Journal of the Indiana University Student Personnel Association

2000 Edition

Indiana University Student Personnel Association

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

1999-2000 Journal Staff

Editors
Brent Ericson, Jason Pontius

Review Board
Anna Burkhalter, Thomas Pitchford
Valerie Sarma, Michael Votava

Advisor
Ada Simmons

IUSPA Officers 1998-1999

President:	Dana Umscheid
Vice President:	Jason Pontius
Secretary:	Ernie Kimlin
Treasurer:	Jason Levy
Dir./Develop:	Shaun Harper, Jermaine Upshaw
Dir./Outreach:	Bill Gardner, Jennifer Herzog, Matt Holley, Shannon Burns
Dir./Programs:	Allison Hagan
Dir./Relations:	Jennifer Berson
Professional Dev.:	Sarah Beck, Emily Hildebrand
Advisor:	Ada Simmons

IUSPA Officers 1999-2000

President:	J. J. Story
Vice President:	Dayna Baker
Secretary:	Drew Morgan
Treasurer:	Loreille Reuille
Dir./Develop:	Matt Stillman
Dir./Outreach:	Carolyn Jones, Mark Manderino, Jen Brookings, Josh Skillman
Dir./Programs:	Minda Heyman
Dir./Relations:	Anna Burkhalter
Professional Dev.:	Kimberly Sluis, Valerie Sarma
Advisor:	Stacy Jacob

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:	1988-1989
Dr. George Kuh:	1990-1996
Dr. Bruce Jacobs:	1996-1997
Dr. Teresa Hall:	1997-1998
Dr. Ada Simmons:	1998-2000

Journal Editors

1967:	Ann Palony & Michael J. Wiener
1968:	Marily Liechty
1969:	Dallas Bauman
1971:	George C. Dehne
1972:	Jane A. Lundahl
1973:	Helen Mamarchev & Winnifred Weeks
1974:	Elizabeth Brannon, Robert Ciesliki, Barbara Moudy, David Stacy & Dann Lobsinger
1975:	Dann Lobsinger & Ann Deborah Alter
1976:	Dianne Burnside & Richard Scott
1977:	Susan Hopp, Frank Araiolo & Vince Carunchia
1978:	Elizabeth A Zavodny, Marc Kaplan & Jim Scroth
1979:	Jim Scroth
1980:	L. E. Wegryn: 1980
1981:	B. J. Bischoff & Brian Pisaro
1982:	Rodney P. Kirsch & Janet J. Wright
1983:	Nedra Hartzell & Daniel Salter
1984:	Susan Buffington & Diane Ledger
1985:	Margaret O'Brien & David Stewart
1986:	Lora Burnett & James Vander Putten
1987:	James J. Holmen & James J. Hurley
1988:	David J. Strauss & J. J. Thorp
1989:	J. J. Thorp & Patricia Harned
1990:	Patricia Harned & Diane Robinson
1991:	Diane Robinson & Anne E. Spitler
1992:	Anne Spitler & Lisa K. Mitchell
1993:	Lisa K. Mitchell & Allison Block
1994:	Allison Block & Melody M. Snyder
1995:	Melody M. Snyder, Lisa P. Lourden, Kelli Kaputska Smith & John Bean
1996:	John Bean & Kelli Kaputska Smith
1997:	Suzanne J. Mendoza, Jennifer Forbes & Alan Rose
1998:	Jennifer Forbes & Ryan A. Forsythe
1999:	Nariah S. Broadus & Christopher R. Turner
2000:	Brent Ericson & Jason Pontius

Editors' Comments

Jason Pontius, Brent E. Ericson

Hello and welcome to the Spring 2000 edition of the *Journal of the Indiana University Student Personnel Association.* We are proud to present this collection of five articles that represents the contributions and scholarship of the students in the program at Indiana University. Before presenting the articles, we believe it is important to express our sincere gratitude to the individuals who made this issue possible.

We would like to begin by thanking the Higher Education and Student Affairs program alumni and friends for their generous support and financial gifts over the past year. As some of you may know, the *Journal* was in jeopardy of discontinuing hardcopy publication due to financial constraints. Program alumni generously came to the rescue, permitting the publication of this edition. With future support, this publication will continue to represent one of the finest student affairs programs in the country.

In addition, this edition would not be possible without the contributions and dedication of the authors and researchers who submitted their work. We believe that the articles in this year's edition represent a broad look at American higher education. Topics include the concerns of underrepresented faculty members, preferred study environments, living environment satisfaction, living learning centers for Black students, and responses to hate crimes on campus. Furthermore, the authors of the articles in this publication were all members of the second-year cohort of the 2000 Master's program. The editorial committee expresses its profound thanks for the work of the authors, and wishes each class member continued success in their future endeavors.

It is also important to mention the continued support of the Indiana University Student Personnel Association (IUSPA) for the work and financial support of the students in this organization, and the faculty members of the Higher Education and Student Affairs Program for encouraging graduate students to achieve excellence in scholarship, research, and writing.

Finally, this edition of the *Journal* is only possible due to the dedicated efforts and support of the *Journal* Review Board, and Dr. Ada Simmons, our advisor. These individuals have given perhaps the most valuable resource toward the publication of this journal – their time. We thank you and wish the future editors and review board members the same support and dedication with which you have provided us.

We hope that you enjoy this year's edition of the *Journal*, and that you are able to stay in touch with the program here at Indiana University.

State of the Program

Ada Simmons, Ed.D.
Master's Program Coordinator

It is a pleasure to offer you the Spring 2000 edition of the *IUSPA Journal*. The *Journal* is a product of the talented and dedicated students in the master's degree program and in the selection of topics represented, illustrates the intersection of scholarship and practical application that is a hallmark of our program. In the original research conducted for many of these papers, the authors expose the complexities and challenges faced by student affairs practitioners as they attempt to create and sustain healthy learning environments for college students today. Contributing to the conversation on these issues through the publication of the *Journal* is an important step for our students in their professional development, helping to ready them for greater contributions to the field as they step into influential positions on campuses around the globe. We appreciate your faithful contributions to the master's program through the financial gifts that make possible the publication of this *Journal* and through the referrals of prospective students that keep our program high among those nationally ranked.

The master's program in Student Affairs continues to attract students from all across the United States and occasionally from other nations. Our Outreach Weekends in February drew over 75 students to campus to learn about the program, visit with faculty and alumni as well as prospective and current students, and interview for assistantships. Nearly without exception, prospective students indicate being drawn to the field because of the critical influence of their undergraduate out-of-class involvement on their development – and a desire to be involved in impacting similarly the lives of others. Although the majority of students enrolling in the program do so immediately after undergraduate work, several in each cohort have already had a few years of professional work experience in the field or are drawn to the program to facilitate a career change.

Once enrolled in IU's program, students are caught up quickly in the whirlwind of activity in and out of the classroom. The IUSPA continues to be a vibrant mechanism for fellowship and professional development through the provision of friendship-building activities, seminars, and committee work. Recognizing that peers can be extremely effective facilitators of learning, a concerted effort was made this year to more deliberately build associations between doctoral and master's students and first-year and continuing students. Our students also were able to participate in NASPA in large numbers this year because of the proximity of the national meeting in Indianapolis earlier this spring. Two teams took advantage of the opportunity to compete in the NASPA case study challenge, bringing to bear their understanding of students and campus life on a complex, realistic scenario centered around the controversial issue of campus admissions.

Our faculty have been actively pursuing their research, teaching, and service agendas this year, as the following highlights illustrate. Deborah Carter recently completed a book based on her dissertation research entitled *A dream deferred? Examining the degree aspirations of African American and White college students*. Watch for a fall release by Garland Publishers. George Kuh is directing the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) project which is funded by a $3.3 million grant from The Pew Charitable Trusts. Cosponsored by The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and The Pew Forum on Undergraduate Learning, the NSSE project is an annual survey of the degree to which undergraduates at 4-year colleges and universities are involved in good educational practices. Look for the first national report to be released in mid-October. On the Indianapolis campus,Gene Tempel received another grant for $765,000 from Lilly Endowment, Inc. to create the National Community Foundation Institute and joined the editorial board for the new CASE International Journal of University Advancement that Don Hossler is editing. For the second year in a row Gene was named by Nonprofit Times as one of the 50 most influential leaders in the nonprofit sector in the US. Later this summer Trudy Banta will be conducting the 12th International Conference on Assessing Quality in Higher Education, hosted by Royal Melbourne (Australia) Institute of Technology. Representatives from 25 countries are expected to attend this meeting.

You may be familiar with the old adage that nothing is constant except change, and this year is no exception. After spending the past year in Washington, DC doing research with NSF, Fran Stage will begin the next academic year as a professor at NYU. Initially she will be located in DC working on proposals, curriculum change, and other 'distance' projects, but by fall 2001 Fran will relocate to New York City. While we all wish Fran our very best, we will surely feel the loss of her presence and influence among us. The program is also undergoing another personnel change this year. After serving two years as program coordinator, I am stepping back to devote myself full-time to my role as associate director of the Indiana Education Policy Center at IU. My tenure as program coordinator has been richly satisfying on a personal and professional level, and I am endebted to you all — faculty, staff, alumni, and most importantly, our students – for co-laboring with me these past two years. The new program coordinator is Jillian Kinzie, no stranger to the Higher Education and Student Affairs program. A graduate of IU's master's program in Student Affairs and an experienced researcher, teaching assistant, and practitioner, Jillian is ideally situated to draw upon her wealth of related experience and knowledge to provide leadership for the program.

Now it's time to settle into a comfortable chair, put your feet up, and enjoy reading the *Journal*! As always, we enjoy hearing what you're up to, so drop us a line when you have a free moment (hesa@indiana.edu).

