoming more accepted among leadership theories. Student organizations at women's colleges serve as an avenue for women students to test and develop their leadership skills (Guido-DiBrito & Batchelor, 1988). Women are free to experiment with leadership positions without the fear that they will be viewed as less feminine (Tidball, 1989). Miller-Bernal (1993) found that the women she surveyed at the women's college and the coordinate college were more likely to have received training in leadership that would be useful in post-college life.

According to a survey conducted at the 1987 National Conference for College Women Student Leaders and Women of Achievement, "the most helpful programs for developing women's leadership seem to be those intended primarily or exclusively for women ... [because they] focus on supporting and affirming women's identity, aspirations, and accomplishments" (Sagaria, 1988, p. 6). Women's colleges offer specific opportunities for leadership development as well as informal mentoring and role modeling. Leadership development activities such as workshops for new leaders, exposure to research on leadership styles, and collaborative leadership are used to encourage leadership among female students (Whitt, 1994).

Implications for Coeducational Institutions

Coeducational institutions have not historically provided a friendly climate for female students, however, most female students attend coeducational institutions. Students sometimes experience the "null environment" where there is nothing overtly hostile but there is also no encouragement for leadership success at coeducational institutions (Whitt, 1994). This can be just as discouraging as overt discrimination to women students looking to participate in leadership positions.

The lack of female students in leadership positions in coeducational institutions may lead to the perception that women are not meant to serve in leadership positions (Whitt, 1994). Female peers create an environment in which the students can identify and can feel a connection and an involvement (Sebrechts, 1992). Sharp (1991) reports that at women's colleges about 40% of students are involved in three or more student organizations. Astin (1993) relates that students who feel a connection and are involved with their college are more likely to be satisfied with the experience and persist in college. Whitt contends that connection is inherent in "women's ways of leadership" (p. 198).

As more women students enter higher education, it is important that coeducational schools adapt their practices and policies to better accommodate women students. It is important for administrators in coeducational institutions to provide some of the benefits of women's colleges to combat the drop in academic self-esteem that women in coeducational institutions experience (Bennett & Shayner, 1988). The environment that helps women students is also more effective for male students. Thus, by adapting these methods to coeducational institutions, both male and female students would benefit (Sebrechts, 1992).

Coeducational institutions need to create opportunities for women's leadership. One way to address this need could be to create all-female settings to practice leadership without marginalizing their experience (Whitt, 1994). Self-knowledge and self-assessment for coeducational institutions is an important step to supporting women's leadership development and eliminating a "null" environment (Whitt, 1994).

Administrators can provide role models for women and provide leadership experiences and opportunities for women students to take leadership roles (Bennett & Shayner, 1988). Male administrators and faculty members must learn how to be mentors to women students at coeducational campuses as there are often not enough women faculty and staff members to satisfy the mentoring needs of the female students (Guido-DiBrito & Batchelor, 1988). All faculty should also be aware of their gender biases. In co-educational institutions men tend to receive more attention and more resources (Miller-Bernal, 1993). This and other biases can be addressed through training for faculty and doctoral students.

Neff and Harwood (1993) propose increasing the use of the coordinate college model where a coeducational and a women's college share common curricula, general education programs, recordkeeping, joint departments, and joint libraries while retaining individual degrees, faculty, administration, residential life, student government and student organizations. This model allows for the institutionalization of women's voices through the women's college and retains many of the benefits of women's colleges while allowing for flexibility and interaction between the sexes of a coeducational institution (Neff & Harwood, 1993). The model does have the drawback that often the women's college becomes subsumed under the co-educational school (Neff & Harwood, 1993).

More study is needed of the coordinate colleges system to see if it is viable for existing schools to enter into this type of relationship. Research is also needed on specific types of leadership development programs that work for women in coeducational settings. Administrators also need to know what types of programming and training will be most effective in helping faculty and staff overcome their gender biases.

Conclusion

The three factors that seem to play the largest role in women's development at women's colleges are the environment, the faculty and staff, and the opportunities for leadership. The support and encouragement that women students receive from faculty and administrators plays a very important role in women's leadership development (Whitt, 1994). Yet, the methodologies of some of these studies have been called into question. Newer studies have controlled for other variables that might contribute to the success of women's colleges' graduates and have still found measurable benefits.

The studies do have some other limitations. Often, the studies did not examine racial or ethnic differences among the students at women's colleges (Smith, Wolf, & Morrison, 1995). The results may differ for minority students at predominantly White women's colleges. Since we know that minority students experience predominantly White coeducational institutions differently than White students (Allen, 1992), one may assume that the experience of racial/ethnic minority women is different than that of White women. Also, it would be useful to the study of gender and racial differences to compare the environment for women at historically Black coeducational colleges and at historically Black women's colleges to see if the same climate differences are found as between predominantly White coeducational institutions and predominantly White women's colleges.