Journal of the Indiana University Student Personnel Association

2000 Edition

Contents

Editors' Comments....................4
Brent E. Ericson, Jason Pontius

State of the Program....................5
Ada Simmons

Awards and Honors & Call for Nominations....................8

Satisfaction Among College Students Living in Greek Housing and Living-Learning Centers....................9
Brent E. Ericson, William D. Gardner, Jennifer L. Herzog, Andrew N. Morgan, Edwin J. Stephens

Facing the Challenges: Latina/o Faculty in Higher Education....................22
Shannon Burns

Where Do Students Study? An Analysis of Preferred Study Environments....................33
Sarah Beck, Jen Berson, Allison Hagan, Jason Pontius, Dana Umscheid

Student Satisfaction with the Adams Living Learning Center....................49
Steven E. Neal, Thomas B. Pitchford, Jermaine M. Upshaw Hsiao-Yu Chen, William B. Smith

Behavioral Responses to Hate Crimes: A Study of Asians and Asian-Americans on a University Campus....................64
Shannon L. Burns, Shaun R. Harper Emily S. Hildebrand, Megan N. Moore

AWARDS AND HONORS

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

Robert Thomas
2000 Elizabeth A. Greenleaf Distinguished Alumni Award

Patricia Volp
2000 Robert H. Shaffer Distinguished Alumni Award

Anna Burkhalter
2000 Elizabeth A. Greenleaf Fellowship Award

David Ortiz
2000 August and Ann Eberle Fellowship Award

Daisy Rodriguez
2000 Robert H. Wade II Fellowship

Marcy Levi Shankman and Gary Williams
2000 Holmstedt Fellowships

Ada Simmons
2000 Kate Hevner Mueller Award

Michael Parsons
2000 Glenn W. Irwin, Jr., M.D. Experience Excellence Recognition Award

Call for Nominations

Nominations of individuals for the 2001 Elizabeth A. Greenleaf and Robert H. Shaffer Awards are now being accepted. The Elizabeth A. Greenleaf Award is presented annually to a graduate of the master's degree program who exemplifies "the sincere commitment, professional leadership and personal warmth" of Betty Greenleaf, for whom the award is named. Previous Greenleaf Award recipients include Louis Stamatakos, Phyllis Mable, Deborah Hunter, Vernon Wall, Jamie Washington, Kathryn Goddard, and Helen Mamachev, to name a few. The Robert H. Shaffer Award is presented to a graduate of the Higher Education doctoral program who exemplifies outstanding service to the student affairs profession. Previous recipients have included "Sandy" McLean, Don Creamer, Alice Manicur, Donald Mikesell, and Gary McGrath.

Nominations for both awards close February 1, 2001. The awards will be presented at the 2001 NASPA and ACPA conferences. Please direct your nominations and letter of support to Jillian Kinzie, 4228 W. W. Wright Education Bldg., 201 N. Rose Ave., Indiana University, Bloomington, IN 47405. Thank you.

Satisfaction Among College Students Living in Greek Housing and Living-Learning Centers

By Brent E. Ericson, William D. Gardner, Jennifer L. Herzog, Andrew N. Morgan, Edwin J. Stephens

This study investigates how living environments facilitate social, academic, and institutional satisfaction among college students. Specifically, the satisfaction levels of students in Greek chapter houses were compared to those of students in a living-learning center. Results demonstrate that student satisfaction differs by place of residence and by gender, and serve to provide implications for future practice and research.

With the current national focus on assessment, student outcomes, and persistence rates in higher education, levels of college student satisfaction have become increasingly important. Students' level of satisfaction with a particular institution has been shown to be related to their perceptions of their educational experience (Astin, 1993). The value of a student's level of satisfaction cannot be underestimated because satisfaction, in turn, can have substantial effects on outcomes such as persistence, academic performance, and overall success in acclimating to the campus climate (Astin, 1993). One major determinant of satisfaction is a student's living environment. Specifically, Pennington, Zvonkovic, and Wilson (1989) list "place of residence" as being related to overall college satisfaction. Thus, residential environments play a large role in an institution's attempt to enhance the satisfaction of students.

The American College Personnel Association (1994) notes that student affairs professionals can intentionally create conditions that enhance student outcomes. To illustrate this point, Grimm (1993) observed students living in college residence halls and determined that those who lived in living-learning centers (LLC) were more satisfied than those who did not. Research also indicates that students living in Greek houses are more satisfied with their college experience than their peers living in traditional residence halls or in off-campus housing (Pennington et al., 1989).

Living-learning centers and Greek housing have certain similar characteristics, including the fact that students residing in them have intentionally chosen to do so. However, differences exist, such as how

selection takes place. A mutual selection process of rushing and pledging takes place among members of Greek organizations, whereas in living-learning centers, applications are reviewed by faculty or administrators.

Although these studies show that both Greek housing and living-learning centers are more effective environments for enhancing student outcomes than traditional residence halls, the authors of this study are unaware of any research directly comparing levels of satisfaction between the two. Such a comparison is an important step towards gaining knowledge of what types of living environments can and should be created in order to produce the greatest levels of college satisfaction.

Therefore, the purpose of this study is to compare satisfaction among students living in Greek houses to that of students residing in living-learning centers. It is the goal of this study to further understand which type of intentional living environments promote and enhance greater degrees of social, academic, and institutional satisfaction. The results of this study can be examined and utilized by student affairs professionals when designing, evaluating, or restructuring intentional living environments. A better understanding of what types of environments produce greater satisfaction levels among students can aid administrators in reaching the goals of increasing persistence and retention.

Literature Review

The majority of a student's time in college is spent outside of the classroom (Kuh, Schuh, Whitt, Andreas, Lyons, Strange, Krehbeil, & MacKay, 1991), and is divided up among various kinds of activities, including time spent in the living community. According to Schroeder, Warner, and Malone (1980), the time students spend in their living environment is a determining factor in their satisfaction with college. Schroeder, et al. (1980) further report that a student's sense of congruency with their living environment has been linked to increased levels of student satisfaction, higher levels of persistence and more stability in vocational choice.

The link between satisfaction and a student's place of residence can be explained in part by the interaction that takes place among students within the living community. Pascarella, Terenzini, and Blimling (1994) and Astin (1993) note that living communities promote the development of peer groups, which in turn is a determinant of overall college satisfaction. In addition to promoting the

development of peer groups, living communities can also promote increased student involvement in campus activities such as student clubs and organizations or participation in intramural sports. All of these factors have been shown to be positively associated with overall college satisfaction (Astin, 1993). A student's peer group is the "single most potent source of influence on growth and development during the undergraduate years" (Astin, 1993, p. 398).

Given this understanding of living communities, the following discussion will illustrate the benefits of living in residence hall living-learning centers and Greek houses.

Living-Learning Centers

The early concepts of the living-learning center originated from the mutual desire of students and educators to integrate the knowledge gained from both inside and outside of the classroom, thereby "reaffirming the relevance of education to daily life" (Rowe, 1981, p.51). This integration has been accomplished by a number of strategies and styles, which allow for experimentation and flexibility in creating or changing living-learning centers. Thus a single, all-encompassing and agreed upon definition for this type of environment is problematic.

While living-learning centers vary among institutions, Love and Tokuno (1999) observe the foundation of a successful living-learning center consists of a shared setting where students and faculty collaborate to incorporate the curriculum into daily life. Living-learning communities can impact residents in a number of ways. First, Love (1999) notes that these units help students form social networks with peers, provide opportunities for faculty interaction, and increase student involvement. Second, it has been observed that increased retention, stronger commitment to the institution, and increased personal development are outcomes of living-learning centers (Barefoot, Fidler, Gardner, Moore & Roberts, 1999). Third, Strommer (1999) notes that greater exposure to collaborative learning, frequent class attendance, and overall higher academic success are benefits of living-learning units. In addition, students who reside in living-learning centers see their environment as more personal and less isolated (Williams & Reilley, 1972). Finally, Pascarella, Terenzini, and Blimling's (1994) evidence suggests that "residing in an LLC is more educationally beneficial to students than living in a conventional residential hall" (p. 32).

Greek Houses

The second type of intentionally selected living communities examined in this study, Greek housing, has also been shown to promote student learning outcomes and overall college satisfaction. Astin (1977) writes "fraternity and sorority membership has a substantial positive effect on persistence, overall satisfaction with college, and satisfaction with instruction and social life" (p. 222). Given the aforementioned discussion by Astin (1993) of the influence of peer groups, Greek housing environments assist in the growth and development of students, and leave strong and lasting impressions.

The development of peer relationships in Greek houses has other benefits as well. Parker and Gade (1981) state that students living in Greek housing units have a high commitment to the house, receive high levels of emotional support, experience a drive for academic achievement and intellectual pursuits, and are given the freedom to govern themselves. In addition, Winston, Hutson, and McCaffrey (1980) write that studies completed using the University Residence Environment Scale (URES) showed that fraternities ranked higher on involvement, emotional support, and social interaction when compared to residence halls. Therefore, Greek housing environments may be better able to meet the needs of students and increase their overall satisfaction when compared to traditional residence halls. Seitzinger and Ellis (1989) note that independent students look to peer groups for assistance and are able to find that support within their living environment. Likewise, members in Greek houses turn first to fraternity brothers or sorority sisters for support.

In summary, not only do living environments play a large role in a student's overall success and satisfaction with the college experience, but among the various living environments, living-learning centers and Greek houses facilitate high rates of student involvement, academic development, social interaction, and in turn, overall satisfaction. Both living-learning centers and Greek houses have been shown to have benefits for the students living in them. The question remains, however, as to which of these two environments engenders more satisfaction among students.

Hypotheses

The researchers developed two hypotheses based on Barker's behavior setting theory (as cited in Walsh, 1978). Barker suggested that a behavior setting, such as a Greek house or living-learning center, imposes a pattern of behavior on the individuals in that setting. Therefore, due to the social nature of Greek letter organizations, the researchers believed that members of the Greek houses would have higher levels of social satisfaction than those residing in living-learning centers. Second, due to the academic purpose and emphasis of the living-learning center, the researchers believed that the living-learning center residents would have a greater academic satisfaction than that of the Greek participants.

A third hypothesis stems from Blimling's (1993) review of the influence of residence halls on student satisfaction and perception of the campus social climate. Though Greeks exhibit more social satisfaction with their houses, students in residence halls have demonstrated more satisfaction with the campus social climate in general. "One possible explanation may be that exclusionary peer environments found in fraternities and sororities foster a sense of elitism. This feeling of elitism may encourage some cynicism about some campus activities outside of the fraternity and sorority experience" (p. 261). Therefore, the researchers of this study hypothesize that Greeks will have a higher social satisfaction and living-learning center residents will have a higher institutional satisfaction.

Method

Sample

The study was conducted at a large, public, residential, Research I institution located in the Midwest during the fall semester of 1999. A convenience sample was used from one fraternity house, one sorority house, and a living-learning center. From the distributed surveys, a response of 95 surveys was collected. The response rate from the sorority was 32 out of 35 (91.4%) and 34 out of 40 (85%) from the fraternity. The response rate for the living-learning center was 100 percent for both males and females, yielding 14 and 15 surveys respectively. These specific environments were chosen for comparison because of characteristics they have in common. For example, each has a strong tradition and history, high retention rates within the place of residence, and the fact that students must participate in a specific selection process to live in these environments.

After identifying fraternity and sorority chapters with the desired number of residents, the researchers approached the presidents of one fraternity chapter and one sorority chapter to ask for volunteers for the study. The living-learning center was selected because it embodied many of the identifying factors associated with the various definitions of living-learning centers found in the literature. This

includes student, faculty, and curricular collaboration. The living-learning center also housed a desirable number of males and females of sophomore class standing or higher, which is comparable to the fraternity and sorority living environments.

Instrumentation

A survey, specifically designed for this study, was administered to participants. The survey instrument was pre-tested by sixteen student volunteers from a fraternity and a thematic residence hall floor. The purpose of the pre-test was to determine the suitability of the instrument for assessing student satisfaction and to evaluate the clarity of instructions and individual survey items. Comments received from the pre-test volunteers were used to modify and further develop the survey instrument.