Women's colleges provide a unique environment that is conducive to the positive growth and development of female students. However, there are so few women's colleges that it is unrealistic for more than a handful of women to benefit from them. Coeducational institutions need to adapt the practices of women's colleges so that more women can benefit from a supportive environment during their higher education.

References

Allen, W. S. (1992). The color of success: African-American college student outcomes at predominantly white and historically black public colleges and universities. *Harvard Educational Review, 62* (1) 26-44.

Astin A. (1993). *What matters in college?: Four critical years revisited.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bennett, S. H. and Shayner, J. A. (1988). The role of senior administrators in women's leadership development. In Sagaria, M.A.D. (Ed.) (1988). *Empowering women: Leadership development strategies on campus* (pp. 27-38). New Directions for Student Services, No. 44. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Crosby, F., Allen, B., Culbertson, T., Wally, C., Morith, J., Hall, R., and Nunes, B. (1994). Taking selectivity into account, how much does gender composition matter?: A re-analysis of M.E. Tidball's research. *NSWA Journal, 6* (1), 107-118.

Guido-DiBrito, F. and Batchelor, S. W. (1988). Developing leadership potential through student activities and organizations. In Sagaria, M.A.D. (Ed.) (1988). *Empowering women: Leadership development strategies on campus* (pp. 51-62). New Directions for Student Services, No. 44. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ledman, R. E., Miller, M., and Brown, D. R. (1995). Successful women and women's colleges: Is there an intervening variable in the reported relation-

ship? *Sex Roles: A Journal of Research, 33* (7-8), 489-97.

Leonard, M. M. and Sigall, B. A. (1989). Empowering women student leaders: A leadership development model. In Pearson, C. S., Touchton, J. B., and Shavlik, D. L. (Eds.) (1989). *Educating the majority: Women challenge tradition in higher education* (pp. 157-172). New York: Macmillan.

Miller-Bernal, L. (1993). Single-sex versus coeducational environments: A comparison of women students' experiences at four colleges. *American Journal of Education, 102* (1), 23-54.

Neff, L. A. and Harwood, P. C. (1993). Creating empowering campus climates for women. *Initiatives, 53* (3), 31-39.

Pearson, C. S., Touchton, J. B., and Shavlik, D. L. (Eds.) (1989). *Educating the majority: Women challenge tradition in higher education*. New York: Macmillan.

Sagaria, M. A. D. (1988). The case for empowering women as leaders in higher education. In Sagaria, M. A. D. (Ed.) (1988). *Empowering women: Leadership development strategies on campus* (pp. 5-11). New Directions for Student Services, No. 44. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sagaria, M. A. D. and Johnsrud, L. K. (1988). Generative leadership. In Sagaria, M. A. D. (Ed.) (1988). *Empowering women: Leadership development strategies on campus* (pp. 13-26). New Directions for Student Services, No. 44. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sebrechts, J. S. (1992). Cultivating scientists at women's colleges. *Initiatives, 55* (2), 45-51.

Sharp, M. K. (1991). Bridging the gap: Women's colleges and the women's movement. *Initiatives, 53* (4), 3-7.

Smith, D. G., Wolf, L. E., and Morrison, D. E. (1995). Paths to success: Factors related to the impact of women's colleges. *Journal of Higher Education, 66* (3), 245-66.

Tidball, M. E. (1989). Women's colleges: Exceptional conditions, not exceptional talent, produce high achievers. In Pearson, C. S., Touchton, J. B., and Shavlik, D. L. (Eds.) (1989). *Educating the majority: Women challenge tradition in higher education* (pp. 157-172). New York: Macmillan.

Whitt, E. J. (1994). "I can be anything!": Student leadership in three women's colleges. *Journal of College Student Development, 35* (3), 198-207.

Jennifer Forbes graduated from Indiana University with a Masters in Higher Education and Student Affairs in May 1998. While at IU, she served as an academic advisor with the Honors Division. She graduated from Carnegie Mellon University with a B.S. in Biological Science in 1994.

International Students: An Introduction

Elizabeth A. James

International students represent a population with specialized issues and concerns. Meant as an overview for student affairs practitioners not primarily responsible for international students, this article provides an explanation of culture shock, topics to be covered in international orientation, and the importance of social support systems. Also included are the unique academic issues impacting international students and an explanation of the role of the International Student Advisor and the international advising office in advocating for and counseling foreign students. The paper concludes with suggestions for further research.