The survey was designed to measure the students' levels of satisfaction as it relates to their living environment. The instrument contained 47 Likert scale items, and three open-ended questions. Multiple choice responses ranged from "Strongly Agree" (5) to "Strongly Disagree" (1). The survey was divided into five sections: demographic information; academic satisfaction; social satisfaction; institutional satisfaction; and the three open-ended questions.

Analysis

The completed survey responses were entered into SPSS to determine the mean and standard deviation of each item. In addition, t-tests were used to compare the means and determine the statistical significance of the mean differences. The levels of satisfaction of students in the living-learning center and those in the Greek houses were compared. The same procedure was used to analyze differences between males and females. Specific areas of analysis examined academic, social, and institutional satisfaction. The open-ended responses were coded and categorized by common themes. Percentages of responses within each group were calculated and compared to discern differences between the Greek housing and living-learning center residents.

Limitations

Before discussing the results of the data collection, it is important to identify the limitations of this study. The small sample size from the living-learning center, especially as compared with the Greek sample, may skew results. In addition, the sample is by definition, a

convenience sample, and therefore may limit generalizability to other institutions, different types of living-learning centers, or to other Greek houses.

The reliance on self-reported data is another noteworthy limitation of this study, because it produces a certain degree of superficiality. In particular, satisfaction levels can fluctuate during various times in an academic term (Pennington, et al., 1989). In addition to the timing of the data collection, participants may have over-reported their agreement with individual survey items in an effort to improve the perceived results for their respective sample group. Therefore, self-reporting may have an impact on results.

Results

Table 1 provides an overview of academic, social, and institutional satisfaction among men and women in living-learning centers and Greek houses. This table also indicates the means and standard deviations for each category between all living-learning center and Greek participants. The gender differences among the three satisfaction categories are also illustrated.

Table 1

	All L.L.C Participants		**L.L.C. Men**		**L.L.C. Women**	
	Mean	*S.D.*	*Mean*	*S.D.*	*Mean*	*S.D.*
Academic	3.14	0.66	3.18*	0.65	3.67*	0.59
Social	3.41*	0.78	2.92**	0.81	3.86**	0.39
Institutional	4.06	0.82	3:83	0.99	4.29	0.56
	All Greeks		**Greek Men**		**Greek Women**	
	Mean	*S.D.*	*Mean*	*S.D.*	*Mean*	*S.D.*
Academic	3.53	0.52	3.48	0.55	3.59	0.5
Social	4.14**	0.39	4.02*	0.36	4.27*	0.39
Institutional	4.28	0.41	4.13	0.39	4.43	0.38

*Significant Group Differences, *<.05, **<.001 (two tailed probability)*

First, participants living in fraternity and sorority houses have slightly higher levels of social satisfaction. The mean score was 4.14 for Greeks and 3.41 for living-learning center participants. There were no significant differences between Greek residents and living-learning center residents for academic and institutional satisfaction.

Second, there were significant differences between men's and women's academic and social satisfaction levels within the living-learning center sample. Women produced a mean score of 3.67 on the academic measure and 3.86 for social satisfaction, while men reported a mean of 3.18 and 2.92, respectively. Thus, women there were more academically and socially satisfied than men on both measures.

Third, there was a significant difference in the level of social satisfaction between Greek men and women with women being more socially satisfied than men. Women's mean score was a 4.27 and men's was 4.02. This finding is consistent with that of the living-learning center sample showing women are more socially satisfied in each environment.

There were no significant differences in academic or institutional satisfaction between the two genders. No large differences existed between the mean scores of individual survey items for these two groups. In general, women reported slightly higher agreement with all the individual survey items except for the number of hours spent each week in co-curricular activities. For this measure men reported a minimally higher level of agreement.

Another interesting finding is that the mean scores for both the Greek and living-learning center samples were at or above 4.0 for the final three survey items, which specifically mention the institution and reflect on the student's college choice. The high levels of satisfaction reported by these questions seems to indicate that the study University is meeting student expectations.

In addition to the Likert-scale items, three open-ended items were used to further assess the satisfaction levels of the subjects in their respective living environments. Specifically, their likes and dislikes about the environment and reasons for choosing their surroundings were examined. The first open-ended statement asked the subjects what they liked best about their living environment. The majority of the responses for this item were primarily directed at social and institutional aspects of the living environment, while academics were only mentioned in six responses. Greek participants specifically mentioned friendship as the thing they liked best about their living environment. However, no living-learning center resident provided this response. Both Greek and living-learning center participants' responses included social events, relationships with peers, diversity, acceptance and respect, food, brotherhood, and community.

The second open-ended item asked respondents to report what they liked least about their living environment. The most often mentioned category response among the Greek subjects was a lack of privacy and personal space followed by high noise levels that prevented people from sleeping or studying. Living-learning center residents reported facilities, peer group characteristics, and high levels of noise as the most frequently cited responses.

For the final open-ended item, "Why did you choose to live

here?" the authors found a wide range of responses. For the living-learning center, both desire for a single room and food availability occurred with the most frequency, followed by responses such as aesthetics, accepting or supportive environment, diversity, "lived here last year," and "recommended" which all occurred with the same frequency. On the other hand, the Greek residents' most common reason given for choosing to live in their house was peer group characteristics, which was followed by social life and events.

The responses found in this open-ended analysis are primarily based on the social aspect of both environments. These results support and complement those found in the Likert-scale section of the survey.

Discussion

Through a review of the research findings, several important implications can be drawn from this study. This section will discuss academic satisfaction in the living-learning center, gender differences among study participants, participation rates in the living-learning center, residence hall retention, selection of living-learning center residents, and institutional retention.

The closed-ended responses yielded no significant difference in academic satisfaction between Greek housing and living-learning center residents. This appears contrary to the original mission of living-learning centers. Rowe (1981) reported the initial premise of living-learning centers was to integrate knowledge into daily life. In the open-ended items, students cited the desire for a single room and food as the top reasons they chose to reside in a living-learning center, indicating that the living-learning center may have moved away from its academic foundation.

Given the positive outcomes associated with residing in a living-learning center (Barefoot, et al., 1999; Love, 1994; Pascarella, et al., 1994; Williams & Reilley, 1972), it would be beneficial for this living-learning center to revisit its historical roots and implement more academically based programs and policies. Practitioners should proceed with caution, however. While there cannot be any conclusive results drawn regarding academic satisfaction, the reported mean score of social satisfaction (3.41) does suggest this living-learning center is fostering a certain degree of social satisfaction. Thus, efforts to enhance the academic climate should not be at the expense of social opportunities for students.

Comparisons between male and female residents show female students are more socially satisfied in both the living-learning center

and Greek residences. This may be attributable to the differences in environments in men's and women's residences, or to gender difference itself. Gilligan (1996) suggests that women are socialized differently than men and place a greater emphasis on cooperation and interpersonal relationships. Thus, the nature of the relationships on women's floors and in the sorority house may be a cause of the differences found in this study. Future researchers may want to examine the different environments established by men and women to determine the cause of this discrepancy.

During the data collection process, the research team also noted differences in participation rates between the living-learning center and Greek housing residents. After visiting one fraternity and one sorority the desired number of surveys for this study were obtained. However, five visits to the living-learning center yielded an average of less than six surveys per visit. This suggests that Greek participation rates in organizational meetings and events is higher than that of LLC functions. These attendance rates may support the high levels of commitment typical in Greek organizations as stated in the literature (Parker & Gade, 1981; Winston, et al., 1980). The commitment shown by Greek housing residents may be the result of the peer relations found in these environments. However, it should be noted that often times house and chapter meetings are mandatory for members. If future research can demonstrate that peer relationships result in stronger organizational commitment, efforts to increase social involvement in living-learning centers may increase participation in meetings and hall functions.

The research conducted in this study indicates that students residing in Greek houses have higher levels of social satisfaction than students residing in the living-learning centers. This warrants further research to determine what causes higher levels of social satisfaction. However, if these elements can be properly determined and applied to living-learning centers, it may be possible to increase social satisfaction among students living in residence halls. Increased social satisfaction in the residence halls may lead to more students choosing to reside there. Given the positive outcomes of residing in a living-learning center as cited in the literature (Barefoot, et al., 1999; Love, 1999; Pascarella, et al., 1994; Williams & Reilley, 1972;), future research should be conducted to determine why students in Greek housing are more satisfied with their social lives, and practitioners should attempt to incorporate these elements into the living-learning centers.

One possible explanation for the higher levels of social satisfaction in the Greek housing units is that those students self-select with

whom they will live. This takes place through the recruitment or rush process that is used to supply Greek organizations with new members. The open-ended responses to why students from the Greek housing sample chose their particular living environment indicated it was due to the characteristics of their housemates, the social life and events, and their friends. Conversely, living-learning center residents reported they chose their environment because it provided the opportunity for a single room and because of the food. According to a living-learning center staff member, students do not participate in the selection process for the living-learning center, but rather apply and are chosen by a selection committee composed of two faculty members (personal communication, December 5, 1999). The authors of this study feel there is a strong possibility that if students were allowed to participate in the selection process for the living-learning center, social satisfaction may improve. However, caution should be used. Living-learning center residents responded favorably to the presence of diversity in their environment. Greek houses surveyed in this study show very low levels of diversity among their membership. Therefore, any changes in the selection process should strive to maintain a diverse student population within the living-learning center.

This study concludes that living-learning center students are less socially satisfied than the Greek housing population. Further, Grimm (1993) observed that students who reside in living-learning centers are typically more satisfied than those students who live in traditional residence halls. Thus, there is cause for concern regarding student satisfaction with traditional residence halls. Residence hall satisfaction is a determinant of overall satisfaction, which is closely tied to institutional retention (Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991). Future research is needed to determine how to increase student satisfaction in the residence halls, and maintain and increase institutional retention.

Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to compare academic, social, and institutional satisfaction among students in living-learning centers and Greek houses. The results of data collection demonstrate that satisfaction differs by place of residence and gender. Given the current debate in higher education regarding accountability, it is critical that

institutions assess the satisfaction of their students. It is the view of the research team that thorough and continuous investigation into the nature and causes of student satisfaction will allow practitioners to implement structures and policies on college campuses that will facilitate student development, positive outcomes, and greater satisfaction with the college environment.

References

American College Personnel Association. The student learning imperative. Washington, DC: ACPA, 1994. [Reprinted in the March 1996 *Journal of College Student Development*, vol. 37, pp. 118-22.]

Astin, A. W. (1977). *Four critical years.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Astin, A. W. (1985). *Achieving educational excellence.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

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

Barefoot, B. O., Fidler, D. S., Gardner, J. N., Moore, P. S., & Roberts, M. R. (1999). A natural linkage: The first-year seminar and the learning community. In J. H. Levine (Ed.), *Learning communities: New structures, new partnerships for learning* (Monograph No. 26) (pp. 77-86). Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina, National Resource Center for The First-Year Experience and Students in Transition.

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.

Gilligan, C. (1996). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development* (2nd ed.). Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press.

Grimm, J. D. (1993). Residential alternatives. In R. B. Winston, S. Anchors, & Associates (Eds.), *Student housing and residential life* (pp. 248-268). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

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

Love, A. G. (1999). What are learning communities? In J. H. Levine (Ed.), *Learning communities: New structures, new partnerships for learning* (Monograph No. 26) (pp.1 –8). Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina, National Resource Center for The First-Year Experience and Students in Transition.

Love, A. G., & Tokuno, K. A. (1999). Learning community models. In J. H. Levine (Ed.), *Learning communities: New structures, new partnerships for learning.* (Monograph No. 26) (pp. 9-17). Columbia, SC: University

of South Carolina, National Resource Center for The First-Year Experience and Students in Transition.

Parker, D., & Gade, E. M. (1981). Fraternity and sorority perceptions of their residence environment. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 22* (4), 358-362.

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

Pascarella, E. T., Terenzini, P. T., & Blimling, G. S. (1994). The impact of residential life on students. In C. C. Schroeder, P. Mable, & Associates (Eds.), *Realizing the educational potential of residence halls* (pp. 22-52). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

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.

Rowe, L. P. (1981). Environmental structuring: Residence halls as living learning centers. In G. S. Blimling & J. S. Schuh (Eds.), *Increasing the educational role of residence halls* (pp. 51-64). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schroeder, C. C., Warner, R., & Malone, D. R. (1980). Effects of assignment to living units by personality types on environmental perceptions and student development. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 21* (5), 443-449.

Seitzinger, J.A., & Ellis, D. (1989). Does Greek life belong? Two roads to community. Creating a new residential life system. Setting new goals for the Greek system. *Educational Record, 70,* 48-53.

Strommer, D. W. (1999). Teaching and learning in a learning community. In J. H. Levine (Ed.), *Learning communities: New structures, new partnerships for learning.* (Monograph No. 26) (pp.39-49). Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina, National Resource Center for The First-Year Experience and Students in Transition.

Walsh, W. B. (1978). Person/environment interaction. In G. D. Kuh, J. P. Bean, D. Hossler, & F. K. Stage (Eds.), *ASHE reader on college students* (pp. 105-113). Needham Heights, MA: Ginn Press.

Williams, D. E., & Reilley, R. R. (1972). The impact of residence halls on students. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 13* (5), 402-410.

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

Winston, R. B., & Saunders, S. A. (1987). The Greek experience: Friend or foe of student development? In R. B. Winston, W. R. Nettles, & J. H. Opper (Eds.), *Fraternities and Sororities on the Contemporary College Campus* (pp. 5-20). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Facing the Challenges: Latina/o Faculty in Higher Education

By Shannon Burns

This paper covers the more significant challenges that Latina/o faculty face as minorities in academe. Some of these challenges include the lack of representation of Latina/os in higher education, minority social and psychological barriers, tokenism, barrioization, racism, isolation, separatism, unfair expectations of service to the university community, and difficulty in obtaining tenure. Several individual stories of Latina/o faculty members are given in order to better illustrate the personal struggles they have encountered in higher education.

Latina/o faculty have been criticized by other Latina/os for not committing to Latina/o students or to their responsibilities as Latina/o people (Padilla, 1997). They have been criticized by Anglo academicians as being separatists (Boice, 1993) and too outspoken (Cockcroft, 1995). These criticisms offer only a glimpse into the controversies surrounding Latina/o faculty. The purpose of this article is to present some of the more significant issues that Latina/o faculty face as minority educators in higher education in the United States. First, statistics regarding Latina/o representation are shared and barriers they face in beginning careers in education are discussed. Next, specific challenges that Latina/o educators encounter are given and followed by some of the reasons they persevere. Finally, this article concludes with recommendations for improving the conditions and experiences of Latina/o faculty and reasons why change is necessary.

Lack of Representation and Barriers to Education

The paucity of Latina/o faculty in higher education is quite revealing. In 1985, Chicanos represented less than one percent of all United States professoriate (Aguirre, Jr. & Martinez, 1993). By 1990, this number increased to 3.3% (Cockcroft, 1995). According to Aguirre, Jr. and Martinez (1993), the majority of Chicano faculty are concentrated in two-year schools (1.8% in 1989) and are grossly underrepresented in four-year institutions (0.6% in 1989). In addition, Latina/os are more concentrated in the lower-levels of academe such as junior faculty and lecturers (Garza, 1993). This imbalance persists in the academic departments as most Latina/o professors tend to be employed in the social sciences, education, humanities, language, and

ethnic studies departments, as compared to science, engineering, computer, and math departments (Aguirre & Martinez, 1993). Overall, the evidence shows the definite lack of Latina/o faculty representation in United States higher education.

It is even more difficult to obtain an accurate picture of the number of Latina/o professors because of the differences in terminology when referring to their race or ethnicity. Latina/os are referred to and choose to identify themselves in various ways, as Hispanic, Chicana/o, Latina/o, Puerto Rican, Cuban/a, Mexican American, or Dominican American. For the purposes of this paper, and for consistency, the term Latina/o will be used to encompass all of these identifiers unless a direct quotation from another source uses one of these terms.

The under-representation and imbalance in numbers when it comes to Latina/o faculty can be mostly explained by the institutional, social, and psychological barriers that they face in starting careers in academe. Such barriers include, but are not limited to, early educational experiences, entrance and scholarship exam biases, socio-economic status, others' and self- perceptions of incompetence, and fear of failure. The messages that minority children receive about education and their levels of intelligence are often negative and can carry over into a minority student's college career. In addition, the majority of college professors are White, leaving few people with whom a minority student can identify (Bronstein, Rothblum, & Solomon, 1993). Scholarship tests and college entrance exams are also barriers in that they favor middle- and upper-class White males, making it difficult for many students of color to meet testing standards (Bronstein et al., 1993). Minority students are also more likely to be financially limited in their options for school. This discourages them from paying for application fees, travelling to different schools to visit, and often limits them to the more affordable state and community colleges that are less likely to pave the way toward graduate school.

Psychological barriers to education are created from the negative messages that Latina/o students receive from the world around them (Bronstein et al., 1993). By being treated as though they are incompetent, or that their achievements are due to affirmative action policies, Latina/os may internalize this oppression and begin to limit and denigrate themselves. The fear of failure that results creates yet another barrier for Latina/os wishing to join the ranks of academe.

Challenges Faced By Latina/o Faculty

Many of the problems that Latina/o faculty encounter are

similar to those faced by minority students and other minority faculty in predominantly White institutions of higher education. These include struggles with identity, tokenism, isolation, barrioization (channeling Latinas/os only into areas assumed to be related to their culture), expectations of service, difficulties in reaching tenure, and perceptions of separatism. Within these experiences, prejudice and racism are often present which contribute to the unfair treatment that minority faculty receive. In order to better illustrate the issues that Latina/o faculty members face in higher education, several personal excerpts written by Latina/o faculty in R. V. Padilla and R. Chávez Chávez's book, *The Leaning Ivory Tower* (1995) are presented throughout this paper.

Issues of cultural identity frequently confront many Latina/o faculty. The contradiction of being a minority in a White world pervades higher education and the Latina/o professor is not exempt from this contradiction. A study examining the experiences of Black, Latina/o, and Asian faculty found that almost half reported having to give up some or all major aspects of their culture in order to succeed in their departments (Feagin, Vera, & Imani, 1996). On the other hand, they are criticized by others for assimilating, which is seen as devaluing the Latina/o people and culture and detaching oneself from Latina/o students (Padilla, 1997). Many want to be regarded simply as professors and not "Latina/o" professors and to be respected for their work, not judged by their ethnicity. Ana M. Martínez Alemán (1995), a Cubana professor, shares her personal struggle with her identity as a Latina professor in a Eurocentric academic world:

> Though I speak their languages and know their secret handshakes, sing their ceremonial hymns, and worship their academic gods, I cannot fully be one of them. I am a convert, baptized by academic missionaries who have shown me the way into the promised professional land. Dressed in academic regalia and fluent in its discourse, I can only masquerade as one of them, never truly *be* one of them. I am born outside the boundaries of the pedigree, born into another neighborhood. Moving into my faculty office, taking my seat at the faculty meeting or at commencement, sampling the hors d'oeuvres at the president's holiday bash, I am struck by my lived contradiction: to be a professor is to be an *anglo*; to be a *latina* is not to be an *anglo*. So how can I be both a Latina and a professor?...As Latina/o professors, we are newcomers to a world defined and controlled by discourses that do not address our realities, that do not affirm our intellectual contributions, that do not seriously examine our worlds. Can I be both Latina and professor without compromise? (p. 74-75)

In addition to trying to succeed at predominately White institutions with predominately White faculty, Latina/o professors often feel as though they are perceived by their White colleagues and sometimes students as being the "token minority," and are only there through the results of affirmative action policies (Johnsrud, 1993). Richard R. Verduga (1995) relates his experience along these lines:

> In the fall of 1980, as I neared completion of my doctoral dissertation, the prospect of accepting a teaching position at a reputable research-oriented university was not only personally satisfying but would have been the culmination of seven years of grinding graduate study. Since my first love was research, early on I had decided not to apply for academic positions at teaching institutions. My goal was to develop into a first-rate scholar. My prospects, so I thought, looked good. In fact, a number of other graduate students continually reinforced this belief by informing me that I would "have no problem" landing a position at a first-rate research university. Interestingly, I later realized that such comments were made simply because I was a Chicano and had little to do with my academic accomplishments. (p. 101)

Latina/os who do make it in academe are frequently concentrated in academic departments such as Chicano studies, ethnic studies, Spanish language and literature, or bilingual education. They are also more likely to participate in committees related to cultural events and issues, international or study abroad programs, and minority affairs and recruitment. These areas have been referred to as affirmative action "dumping grounds" where institutional policies and discrimination keep Latina/o and other minority faculty members grouped together with little connection to the rest of university life (Garza, 1993). This practice known as "barrioization," "contributes to the formation of 'separate but equal' racial/ethnic divisions that fuel the misperception of Chicano/Latino scholarship as political partisanship and advocacy

rather than true, legitimate research and scholarship in its own right" (Garza, 1993, p. 36). The opinion that minorities should study or teach only those subjects that relate to their culture or ethnicity (or are only capable of doing so) can be seen in the following example of a Dominican American faculty member:

> Usually faculty and other graduate students were stunned when I said I was pursuing nineteenth-century British literature. "Aren't you interested in the literature of your people," a few asked. My people! When did knowledge and literature become the property of a specific group, I often thought but rarely had the nerve to say. (Cruz, 1995, p. 92)