International students are playing an increasingly important role on our college campuses. The Institute of International Education cited that in the 1996-97 school year, 457,984 international students came to the United States to study with a 0.9% increase in foreign student enrollment in 1997 (Open Doors, 1997). Nearly 60% of today's international students come from Asia, with Japan, China, the Republic of Korea, India, and Taiwan leading the world in the number of students in the United States. Canada sends the largest number of students from Western nations, (Open Doors, 1997) and enrollment from eastern and western Europe and from the Commonwealth of Independent States (the former USSR) is also increasing (Desruisseaux, 1994). While 67.2% of international student funding continues to be from personal or family resources (Open Doors, 1997), it is becoming more common for the student to be from a developing nation and sponsored by the home government, home university, or some other agency (Locke & Velasco, 1987).

Although the term foreign has negative connotations, it is still largely used in the literature, and the terms foreign and international will be used interchangeably throughout this text. The terms host national and American will also be used interchangeably, although it is important to note that there are a million students in the world not currently studying in their own countries, and the research represents all international students regardless of the host country. This article will discuss the importance of international students on American campuses. An operational definition of culture shock, the first major obstacle confronting international students, will be presented next. Important components to the adaptation of international students will also be discussed, including orientation, social support systems, academic issues and advising, and the role of the International Student Advisor and International Student and Scholar Offices.

The complexity of international student adjustment is often greatly misunderstood by the general public, but Furnham & Trezise (1983) explain that the problems of international students are basically three-fold. First, there are the stresses that confront anyone living in a foreign culture such as racial discrimination, language problems, accommodation difficulties, separation reactions, di-

etary restrictions, financial stress, misunderstandings and loneliness. Second, there are the developmental difficulties that face all late adolescents and young people whether they are studying abroad or not. This is typically a time of considerable vulnerability when the young person attempts to become emotionally independent and autonomous and a responsible member of society. Third, there are academic stresses where students are expected to work very hard with complex and perhaps alien material. Pedersen (1991) states that problems encountered by foreign students are not so different from problems confronted by students in general, and the fact that they are foreign nationals should not be allowed to obscure the identity crises they share with all other students in American universities. While these points are valid, the special needs of international students indicate they may represent a group at risk for academic failure or emotional problems in a university setting.

It is clear that international students represent a special population in the university community, but if their needs are adequately met there are many benefits to having international students on our campuses. Research has revealed that foreign students spend large sums of money in housing and essential purchases which contributes to the financial well being of the colleges and universities they attend and to the communities in which they live (Rogers, 1984). Furthermore, foreign students studying in the U.S. do not have access to federal grants or loans, and are often not eligible to receive scholarships, even in private universities (Neuberger, 1992). Therefore, they represent a source of sizable income for the university that has a flourishing international student body.

Aside from financial gain there are other reasons to actively recruit international students. Institutions of higher education are currently involved in an effort to "internationalize" and make their campuses "multicultural," which would include ethnic American groups as well as foreign nationals. Having international students on the campus who are involved in the university community furthers this educational goal and trickles down through every aspect of university life. For example, international students provide a unique opportunity to impart classroom discussions with an alternative viewpoint, especially in areas such as political science, history, business, and communications (Willer, 1992). The presence of international students in residence halls and classrooms provides American students with a unique opportunity for personal growth. Sharma & Jung (1985) postulated that U.S. students who have a higher level of interaction with international students were generally less prejudiced against people of other nations, less antagonistic toward racial and ethnic groups, more enthusiastic about liberal and social views, and more sympathetic towards persons in unfortunate circumstances. Many of the international students enrolled in U.S. universities represent the best and brightest students in their host country (Constantinides, 1992). Some of these students may become future leaders in government, industry, technology, business and education (Locke & Velasco, 1987). The experience they have in the United States while pursuing their educational goals may have a significant impact on future relations between the United States and the countries

these students represent (Pedersen, 1991). Although each of these goals may result from intercultural contact, Amir (1969) found that they usually occur only under carefully structured conditions, and it is important for colleges and student affairs professionals to implement these supportive conditions.

Culture Shock

International students must quickly learn a wide range of unfamiliar and culturally defined roles under conditions of considerable stress (Pedersen, 1991). This is a good way of describing the phenomenon of culture shock, an experience that affects all sojourners to some extent. Culture shock, both in severity and resolution, is greatly affected by several factors: the reasons they left their home culture (Dyal & Dyal, 1981), how similar the host culture is to their own culture, and the personal maturity and adaptability of the student (Church, 1982). Culture shock is precipitated by the anxiety that results from losing familiar symbols of social intercourse such as customs, gestures, facial expressions, or words (Oberg, 1960). Usually culture shock is viewed as a normal process of adaptation to cultural stress involving such symptoms as anxiety, helplessness, irritability, and a longing for a more predictable and gratifying environment (Gullahorn & Gullahorn, 1963; Oberg). Research has shown that there are several stages of cultural adjustment which follow a U curve.