Later, when she did change her field of study to literature on Dominican Americans, she continued to experience assumptions about her interests based on her race. Here she relates an incident with an important university official:

> When I explained that I had done research on highly literate Dominican Americans, his immediate response was, "Oh, so you must be a Dominican American yourself." "Yes, I am," I answered, and by the end of the conversation I was angry: It is a no-win situation. Had I done research on a typical mainstream subject, my right and ability would have been questioned. When I do research on my own community, I am considered suspect, narrow, ethnocentric, and incapable of being objective. (Cruz, 1995, p. 92)

Related to the issue of barrioization is not only the assumption that Latina/os in academe wish to, or should take on Latina/o related subjects and roles, but that they are *expected* to do so. In addition to the roles of teaching, research, and service that all faculty members are required to perform to obtain tenure, Latina/o faculty are generally expected to take on additional duties and have extra demands placed on them. They are asked to be on committees to offer a multicultural perspective, Latina/o students seek them out as role models and for advisory positions, and they are asked to represent their minority population for other services in which they feel obliged to participate (Johnsrud, 1993). One Puerto Rican faculty member recounts an experience where she was consulted on behalf of the minority population:

> Whether at the college or in professional organizations, I found that an implicit expectation was that, as a minority, I would serve as the connection to minority networks. When it was time to think about minorities who would be good for this or that, or about a minority candidate for a position, the minorities in the room (sometimes I was the only one there) were assigned the task. This was reasonable at one level, but unreasonable and unfair at another. While minority faculty members tend to know other minorities, it is unreasonable to expect them to know minorities in all fields...I also realized that the burden of affirmative action was not on my shoulders, but on the institution's. (Torres-Guzmán, 1995, p. 61)

Attitudes and treatment that channel Latina/o faculty into certain academic areas and minority service-oriented positions can lead to feelings of isolation and marginalization (Aguirre & Martinez, 1993). The small number of minority faculty at an institution adds to isolation and separation from the mainstream academic culture as the ability to create networks that involve Latina/os in non-minority affairs is limited. Being kept on the margins of academe also prevents White faculty from altering their perceptions of Latina/os. As a result, White faculty persist in ignoring them and perpetuate institutional discrimination (Aguirre & Martinez, 1993). Trying to break into the majority circle can be very difficult and traumatic for many minority professors, especially in the early years of their profession. Oftentimes, Latina/o faculty members leave an institution after a few years, because they do not feel as though they fit well within the institution's culture. A Mexican-American faculty member tells of his feelings of isolation at one university during the 1980's:

> As a result of attrition, I became a senior member of the department's faculty. However, the exclusiveness of the academy persisted. I was still seen as a minority faculty. I never became part of the informal leadership network in the School of Education, nor was I allowed opportunity to provide formal leadership at the departmental or school levels. (Contreras, 1995, p. 127)

Barrioization, isolation, and exclusion from mainstream academia result in keeping minority faculty members removed from their White colleagues who sometimes misperceive this division as minority separatism (Boice, 1993). Because Latina/os tend to circulate within Latina/o and minority populations and to be involved in Latina/o related issues and departments, many White faculty view this as being a choice that Latina/os have made, rather than a result of institutional discrimination. They do not realize that the atmosphere is not always welcoming for Latina/os and many attempts to interact among White faculty and within the majority-dominated culture have failed.

Many examples of failed attempts to fit in to the culture, or at least to gain respect from their White colleagues, are abundant among Latina/os as they go through the process of obtaining tenure. This is probably one of the biggest difficulties facing Latina/o professors in their academic careers. Going up for tenure can be nerve-wracking and complex in its own right, but it can be even more so for minority faculty. Instances of subtle and out-right racism have been noted by Latina/os as they have been considered for tenure. Latina/os are frequently told their research subjects are not noteworthy or scientific enough, the journals they publish in are not scholarly, or that they have concentrated more on service than research (Bronstein, 1993). Furthermore, because many Latina/o faculty are not tenured, they are perceived as not being able to meet the rigorous standards associated with tenure, rather than being confronted with a discriminatory process (Torres-Guzmán, 1995). Two Latinas/os share their experiences as they went through the process:

> Everyone had given me the institutional history. Only one Latina had obtained tenure, and she had not entered at a junior status as I had. I had replaced a Latina who had not been given tenure. Furthermore, within my first two years at the college, another Latina was denied tenure. The message was written on the wall: Latinas rarely make tenure; you have got a struggle on your hands. (Torres-Guzmán, 1995, p. 56)

> At the first institution where I was employed, I went up for promotion and tenure a year early with the unanimous support of my department head, dean, associate deans, and the college faculty. But at the level of the graduate college my promotion and tenure were delayed one year because they felt that I had not published in "major journals." Here was a graduate dean, not in the field of education, telling me, and in fact the whole college of education, what he considered to be major journals in education. Yet there had been White faculty members who went up early, and who had fewer publications and service than I, who were tenured and promoted. (García, 1995, p. 160)

Other instances of racism are legendary throughout the Latina/o community. Inside and outside of the classroom, Latina/os and other minorities face the overt and covert racist attitudes and behaviors that they also regularly encounter off the college and university campus. Ethnic jokes and slurs, glaring looks, and degrading remarks are just some examples. For instance, professor Tatcho Mindiola, Jr. (1995) who was continually referred to as "Taco" by his White supervisor at an important and public meeting among state legislators and Chicano coalition members. The story of Dominican American Dulce M. Cruz (1995) suggests that a student dropped her class because he wanted to be taught by a "real" American, even though she was raised in the States and her primary language is English.

Not all Latina/o faculty experiences are negative, as there are also several rewards of the professoriate. Many Latina/os feel as though their contributions to academe and to their students in general are well worth the costs of working in a predominately White atmosphere. The study mentioned earlier of Black, Latina/o and Asian faculty reported many members having a positive view of their impact on their institutions (Bronstein, 1993). For example, some mentioned being able to restructure or add to the ethnic studies curriculum. Others spoke of creating multicultural programs, of encouraging minority students to be activists, and of changing minority hiring policies. Still others commented about the relationships they developed with their colleagues for whom they acted as models or resources. Finally, the impact they have on their Latina/o students is often mentioned as being the most rewarding as illustrated in the experience of Felix M. Padilla (1997) (emphasis is Padilla's):

> For me to witness Latina/o students pursue and enjoy education for freedom was (and will always be) the most exciting and stimulating personal and intellectual moment. I was truly touched by the experience. I watched as students came to express a sincere eagerness toward critical learning, a sincere desire and com-

mitment to continue, beyond our class, to be engaged in critical dialogues we had developed together in our classroom. The idea of education as a practice of freedom was being reconfirmed. I have come to believe more and more in the transformative power of teaching, pedagogy. (p. 18)

Not only are there benefits for Latina/o faculty, but there is a great need for more of them to add to the lives of other faculty and students, and of higher education in general. Latina/o faculty members are often the ones pushing for social change and providing mentors for Latina/o and students. Without people from similar backgrounds and with similar experiences, Latino/a students lack successful examples of those within their race who have overcome the challenges facing minorities in higher education. In addition, Latina/o faculty are those conducting important research regarding the Latina/o other minority populations. In general, it is their presence that helps create a more diverse and supportive culture which makes higher education more relevant to an increasingly minority campus community (Garza, 1993).

Recommendations and Conclusion

This article has highlighted the lack of representation and the imbalance in the numbers of Latina/o faculty and has presented the significant challenges that face this minority population of educators in the United States. These challenges include identity issues, tokenism, isolation, "barrioization," unrealistic expectations of service, struggles in reaching tenure, and perceptions of separatism. This article also touched on some of the reasons Latina/o academicians persist in a field where they continue to encounter instances of racism and discrimination. If the current experiences of Latina/o faculty are to change, it is up to the educators of all races to work to increase their numbers, to obtain fair representation, and to provide them with equal treatment throughout their academic careers.

Focusing on the recruitment and retention of Latina/o faculty, monitoring promotion and tenure practices, attending to issues of inclusion and barrioization, and providing mentors and a supportive environment for Latina/o faculty are all immediate and important steps that can be taken. Continuing to educate White students, faculty, and administration as to the issues facing Latina/o and other minority faculty is also an essential move toward improving the experiences of minorities in academe (Bronstein et al., 1993). With this in mind, it

seems appropriate to restate the words of Chicano professor, Roberto Haro (1995):

> A firm commitment and a national resolve is needed to identify and help qualified Latinos achieve leadership roles in higher education. This valuable human resource should not be ignored. Latinos need to be better utilized in American higher education. They will bring new and valuable ideas, insights, and solutions to many of the pressing challenges that exist on our campuses. In these times of declining resources and mounting pressure to enhance diversity on our campuses, their contributions may be invaluable. (p. 205)

Without adequate representation and fair treatment of Latina/os faculty, the messages are then that Latina/os are not welcome in higher education, that they cannot succeed, and that working for the goal of an academic career is not worth the effort. This continues to build the barriers to education for Latina/os that desperately need to be broken if there is to be change. Hopefully, with greater awareness and acknowledgement of the issues Latina/o faculty face in higher education, we can strengthen our work toward eliminating those challenges that are due to racism and discrimination.

References

Aguirre, A., Jr., & Martinez, R. O. (1993). *Chicanos in higher education: Issues and dilemmas for the 21st century.* ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 3. Washington, D.C.: The George Washington University, School of Education and Human Development.

Boice, R. (1993). Early turning points in professorial careers of women and minorities. In J. Gainen & R. Boice (Eds.), *New Directions for Teaching and Learning,53* (pp.71-79). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bronstein, P. (1993). Challenges, rewards, and costs for feminist and ethnic minority scholars. In J. Gainen, & R. Boice, (Eds.), *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 53* (pp.61-70). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bronstein, P., Rothblum, E. D., & Solomon, S. E. (1993). Ivy halls and glass walls: Barriers to academic careers for women and ethnic minorities. In J. Gainen & R. Boice (Eds.), *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 53* (pp.17-31). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cockcroft, J. D. (1995). *Latinos in the struggle for equal education.* New York: Franklin Watts.

Contreras, A. R. (1995). The odyssey of a Chicano academic. In R.V. Padilla & R. Chávez-Chávez (Eds.), *The leaning ivory tower: Latino professors*

in American universities (pp. 111-129). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Cruz, D. M. (1995). Struggling with the labels that mark my ethnic identity. In R.V. Padilla & R. Chávez-Chávez (Eds.), *The leaning ivory tower: Latino professors in American universities* (pp. 91-100). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Feagin, J. R., Vera, H., & Imani, N. (1996). *The agony of education: Black students at White colleges and universities.* New York: Routledge.

García, H. S. (1995). Toward a postview of the Chicano community in higher education. In R.V. Padilla & R. Chávez-Chávez (Eds.), *The leaning ivory tower: Latino professors in American universities* (pp. 151-153). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Garza, H. (1993). Second-class academics: Chicano/Latino faculty in U.S. universities. In J. Gainen & R. Boice (Eds.), *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 53* (pp. 33-41). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Haro, R. (1995). Held to a higher standard: Latino executive selection in higher education. In R.V. Padilla & R. Chávez-Chávez (Eds.), *The leaning ivory tower: Latino professors in American universities* (pp. 189-207). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Johnsrud, L. K. (1993). Women and minority faculty experiences: Defining and responding to diverse realities. In J. Gainen & R. Boice (Eds.), *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 53* (pp.3-16). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Martínez Alemán, A. M. (1995). Actuando. In R.V. Padilla & R. Chávez-Chávez (Eds.), *The leaning ivory tower: Latino professors in American universities* (pp. 67-76). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Mindiola, T., Jr. (1995). Getting tenure at the U. In R.V. Padilla & R. Chávez-Chávez (Eds.), *The leaning ivory tower: Latino professors in American universities* (pp. 29-51). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Olivas, M. A. (Ed.). (1986). *Latino college students.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Padilla, F. M. (1997). *The struggle of Latina/o university students: In search of a liberating education.* New York: Routledge.

Padilla, R. V., & Chávez Chávez, R. (Eds.). (1995). *The leaning ivory tower: Latino professors in American universities.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Torres-Guzmán, M. E. (1995). Surviving the journey. In R.V. Padilla & R. Chávez-Chávez (Eds.), *The leaning ivory tower: Latino professors in American universities* (pp. 53-65). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Verduga, R. R. (1995). The segregated citadel: Some personal observations on the academic career not offered. In R.V. Padilla & R. Chávez-Chávez (Eds.), *The leaning ivory tower: Latino professors in American universities* (pp. 101-109). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Where Do Students Study? An Analysis of Preferred Study Environments

By Sarah Beck, Jen Berson, Allison Hagan, Jason Pontius, Dana Umscheid

This paper examines where and why students choose various study environments. The focus is less on study habits and more on the conditions that student prefer when studying. The purpose of this paper is to determine if environment affects studying outcomes and what environmental conditions are most conducive to study.

Colleges and universities must strive to design and create environments congruent with student preferences and needs in order to foster optimal development among students. One of the most important environments to investigate is the space in which students study. Studying is found to be associated with numerous positive outcomes including retention, graduating with honors, enrollment in graduate school, and all self-reported increases in cognitive and affective skills (Astin, 1993).

To better address how environments may have an effect on behavior, Pascarella and Terenzini (1991) define physical theories and models as those that focus on the external, physical environment. They state that an environment may allow or foster certain activities, such as studying, or may limit or hinder other activities in those spaces. Environments may even select or shape the behavior of individuals in the common setting in a similar way, regardless of their individual differences (Barker, 1978). Banning (1978) offered the phrase "campus ecology" to describe the relationship of college students to their campus environment. The ultimate goal of an institution should be to design a campus environment that meets the needs of students, rather than the students needing to adapt to an incompatible environment (Banning, 1978). Toward this end, several studies (Christ, 1966; Condon, 1964; Stoke, Grose, Lewit, Olmstead, & Smith, Jr., 1960) were conducted in the 1960s regarding study spaces and conditions in post-secondary institutions to determine how the changing college campuses should adapt in their ever-expanding construction. Nearly 40 years later, the authors of this paper could uncover little additional research on the subject of preferred study locations.

In order to improve study environments, how are campus

architects and administrators to know where students prefer to study and the physical qualities of those study environments? In an effort to determine if the findings of research from the 1960s still apply today, the researchers examine modern student preferences for study locations and the quality of student-environment fit.

Literature Review

Although relatively little literature on students' study preferences exists, an analysis of research from the 1960s is considered. Following a review of the existing literature, the ecological framework, as proposed by Banning (1989), is described in terms of student-environment fit.

Student Choice of Study Space in the 1960s

Three separate studies were conducted between 1959 and 1966 to analyze student choice in study environments. Collectively, the studies examined over 1,500 students in public, private, co-ed, single-sex, 2-year and 4-year institutions, residential and commuter campuses. Despite the vast differences between types of students surveyed, the findings and recommendations of all three studies were very similar.

The first study, conducted by Stoke et al. (1960), was commissioned in 1958 by the presidents of Amherst College, Mount Holyoke College, Smith College, and the University of Massachusetts to examine whether patterns existed among student choice of study space. Ultimately, this research would be used in determining where study areas should be built as the campus architectures were adapted to help with the increasing enrollment. In 1959, roughly 100 students at each of the four institutions were asked to keep a study diary for four days, and complete a 95-item survey regarding preferences in study environment. The second study was conducted by Condon and the Community College Planning Center at Stanford University in 1964. Although the methodology and sample were not detailed in the paper, it is reported that 700 students across six junior colleges in California were surveyed. Christ (1966) developed the third study as a replication of Condon's (1964) study. The author limited the sample to roughly 500 male students at Loyola University—Los Angeles. Christ (1966) noted that these participants were equally representative of students who live on-campus and commuter students. For the purposes of this literature review, the authors rely heavily upon the research of Stoke et al. (1960) due to the comprehensive nature of that study.

In choosing a study space, privacy and quiet were greatly valued. Students preferred to study with few surrounding people or

alone, although some cited the need for the presence of others to keep them on task. Students wanted spaces that were close to resources, such as books, office supplies, periodicals, and technology (primarily typewriters). They preferred formal settings (desks and chairs) more than comfortable furniture. They wanted control over lighting, temperature and ventilation, and separate designated areas for smokers and non-smokers. Lastly, although they preferred the ability to take study breaks, on the whole they did not want to be near snack or social facilities (Stoke et al., 1960). For the most part, Stoke et al. (1960) speculated that this is likely due to the limited distractions and greater individual control over the environment.

These studies also analyzed the data in terms of common study locations, namely dormitories, libraries, empty classrooms, and dining halls. One's home (most often a dormitory room) was clearly the student preference for location. Stoke et al. (1960) speculated this choice was due to the level of privacy and student control over the environment. Resources such as textbooks and note-taking supplies were also readily available at a personal desk at home, rather than one shared at a library or another public space.

In the Stoke et al. (1960) investigation, libraries were analyzed for their effective use of space. Students ranked the libraries second despite much dissatisfaction with the atmosphere. The libraries were mostly broken down into three study area categories: large study rooms, small seminar rooms, and study carrels (Stoke et al., 1960).

Two other study areas were frequently cited by students as preferred study spaces. The first were empty classrooms used for studying. These rooms provided the formal institutional furniture that students preferred and tended to be free of noise and traffic distractions. However, students said the hours and availability were severely limited. The last significant area students reported as a preference for study space was dining halls. The large tables and ample lighting were considered highly agreeable (Stoke et al., 1960).

In summation, these three studies identified the differences between individual students and their variability in choice of study space. The findings from all three studies emphasized a preference for student control over environment, privacy, quiet, and areas free from distractions.

Ecological Approach

In order to expand the knowledge base and update the literature on students' preferred study locations, an environmental framework

can be useful. The ecological perspective is based on a transactional view of persons and their environments. It is grounded in the belief that the environment has an effect on people and their behavior, and that people also have an effect on their environment. The ecological approach emphasizes the importance of designing environments on campuses that encourage maximum growth and development of students. Banning (1989) proposed a seven-step process in which one can design and manage the campus ecology.

The study that follows utilized Banning's (1989) ecological approach to analyze student use of campus environments. Because the campus design has been constructed, and educational goals and values are well established, the research began by measuring students' perceptions of the campus. By assessing student perceptions and behaviors, the researchers hoped to discover what ecology best promotes development and growth in students.

This study sought to find if students in 1999 value different components to study space than their 1960s counterparts. Special attention is paid to the relevant external factors, such as student employment, technology, and group work and their relation to student studying and Grade Point Average (GPA).

The purpose of this study is to examine: (1) where students prefer to study most frequently, (2) to assess what physical qualities embody their favorite study space, and (3) to uncover significant factors affecting studying and GPA. The researchers hypothesized that there would be significant changes in preferences of study locations and qualities of those locations since the 1960s research. This hypothesis is based on speculation that technology and change in the demographics of the student body would influence study patterns. The researchers also hypothesized that outside factors with an indirect influence on studying would vary with measurements such as college GPA. Ultimately, the authors believe that if colleges and universities are not providing adequate study environments for their students, they are not serving the mission of student-environment fit. This study aims to identify a framework against which institutions might examine their study environments.

Method

Participants

The participants of this study consisted of juniors and seniors enrolled in a course offered through the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS). The participants attended a large, public, residential, Research

I institution in the Midwest. As the researchers believed younger students might still be trying to determine their preferred study location, this course was intentionally selected because of its population of students who had been at the university for two or more years.

A convenience sample of 144 enrolled students was surveyed, and those participants who had been at the institution for less than two years were taken out of the sample leaving a remainder of 126 usable surveys. Time constraints and inaccessible student contact information required a convenience sample for this study. Participants were 50.8% female, 49.2% male with racial and ethnic backgrounds consisting of: 82.2% White, 7.9% African-American, 3.2% Asian-American, 1.6% Latino, and 6.3% other. The average age of participants was 21.6 years, and most students had spent three years at the institution. An application for human subjects approval was submitted and accepted in order to ensure that the methods of this research adhered to guidelines of the institution.

Procedure

Based on literature reviewed, the instrument for this study was modeled after themes present in prior research. The survey was pretested on ten undergraduate students to determine the clarity of the instrument. The researchers sought prior approval from the course instructor for permission to survey the students enrolled in the course mentioned above. One researcher attended the beginning of one class period to ask for volunteers to complete the anonymous survey. The course instructor was not present in the classroom during the distribution of the survey to ensure that students did not feel pressured to participate in the study. After reading an information sheet attached describing the nature of the research, students were given the option to not participate in the study.

The survey consisted of questions asking for demographic information including race, age, college GPA, high school GPA, academic major, whether a student worked on or off-campus and the number of roommates they had at the time of the survey. The survey also consisted of fill-in-the-blank questions about their preferred location to study for various tasks (i.e., group work, studying for final exam). The next set of questions examined the qualities that students look for in a study space in general. Next, a five-point Likert scale was used to determine how frequently students worked in groups under certain situations. The last two questions asked the students to give open-ended responses regarding qualities of their preferred study

locations and suggestions for improvement to the university.

Analysis

The data from the 126 participants were analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) program to calculate the frequency of responses as well as the mean, median and standard deviation among students with grade point averages of 3.0 and above and below 3.0. For numerical data, t-test analyses were used to determine significance. Categorical variables were analyzed using Chi-square tests.

Data from the open-ended questions were analyzed by identifying common themes or characteristics indicated on the surveys. The researchers met to discuss the emergent themes and to confirm each other's results. Finally, the researchers agreed on conclusions and implications for practice from the data as demonstrated in this report.