The U curve hypothesis indicates that cultural adjustment follows a pattern shaped like the letter U. The U curve depicts the initial optimism and elation in the host culture, called the "honeymoon period" where everything encountered in the new culture is exciting and new. This stage can last anywhere from a few days to six months, depending on how soon everyday coping and communication with the new culture must begin (Oberg, 1960). This is followed by a dip in the level of adjustment, which is characterized by hostile, emotional, and stereotypical attitudes toward the host country and increased association with fellow sojourners and people from their home culture. This stage can last anywhere from 6-18 months or more. After this stage in adjustment is worked through, there is a gradual recovery to higher adjustment levels where the sojourner gains increased language skills and has a greater ability to operate in the new culture. Gullahorn & Gullahorn (1963) proposed a W curve hypothesis, indicating that sojourners often undergo a reacculturation process (a second U curve in their home environments similar to that experienced abroad). While reacculturation, or reverse culture shock, is a very real and in some ways a more debilitating experience, further discussion is beyond the scope of this paper.

Church (1982) summarized that support for the U curve hypothesis must be considered weak, inconclusive and overgeneralized. Church notes that although the U curve description of adjustment implies a within-individual longitudinal adjustment process, almost all of the data on which these descriptions are based are cross-sectional. While there is little scientific evidence supporting the U curve, it is a simple explanation for a complex and highly individualized process. This assists students in understanding the adjustment difficulties they may be experi-

encing. International students are often relieved to discover that other students are going through the same process, and that they are normal and by no means weak or unstable.

Orientation

Orientation is often an introduction not only to the institution and the American education system but to the American culture itself. Due to the special needs of the international student, it is often impossible or impractical to include them in the regular freshman orientation for American students. Therefore, it is advisable to have a separate orientation for incoming international students. According to some orientation handbooks such as AMIDEAST's (1983) *An Introduction to Living and Studying in the U.S.*, government regulations such as procedures at the port of entry, immigration regulations, driving regulations, and what to do in an emergency should all be topics included in an orientation program for international students. Most institutions now require mandatory insurance for international students, necessitating a discussion of insurance coverage and filing procedures. Housing, food, leisure, U.S. social customs, travel in the U.S., communications, money, climate, and necessary clothing are also suggested topics for discussion in either the on-campus orientation or in pre-departure orientation materials. It is advisable that international students be allowed to participate in the parts of the freshman orientation that they may wish to attend, however, for it can be an important first step towards making social contacts.

Orientation is a hectic time for the International Student Advisor. Problems at the port of entry, students arriving with immediate concerns as basic as bedding and English proficiency and placement testing can all occupy the advisor at a time when their personal attention is crucial to the incoming student. Having a staff of student orientation leaders consisting of both upperclass international and host national students can be invaluable to the new students, as well as help relieve pressure on the advisor. These orientation assistants often serve as the new student's first chance to make contact with peers, and this contact can help provide a smooth transition. International students often arrive as much as a full week before other incoming students, at a time when resident assistants are occupied with training, and the halls are virtually empty. This can be a shockingly lonely time for the new international student, thus increasing the importance of these student leaders.

Social Support Systems

In informal and formal needs assessments, international students repeatedly expressed a desire for interaction with American students (Liddell, 1990). "The number, variety, and depth of social encounters with host nationals may be the most important yet complex variables related to sojourner adjustment" (Church, 1982, p. 551). In a number of studies on bicultural adjustment, social concern has been identified as one of the biggest issues facing international students (Pedersen 1991). Furnham & Alibhai (1985) noted that social systems buffer stress by providing the individual with emotional support and guidance.

There are many barriers the international student faces regarding social situations. The first and most obvious barrier is language. Many international students have limited experience in speaking English, especially in a conversational setting. Regional accents, slang, and pace of speaking will impact understanding (Althen, 1983). Social interaction with host nationals is inhibited by status differentials, ethnocentric attitudes, evaluative or judgmental perceptions, different definitions and norms for friendships, and the high level of anxiety and threat to self-esteem frequently associated with intercultural encounters (Church, 1982). With the aforementioned barriers to social interaction, it is not uncommon for the international services office to insulate the foreign student from stress-inducing social encounters (Thielen & Limbird, 1992). This practice, while intended to help the student, could actually have the adverse affect of hindering the development of skills necessary for positive integration with the university community (Thielen & Limbird). Therefore, the international advising center's intervention in reducing barriers and encouraging social interaction is crucial. Attempts should be made to provide international students with a variety of programs and possibilities for establishing a social network that meets the needs of the individual student.