Limitations

Due to the nature and the duration of the study, several limitations exist. First, little research on study preferences since the 1960s could be found. Second, a convenience sample was obtained from students enrolled in one specific course with 84% of the participants majoring in programs within the College of Arts and Sciences. This course was optional and may be affected by student self-selection. Third, the data from the participants were self-reported and due to the confidentiality of the students' university records, grade point averages could not be confirmed and the participants' reported study hours might be different from their actual hours spent studying. Another limitation that exists is that the participants were in a group setting in the classroom while answering the survey, so there might have been some discussion among the students regarding their responses.

The researchers' personal backgrounds could have led to some unintentional biases in creating the instrument, since the researchers consisted of four White females and one White male. Likewise, the surveys were distributed by the White male researcher, which could have led to some bias in student responses or participation.

The researchers also note that the survey did not account for the students' study preferences prior to entering college or how their study preferences and locations may have changed since their freshman and sophomore years. Without obtaining how their study habits may have changed, it is difficult to determine if the GPA of these students is a function of the institutional environment or a function of input

characteristics from the students themselves.

Results

The results of the data were divided into different categories including student profile, study location preferences, qualities of preferred study locations, other factors influencing studying, and overall differences in preference among students in the two GPA categories (3.0 and Above, and Below 3.0).

Student Profile

Of the 126 participants, 67.5% lived off-campus with peers, 15.9% lived in a sorority or fraternity, 10.3% lived in a residence hall on campus, and 6.3% lived off-campus with family. The average number of roommates was 0.9. In regards to GPA of the 126 participants, 57.9% of participants had a GPA of 3.0 and above, while 42.1% had below a 3.0 (M= 3.01). On average, participants reported studying 2.24 hours on weekdays, and 3.07 hours on weekend days. Of those surveyed, the majority (61%) were employed and of those who do work, 42.3% work on-campus. Other data indicate the average number of hours worked per week is 9.24 and that 29.3% of employed students were able to study while at their job.

Study Location Preferences

The fill-in-the-blank responses of Part II yielded results which show that students overwhelmingly prefer to study at their home more than any other location. In this section, respondents indicated their preferred study location for a variety of different types of study. When studying in a group, the top choice was to meet in a library on campus (38.1%), followed by 23.0% preferring to meet in a group member's apartment/home/living unit, with the remainder spread over 23 other locations. When doing individual homework, 64.3% of participants preferred the location of their own home, 17.5% preferred the library, and 6.3% preferred the Student Union. As for the preferred location for writing a paper, again, the majority (65.9%) preferred their own home while 16.7% preferred to use a computer lab. While studying for a final exam, the majority (52.4%) preferred their own home, and 28.6% preferred a library. As an overall favorite place to study, 57.2% preferred home, 20.6% preferred a library, 6.3% preferred a café/coffeehouse/bookstore and 4.8% preferred the Student Union.

Qualities of Preferred Study Locations

The next section of Part II of the survey dealt with the qualities of preferred study locations ranging from furniture to food to temperature and noise. When describing the furniture of their favorite study location (given six multiple choice answers), 39.7% stated that they use an upright chair, 39.7% use a cushioned chair, and 27.8% use a bed (percentages total more than 100% because multiple answers were permitted). As for preferred surface area on which to work (when five multiple choice answers were given) 34.1% stated that they use a desk, 38.1% use a table, and 39.7% chose use a book or notebook as a writing surface.

When asked to describe the qualities of their favorite study locations in regards to proximity to amenities, 92.1% of students want to be able to eat at their study location, 68.3% want to be near a place where they can purchase food, and 43.7% want to be near a smoking area. When in these locations, 61.1% prefer to study alone and 20.6% study with one other person. Of those surveyed, 70.6% prefer their favorite study location to have average temperature as opposed to warm or cool, and as far as noise in this location, 57.1% prefer silence over music or light background noise. Many students (51.6%) prefer moderate light over bright or low light. Students have high expectations of their access to technology. Referring to their favorite study location, 84.9% stated they have access to a computer, 73.8% have access to e-mail and the Internet, and 69.8% have access to a printer. These preferred qualities of study locations were analyzed for differences among the two groups of participants—3.0 GPA and Above, and Below 3.0 GPA—however statistical significance was not found between these two groups.

Differences by GPA Category

In order to complete the analysis of differences for preferred location, two categories were created (1) preferred category was home and (2) preferred category was other than home. This was done to allow the researchers to execute t-test analysis on these variables. The researchers hypothesized that students with higher GPA may choose different study locations than their peers with lower GPAs. In comparing the GPAs of students who preferred to study at home to those who preferred other study locations, however, no significant differences were discovered.

Differences by Employment Status

Researchers analyzed employment in several different respects including employment status, location of employment, ability to study at one's job, as well as hours worked per week. Contrary to the researchers' predictions, there was no significant difference in GPA between students who were employed ($M=2.97$) versus students who were not employed ($M=3.08$ and $p>.10$). As was predicted, the difference in GPA between students who were employed on-campus ($M=3.13$) and those employed off-campus ($M=2.85$) was significant ($p< .05$). Although some students were able to study at their jobs (29.3%), there was no significant difference ($p> .1$) on GPA between those who could and could not study. In regards to hours worked per week, there was a significant differentiation between GPA categories for students who worked different hours per week. The mean number of hours worked per week for students who have below a 3.0 GPA was 11.13 while the mean for students with a 3.0 or above was 7.88 ($p< .05$).

Additional results provided researchers with both the preferred locations of study spaces as well as qualities students look for in those spaces. Two open-ended questions were included in an effort to gather qualitative data regarding student preference of study space. The first question—regarding student suggestions for institutional improvement to enhance study options—produced three primary themes, which are (1) aesthetics and noise, (2) access to preferences and (3) availability of preferred resources. This question also produced an (4) "other" category. The second open-ended question explicitly asked students to describe their ideal study spaces. Again, three similar primary themes emerged, including (1) ambiance and noise, (2) individual comfort and (3) amenities and resources, and (4) "other."

Suggested Institutional Improvements to Enhance Study Options

Aesthetics and noise. The first area of suggested institutional improvement concerned the physicality of the environment in which college students generally choose to study. Participants made some suggestions regarding what types of lounges they preferred to study in, the furniture at any study location, the lighting and décor of these areas, and the ability to control auditory factors including talking and music.

For example, several students responded negatively to recent renovations at the Student Union: "The cafeteria at the [Union] last year was a silent study area. Students could go there and sit at a table, eat, drink and spread out their materials. This year with the renova-

tions the cafeteria is noisy and too social to meet the study needs of myself and fellow students."

Some participants solely recommended changes to the aesthetic appearance of some locations: "They could improve the computer labs (for greater comfort) – perhaps add some classical music, softer colored paintings and better lighting. The [labs] feel very sterile and uninviting."

Many students wanted more flexibility and options for choosing a location. Two students commented that the only three study lounges in a primary academic building on campus were always noisy and overcrowded. To reconcile this, some students recommended creating a nearby "study building, dedicated solely to students, which would contain computer labs and snack vendors, but would be used only for studying."

Access to study preferences. Another common theme that emerged regards the students' ability to access their preferred study locations and amenities. Respondents commented on the perceived lack of university parking, the hours many locations were available, and access to food and beverage, as well as designated smoking areas.

Several respondents criticized the prohibition of food and beverages in their preferred locations. Others were disappointed with the availability of particular offerings in designated food areas.

Some students commented on the lack of late-night study space options. "The inside areas of the library close at midnight, and the main lobby of the library is extremely noisy, so it is difficult to study there."

Parking and transportation often affected where students choose to study. For example, one student replied, "They need to make it easier to get on-campus and park, so that we could study more at the library, or other locations on campus. [The parking situation] is why I study a lot at home."

Finally, several students requested better access to, an increase in the number of smoking areas, and that smoking be allowed indoors. This was also a reason cited for students who chose to study off-campus.

Availability of resources. This third theme suggested that many students felt they did not have adequate access to resources essential to their studying. Participants recommended that improvements be made to the accessibility of computers and other electronic resources such as

photocopying. Lastly, students requested that specific areas be designated for group studying, as these are often noisy and active endeavors that disturb other students and do not provide adequate workspace in traditional study areas.

Regarding group work, one student acknowledged that more classes were requiring group projects as part of the curriculum. Another student requested the university create and designate specific computer labs that were conducive to group work.

In general, students had a lot to say regarding the available computer labs, particularly noting overcrowding and the prevalence of classes that occupy computer labs. One participant proposed a "check-out" process to allow students access to laptop computers at remote locations or during classes for note-taking.

Other responses. Despite the preponderance of quality feedback to this first question, a number of participants chose alternative actions. Some students left the question blank. Others provided responses that, although enlightening, did not relate to their preferred study spaces. Lastly, five students offered no suggestions for improvements to their study options, instead expressing satisfaction with the status quo.

Descriptions of Ideal Study Spaces

Ambiance and noise. The first main theme that arose in student descriptions of ideal study spaces dealt primarily with the physical appearance and relevant silence of an area. Student comments described background noises, visual décor, and general appearance of a study space.

Some students provided detailed descriptions which covered all the emergent themes. One example:

> I would like some sort of chair and couch where I could work at a desk/table but either have my feet extended or curled up next to me, but I would not be able to recline, since I would probably fall asleep that way. There should be plenty of windows (possibly skylights as well), and a fireplace to make it feel like the outdoors—while giving it a cozy, intellectual feeling. There would be light classical music in the background and the chair would be leather. There would be no fluorescent lighting and there would be dictionaries and/or thesaurus available. Internet access would also be available. Large amounts of people would be allowed to be in the room.

Other participants preferred a much simpler environment. One student responded, "I just want a desk and a chair facing a clean wall in a quiet library with a place to walk."

Individual student comfort. A second common participant response when describing their ideal study spaces lent itself largely to student comfort. Fifty-two students provided examples detailing specific types of furniture, temperature variations, and amount of privacy. The following response reflects the general sentiments of many participants:

"I'd love a big comfy couch in a red or orange, with heavy (lots of) lighting, a mini-fridge stocked with pop, candy and junk food; ashtrays to smoke; a big bed; and a recliner so I'm always comfortable when I study."

Amenities and resources. The last emergent theme provided by the students reflected access to various resources and favorable amenities. Many participants detailed preferable criteria which included the ability to smoke, or be in a smoke-free environment; access to computers, printers, e-mail and Internet; the availability of television and stereos; and access to food or beverages, particularly coffee.

Other responses. Although participants again provided quality feedback to this question, a number of participants responded differently—by leaving the question blank or providing responses that were not relevant to describing a realistic ideal study space.