The nature of the residence hall has also been found to have significant importance (Neuberger, 1992). An international theme hall, where host nationals request to live with a foreign student can provide the international student with an opportunity to make strong bonds with other international students and U.S. students. The roommate relationship is dependent on several factors. One factor is the willingness of the host national to live with an international student. Other factors include the ideas of the international student and the American student regarding what makes a "good roommate." American students, when asked to list qualities that make a good roommate, tended to focus on "a desire for closeness, emotional support, and doing activities together outside of their room" (Saidla & Grant, 1993, p. 339). International students rarely mentioned qualities of the personal relationship, but focused instead on lifestyle issues such as privacy, respect for territory, and neatness (Saidla & Grant). The roommate relationship between international students and American students is not inherently dysfunctional; structured programs and activities with an international emphasis can make this relationship very successful. International residence halls usually provide programming designed to assist with both the cultural adjustment of the international student and with the inter-cultural training of the American student. Many times international students themselves are resident assistants in international theme halls, which can provide valuable and accessible counseling in the form of peer advising as well as an important leadership opportunity for the foreign student staff member. "For both international and American students, the lasting benefit of participation in such an arrangement (an international theme hall) may be deep and abiding interpersonal relationships that are developed during the college years" (Saidla & Grant, p. 339). There is some criticism of inter-

national theme halls, with a fear of creating an "international ghetto" at the top of the list (Neuberger, 1992). This effect can be controlled by assuring that U.S. students in the hall outnumber international students. Another concern is that this arrangement may allow the international student to remain in his or her comfort zone, living unchallenged by and protected from differing values and levels of acceptance (Grimm, 1993; Neuberger).

Peer advising can also be a way of increasing leadership opportunities for international students while providing another layer of social support for new international students. Peer advisors can be successful international students, or internationally minded American students, especially if they have studied abroad and can empathize with the problems associated with coming to a new culture. The insights that peer advisors can offer about American culture, study habits that have worked for them, getting involved with the campus and so forth can provide a non-threatening environment to discuss what they may be uncomfortable discussing with someone of authority such as an international student advisor.

The language barrier was cited as being one of the most important reasons international students are uncomfortable in social situations (Bink, 1994). Setting up coffee hours with host national and international students can provide international students a structured, yet informal, chance to practice conversational skills. Another possibility is providing international students with volunteer American language "partners" who meet on a regular basis for simple conversation. Retention rates in this kind of program are often dependent upon the host national, so adequate training of the host national is suggested.

Finally, institutions that have a large percentage of international students usually have international student clubs, nationality clubs (clubs representing a certain population, such as the Turkish club or Asian students club), and for the more comfortable student, professional and American social clubs such as fraternities and sororities. Typically international student clubs provide the international student with the camaraderie of cohorts that are experiencing or have experienced similar situations. Often American students are invited to join these international and national clubs, thus providing another avenue for interaction with host nationals.

It is important to note that while many international students express a desire for increased social interaction with the campus community, there are justifiable reasons students may want to limit their interaction with the larger campus society. An example are Chinese students, who may fear they will be influenced by values and beliefs that are not accepted in their home country, especially after the crushing blow to democratization that was dealt in Tiananman Square (Thielen & Limbird, 1992). Student affairs professionals with responsibilities for international students must recognize and respect the delicate issues that may impact the level of cross-cultural interaction a student chooses to have, while providing multi-layered opportunities for whatever the level of desired integration.

Academic Issues and Advising

The responsibility for academic advising falls not only with the advisor in the academic department but also with the foreign student advisor. In order to maintain an F-1 or J-1 (student) visa, the student must be making satisfactory progress toward the completion of a degree and be enrolled in at least 12 credit hours for undergraduates and eight hours for graduate students. Therefore, the international advisor has to be consulted before changes to the schedule can be made, especially before a student drops below full time enrollment. In schools that have an early alert system to spot academic trouble, the international student advisor is often called upon to participate in academic advising.

Several academic problems that international students encounter are different from the problems of American students. The first and most basic problem is English language proficiency. Every international student must take the TOEFL (Test of English as a Foreign Language) in order to be admitted to a U.S. institution. The TOEFL measures listening comprehension, reading comprehension, and grammar. However, as with other standardized tests like the SAT or GRE, the TOEFL can be practiced and certain test taking techniques learned. Therefore, the TOEFL may not be a realistic measure of English language skills. Many students who pass the TOEFL still have difficulty speaking in a conversational setting, keeping up with assigned readings, and in writing ability. Essay tests and research papers may be the academic downfall of an international student if they are not adequately prepared. Writing proficiency tests must be included in placement examinations for international students to detect any need for further English as a Second Language (ESL) courses or remedial writing courses.

Related to English language skills are placement testing and accreditation. Secondary education varies drastically from one country to another, which provides a problem for some registrar and admissions offices. Students may sometimes be placed in classes that they are too advanced for, or in some instances, classes for which they do not meet the proper prerequisites. Registrars and admissions officials must be educated in the world's education systems in order to help with the credentialing of academic certificates, class placement, and transfer of credit from the home institution.

Other academic problems can include a lack of information about the host institution's educational system. International students "must become acclimated to the unfamiliar U.S. academic system, which means that in addition to mastering course material, they may have to become familiar with a new grading system and the differences between units and credits, semesters and trimesters" (Boyer & Sedlacek, 1988, p. 218). Credit given for discussing material in class, (where in their home country the classroom format may be entirely lecture oriented with discussion discouraged), numerous multiple-choice examinations (Boyer & Sedlacek, 1988), and a wide cultural variance on issues of academic honesty are major issues facing the international student (Coleman & Carsky, 1994). The purpose and philosophy of education differs widely across cultures. In many cultures, the process of learning involves memorization of course content. Original

thought is discouraged, as a mere student cannot at this point taint the "truth" offered by scholars and professors (Constantinides, 1992). U.S. academic expectations of paraphrasing and summarizing would modify this truth, so it is not uncommon to have international students produce word for word an academic text (Constantinides, 1992). While this is expected practice in many countries, this constitutes plagiarism in the United States' educational systems. Philosophies concerning cooperative learning and competition also vary greatly from country to country (Constantinides, 1992). What would be considered the honorable practice of assuring the achievement of all through collaborative efforts in the home country would be considered cheating in the United States. This presents an area of concern for faculty and campus judicial systems. While international students should certainly not be given special treatment, it would be wise for institutions to address these cultural differences. Constantinides (1992) offers two suggestions to judicial officers. One is to create a sanction for first time international offenders that would consist of a class teaching appropriate levels of cooperation and citation at U.S. institutions. This would allow the university to further educate the student without destroying his or her academic career. Another option would be to present this class as part of the orientation program as a proactive method of intervention.

Academic problems resulting from cultural adjustment can also occur. "Normal functioning is not often possible in the early stages of adaptation; consequently, faulty decisions and bad judgments can be the result. The negative effects of faulty decision-making can be costly in terms of time spent re-enrolling, or re-taking programs" (Westwood & Barker, 1990, p. 253). Schram & Lauver (1988) also point out that academic success may be hindered by inadequate or slow adjustment to the university setting. Problems that occur during the student's adjustment period may leave a poor impression on faculty members (Westwood & Barker), or result in the student getting hopelessly behind. In this respect, it is important that faculty members be educated about the particular problems international students may have in their studies, and become familiar with patterns of adjustment in international students.

Social contact with host nationals is tied to academic success. Boyer & Sedlacek (1988) found that for international students, self-confidence and availability of a strong support person consistently predicted GPA across the eight semesters they examined. Boyer & Sedlacek also found persistence in international student's academic endeavors to be related to their adjustment to the system or the external environment as well as their level of self-confidence and the availability of a strong support person. Westwood & Barker (1990) concluded in their study that contact with certain host national individuals is "positively correlated with academic success and lowered probability of dropping out of academic programs" (p. 260).

Dealing with culture shock; planning orientation and programs designed to foster social contacts with host nationals; acting as a resource for faculty, registrars, and admission advisors; and training faculty and staff in intercultural

communication are all responsibilities of the International Student Advisor. This requires a vast knowledge base of cultural adjustment theories, the institutional culture, and superb administrative skills.

The International Student Advisor and Advising Office

The international student advisor wears many hats including immigration official, tax and insurance expert, bookkeeper, community resource, crisis manager, friend, counselor, and even disciplinarian. Foreign Student Advisors (FSAs) must be able to work with several factions who may sometimes have opposing interests. They are a link between the students, the faculty, administrators, other student affairs professionals, the community, and the U.S. government. The FSA must be able to balance the concerns and needs of these groups, and must have the knowledge necessary to mediate between them. FSAs must also be culturally sensitive, and able to tolerate ambiguous situations in which the real problem may not be readily apparent. "The International Student Services Office can easily be characterized as a miniature student affairs division, at least at colleges or universities enrolling several hundreds of international students form different countries" (McIntire, 1992, p. xv).

It is sometimes difficult for the FSA to enter into a counseling relationship with international students. The reasons for this are complex, however one major factor is that FSAs are often seen as an enforcer rather than as an advocate, or an agent of the government rather than an educator (Levitov, 1992). Another important obstacle in helping international students in counseling situations is debunking the belief that interpersonal counseling is only for "sick" people. International students "are generally reluctant to initiate a counseling relationship" (Boyer & Sedlacek, 1989, p. 404). This may be due to cultural differences in attitudes toward counseling, or to "a lack of information about counseling centers, lack of awareness of the usefulness of counseling services, and a suspicion of the entire counseling process" (Locke & Velasco, 1987, p. 117). This requires the FSA to provide outreach programs for their students not only to increase knowledge of the counseling services available to international students, but also to demystify the counseling process.

Counseling across cultures requires a need for "cultural self-awareness and sensitivity, an awareness of assumptions or values, openness to and respect for differing value systems, tolerance for ambiguity, willingness to learn with and from clients, and a genuine concern for people with differing values" (Pedersen, 1991, p. 15). Althen (1991) suggests that "cultures underlie not only value systems but customary means of communicating as well" (p. 63). He has learned to adapt his communication style to his knowledge of the culture he is working with, such as speaking "very softly with Malays, and (usually) loudly with Nigerians" and speaking "indirectly with Japanese, not openly confronting them with objections or disagreements" (p. 63). Important also is the knowledge of group constructs both in our own culture and those abroad. However, one must avoid the danger of treating the international student as a 'nationality' and not as an

individual. Important also is the FSAs ability to realize their limitations in counseling. Most FSAs are not trained counselors, and will need to rely on campus counseling centers for referral. It is, of course, desirable that someone at the counseling center is trained and experienced in cross-cultural counseling.

Suggestions for Research

The lack of grounded theory has been a major factor inhibiting research about international students (Church, 1982; Pedersen, 1991) and affects our ability to counsel them. Many traditional student development theories may not apply to foreign students. Even theories that have focused on U.S. minority student development have not always been applied in meaningful ways and Pedersen urges that it is necessary either to modify theories now in use or develop new theories. Efforts must be made by psychologists, student development theorists, and educators to increase both the volume and the substance of research regarding this population. While the numbers of international students in this country are steadily increasing, the research has shown only marginal growth. There is lack of research on social encounters. For instance, while some researchers have shown that social interaction between internationals and host-nationals is important, there have been few studies conducted on different methods designed to increase the quality of these interactions. There is also a lack of solid information regarding the academic progress of international students. For example, how students adjust to the academic stresses of college in the United States; how they approach such issues as academic honesty when there are vastly different cultural approaches to what American society calls "cheating"; how professors can reach out to international students to improve their communication skills in the classroom and encourage their involvement in academia outside of the classroom. These are all issues that should be researched to a greater extent.

A theory of international student adjustment must be developed to help train today's student affairs professionals. Currently many institutions offering College Student Personnel programs do not offer a separate component dealing specifically with international student development. When issues affecting international students are discussed they are often in conjunction with U.S. minority issues. Although the two populations deal with some of the same issues such as racism, identity problems, and issues of self-confidence, it is premature to assign minority student development theories to international students without further research. International student advisors, lacking a concrete theory of adjustment and development, must supplement their education with coursework in higher education, international and comparative education, law, business, and cross-cultural communication as well as familiarizing themselves with research on this population.

Conclusion

International students have proven to be a special population in the colleges and universities of the United States and the rest of the world. The opportunity for success is great, and the impact they can make on the campus both academically and socially is a sound return on the university's investment in these students. It is therefore important to do everything possible to make sure these students live up to their potential. Through innovative programming; thorough orientation; training of faculty, staff, and students in cross-cultural communication; and educating international students about resources and services available, it is possible to provide the support necessary to help international students both adapt to the host country and the university.

"As the world shrinks, borders are opened, and nations become more interdependent even as they gain individual independence, students must not only be internationally aware, they must be knowledgeable of issues beyond their cities, countries, and continents" (Neuberger, 1992, p. 116). Student affairs practitioners must realize that while international students represent a specialized clientele with their own advising office, that all student affairs professionals have a responsibility toward this group of students. "While such assignment (of specialized student affairs professionals) has come in part as a positive recognition of the special and unique needs of international students, it also, all too often, has meant that other aspects of student services have not been encouraged to respond to international students as their own clientele" (Willer, 1992, p. 164). Student affairs practitioners that are not immediately responsible for international students that become further educated about this population will not only help individual foreign students complete their education in the United States, but will influence in some way the global attitudes toward people of different races, religions, and nationalities.

References

Althen, G. (1983). *The handbook of foreign student advising*. Maine: Intercultural Press.

Althen, G. (1991). Some help and some myths. *The Counseling Psychologist, 19* (1), 62-65.

AMIDEAST (1983). *An introduction to living and studying in the US.* US: AMIDEAST.

Amir, Y. (1969). Contact hypothesis in ethnic relations. *Psychological Bulletin , 71*, 319-342.

Bink, C. (1994). Group counseling and ESL students. *Journal of College Student Development, 35*, 139.

Boyer, S. P. & Sedlacek, W. E. (1988). Noncognitive predictors of academic success for international students: A longitudinal study. *Journal of College Student Development, 29*, 218-223.

Boyer, S. P. & Sedlacek, W. E. (1989). Noncognitive predictors of counseling center use by international students. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 67* (7), 404-407.

Church, A. T. (1982). Sojourner adjustment. *Psychological Bulletin, 91* (3), 540-572.

Coleman, S. & Carsky, M. (1994). Responding to cultural differences: An innovative approach to measuring international student satisfaction. *International Education, 24* (2), 5-13.

Constantinides, J. (1992). Academic challenges and opportunities. In McIntire, D. & Willer, P. (Eds.) *Working with international students and scholars on American campuses* (Report No. ISBN-0-931654-18-1). Washington, D.C.: National Association of Student Personnel Administrators. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 360 599).

Desruisseaux, P. (1994, November). US enrolls record number of foreign students. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, pp. A38-A41.

Dyal, J. A. & Dyal, R. Y. (1981). Acculturations, stress and coping: Some implications for research and education. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 5*, 301-328.

Furnham, A. & Alibhai, N. (1985). The friendship networks of foreign students: A replication and extension of the functional model. *International Journal of Psychology, 20*, 709-722.

Furnham, A. & Trezise, L. (1983). The mental health of foreign students. *Social Science Medicine, 17* (6), 365-370.

Grimm, J. C. (1993). Residential alternatives. In Winston Jr., R. B., Anchors, S. and Assoc. (Eds.) *Student housing and residential life.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Gullahorn, J. T. & Gullahorn, J. E. (1963). An extension of the U-curve hypothesis. *Journal of Social Issues, 14,* 33-47.

Levitov, P. S. (1992). Legal issues affecting international students. In McIntire, D. & Willer, P. (Eds.) *Working with international students and scholars on American campuses* (Report No. ISBN-0-931654-18-1). Washington, D.C.: National Association of Student Personnel Administrators. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 360 599).

Liddell, D. L. (1990). Internationalizing the campus through student programming. *Journal of College Student Development, 31,* 281-283.

Locke, D. C. & Velasco, J. (1987, July). Hospitality begins with the invitation: Counseling foreign students. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development,* 115-119.

McIntire, D. (1992). Introduction. In McIntire, D. & Willer, P. (Eds.) *Working with international students and scholars on American campuses* (Report No. ISBN-0-931654-18-1). Washington, D.C.: National Association of Student Personnel Administrators. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 360 599).

Neuberger, C. G. (1992). Working with international students on our campuses. In McIntire, D. & Willer, P. (Eds.) *Working with international students and scholars on American campuses* (Report No. ISBN-0-931654-18-1). Washington, D.C.: National Association of Student Personnel Administrators. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 360 599).

Oberg, K. (1960). Cultural shock: Adjustment to new cultural environments. *Practical Anthropology, 7*, pp. 177-182.

Open Doors, 1996-1997. (1997). New York: Institute for International Education.

Pedersen, P. B. (1991) Counseling international students. *The Counseling Psychologist, 19* (1), 10-58.

Rogers, K. (1984). Foreign students: Economic benefit or liability? *The College Board Review, No. 133*, pp. 20-25.

Saidla, D. D. & Grant, S. (1993). Roommate understanding and rapport between international and American roommates. *Journal of College Student Development, 34,* 335-340.

Schram, J. L. & Lauver, P. J. (1988). Alienation in international students. *Journal of College Student Development, 29*, 146-150.

Sharma, M. P. & Jung, L. B. (1985). How cross-cultural social participation affects the international attitudes of US students. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 9*, 377-387.

Thielen, T. & Limbird, M. (1992). Integrating foreign students into the university community. In McIntire, D. & Willer, P. (Eds.) *Working with international students and scholars on American campuses* (Report No. ISBN-0-931654-18-1). Washington, D.C.: National Association of Student Personnel Administrators. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 360 599).

Westwood, M. J. & Barker, M. (1990). Academic achievement and social adaptation among international students: A comparison groups study of the peer-pairing program. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations,14,* 251-263.

Willer, P. (1992). Student affairs professionals as international educators: A challenge for the next century. In McIntire, D. & Willer, P. (Eds.) *Working with international students and scholars on American campuses* (Report No. ISBN-0-931654-18-1). Washington, D.C.: National Association of Student Personnel Administrators. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 360 599).

Elizabeth James is a first year graduate student in the Higher Education and Student Affairs program. She received a B.A. in psychology at the University of Evansville in May 1995. Elizabeth worked for two years as the Assistant Coordinator of Residence Life and Coordinator of Student Activities at the Timberline Campus of Colorado Mountain College before coming to IU. In addition to her assistantship at the Office of International Services, she is a judicial officer in the Office of Student Ethics. Elizabeth plans on pursuing a career in international education, particularly in the field of international student advising.