Discussion

The hypothesis that student preferences would differ significantly from the findings of the earlier research (Christ, 1966; Condon, 1964; Stoke et al., 1960) was largely unsupported. Even though almost 40 years has lapsed since the previous research on the physical characteristics of study space, student preferences have changed very little. Despite the similarities there were some differences found. The second hypothesis, that additional findings with an indirect influence on studying would appear with measurements such as college GPA, was also largely unsupported. The exceptions were some significant findings pertaining to student employment and perceptions of critical thinking as related to college GPA.

Study Space Preferences

In regards to where students prefer to study, the researchers' findings that 64% of college students prefer to study at home and 17.5% preferred the library were consistent with the Stoke et al. findings (55-65% and 12% respectively). Like the Stoke et al. (1960) survey, the researchers also found no significant difference in college GPA where students preferred to study. However, in the current study there were two conditions when library usage increased substantially: group work activities and during final exams. There were some other differences as well. While students in the past claimed to have studied more than five hours per day, the modern student studies less than three hours every day. The increase in library popularity for group work could be explained by examining available space. Most apartments or bedrooms, unlike the library, cannot handle large groups. The increase in library use during finals could be because students perceive there to be fewer distractions at the library.

Physical Characteristics

The physical qualities of students' favorite study locations have also changed little. As compared to the previous findings (Christ, 1966; Condon, 1964; Stoke et al., 1960), students still tend to study alone or with few people, with privacy and quiet, close to resources and technology (computers instead of typewriters), with control over lighting and temperature, and with areas designated for smokers. The desire for smoking areas (43.7%) is not surprising because most university buildings are designated as non-smoking areas. At the institution surveyed, any students who are smokers currently must go outside to smoke.

There were some differences in physical characteristics. Students from past research were not interested in snacks when studying while a strong majority of students in this survey want access to food. Conversely, students in the 1960s favored the study carrel as a place to work, but few in this study use carrels (5.6%). Furthermore there seemed to be a shift from a preference for formal tables and chairs to softer, more comfortable furniture like beds, couches, and ottomans.

Additional Findings

There were several significant findings when study preference related factors measured by the survey—student employment and

critical thinking abilities—were examined. Students with a GPA below 3.0 worked more (M=11.13) hours per week than students with a GPA above 3.0 (M=7.8). Could it be that the more a student works, the higher the negative impact on GPA? Perhaps students who work more have less time to study. This is unlikely for two reasons. First, this study found no statistically significant difference in college GPA between students who worked and those that did not work. Second, there was no significant difference of hours studied between students with a GPA above 3.0 and those with a GPA below 3.0. One possible explanation is that students who work more hours experience greater fatigue and thus are less productive during their time studying.

Another finding related to college employment was a statistically significant difference in college GPA depending on where students worked. Students who worked on-campus had a higher GPA (M=3.13) than students who worked off-campus (M= 2.85). One explanation for this is that students who work on-campus are able to study at work more than those who work off-campus. The results do not support this idea because no significant difference in GPA was found between those students who can study at work and those who cannot. Perhaps those who work on-campus have more positive outcomes such as GPA (Astin, 1993).

Finally, there was a statistically significant difference in survey responses to the statement "CAS classes improved my critical thinking ability" between students whose GPA was above 3.0 (3.73) and those who were below a 3.0 (3.21). It would seem that most students who took the survey believe that courses in the College of Arts and Sciences improved their ability to think critically. It is not known why students with GPAs above 3.0 would tend to have more agreement with the statement. Perhaps those students with higher GPAs have a stronger inclination toward enrolling in certain types of classes or have a greater level of satisfaction because of their higher GPAs.

Overall Implications

Over the course of almost 40 years, there appears to be little relative difference in student preference for either study location or study location characteristics. The authors speculate that these similarities may simply reflect the nature of studying. Perhaps people at American universities study best under the conditions found in this survey and past research. However, this survey also found that it is difficult to generalize preferences: there is no single study space that appeals to all students. When students were asked to describe their

ideal study space, the answers ranged from coffee shops, to bookstores, to sunrooms. Students said they wanted ambiance, but they defined it in ways ranging from colorful, well-decorated rooms to plain rooms with few distractions.

The researchers believe that the general themes for this survey are ones of comfort and control. Students want to be comfortable when they study, but comfort is defined in a wide variety of ways. Even though more students prefer silence, a large number like to listen to music or study with the television on. While most students indicated that they prefer average temperatures and moderate lighting, a large number of students like the amount of light and temperature to be higher or lower. There is no single universal set of criteria in determining ideal study locations.

Students also want as much control over the comfort of their study environment as possible. They do not want to adjust to the conditions of their environment, but instead create personalized environments in which they are comfortable. This helps explain why dorm rooms and bedrooms are so popular. Nowhere else on a college campus does a student have as much control over their environment. A library is unable to change its conditions to fit each person but in one's own room, conditions such as temperature and light can be adjusted to create a space that is most conducive to studying. It was noted that the library becomes much more popular during finals time. Perhaps for some students, less distraction is of greater value than overall comfort during finals.

As college designers and administrators consider environmental changes to their campuses, the importance of student input is apparent (Banning, 1989). Despite their varying optimal conditions, students do have strong preferences in choosing their study locations. Designers should utilize this student input to make these spaces as flexible as possible while also keeping them accessible. Clearly, colleges will never be able to meet the preferences of every student. However, by considering student opinions, administrators can ensure optimal utilization of the spaces they do create as well as the options they offer students.

Suggestions for Future Research

After noting the absence of relevant literature in this area, the authors would encourage additional research in four areas. First, the researchers would encourage a longitudinal analysis of study preferences which would study students in high school and then again at

several specific points during college. It would be of interest to know if and how these study space preferences are shaped and impacted by college. The second study would be a survey of current campus architecture to consider whether study areas on college campus actually meet the reported needs of students. Third, perhaps a study to determine how students allocate their time, and whether that affects study location preference might be beneficial to understanding this issue. Finally, considering this survey's findings of relationships between aspects of employment and GPA, the researchers would like to do a more directed study on the impact of employment on aspects of college life.

References

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

Banning, J.H. (1989). Creating a climate for successful student development: The campus ecology manager role. In U. Delworth, G.R. Hanson, & Associates (Eds.) *Student services: A handbook for the profession* (2nd ed., pp. 304-322). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Banning, J.H. (1978). *Campus ecology: A perspective for student affairs.* Cincinnati, OH: National Association of Student Personnel Administrators.

Barker, R., & Associates (1978). *Habitats, environments, and human behavior: Studies in ecological psychology and eco-behavioral science.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Christ, F. (1966). *Some university students and their ideal study environment...as they see it, university study skills center.* Loyola University – Los Angeles, University Study Skills Center.

Condon, J. (1964). *A study on studying: A report from the community college planning center, school planning laboratory.* School of Education, Stanford University. Palo Alto, California, The Community College Planning Center.

Pascarella, E.T., & Terenzini, P.T. (1991). *How college affects students.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Stoke, S.M., Grose, R.F., Lewit, D.W., Olmstead, M.S., & Smith, B., Jr. (1960). *Student reactions to study facilities: With implications for architects and college administrators.* The Committee for New Colleges. Amherst, Massachusetts.

Student Satisfaction With the Adams Living Learning Center

By Steven E. Neal, Thomas B. Pitchford, Jermaine M. Upshaw, Hsiao-Yu Chen, William B. Smith

The purpose of this study was to gather information from past residents of the Adams Living Learning Center, an African American thematic unit at a large, Research I institution in the Midwest. Qualitative methods were employed to assess satisfaction among former residents, as well as to discover where improvements might be needed. The study provides implications for how the center could be strengthened as well as suggestions for designing residence hall units conducive to the development of African American students.

Introduction

During the years that it was housed at its original location, the Adams Living Learning Center, an African American thematic unit situated at a large, Research I institution witnessed the highest retention rate of any residence hall facility at its campus. One of these factors can be attributed to the autonomy that the students felt from having their own independent residence facility. Currently, the Adams Living Learning Center is undergoing a relocation phase, with its residents being housed in a traditional residence hall facility. This could potentially alter the sense of autonomy and community that existed within the center prior to its relocation. With such a monumental turning point, it is important to examine both the attributes and shortcomings of the center's previous environment to understand what elements were effective as well as ineffective in maximizing a minority residential living experience.

Studies of minority campus living climates have gained some attention in recent years for a number of reasons. Findings suggest students of color at Predominately White Institutions do not feel they are a part of the institution's environment. Tinto (as cited in Turner, 1994) said that research consistently demonstrates that a student will remain in college when he or she feels connected, involved, and served. The results of Turner's (1994) survey regarding the campus climate for students of color at the University of Minnesota indicated that minority students face an unsupportive and oftentimes lonely environment while attending a Predominantly White Institution.

Success or failure reflected in retention rates is suggested in

many cases to be directly linked to the environment in which the student resides. One obstacle here, however, is that while discussion and research regarding living environments has received increased attention, most theories regarding student development are focused solely on teaching environments, mainly because environments external to the classroom are often viewed as difficult to change. While the individual's environment is recognized to be an important determinant of development, it tends nonetheless to be treated theoretically as an amorphous set of conditions (Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991).

Pascarella and Terenzini (1991) further concluded that, "virtually none of these theories examines in any detailed fashion the environmental conditions and processes that might lead to development of any particular kind at any particular stage" (p. 46). Therefore, most of what can be used as theoretical perspective and as reference for this study will be reflective of the researchers' findings as they relate to a concentrated living environment.

The purpose of this study was to gather information from past residents of the Adams Living Learning Center, to determine the level of satisfaction among its residents, as well as to learn where improvements might be needed. The findings could have implications in various areas of other thematic communities and for residence halls where African American students reside. Specifically, the study provides implications for how residence hall administrators design residence hall units to be conducive to the development of African American students.

Literature Review

A number of theories are grounded in the general notion of environmental influence. Barker (as cited in Pascarella and Terenzini, 1991) developed a theory of "behavior settings" in which he theorized: ".... environments select the shape and behavior of the people occupying any given setting" (p. 39).

In leading more specifically to the issue of residential environments, some information has been published discussing the correlation between living environments and the successful development of subgroups. One of the common denominators for the development of a student subculture is a common living area. Love, et al. (1993) found that living in close proximity to one another and persistent interaction are important to the emergence of a peer group or subculture. Furthermore, providing common living units for certain groups can favorably shape their cultural development (Love, et al. 1993).

Various other studies have assessed the cognitive and academic impact on students as a result of living on campus. A study conducted by Chickering (1974) indicated that students who lived on campus were generally more satisfied with college, self-confident, demonstrated personal growth and development, and were more involved in campus activities than students who lived off campus and commuted to school. Astin's (1977) study found a correlation between residence halls and liberalism, participation in campus activities, positive social relationships, and strong faculty and peer interactions. Further, Williams and Reilley's (1972) study discovered that students' positive perceptions of their residence halls translated into a positive perception of their campus environment as a whole.

It is undeniable that the peer group influence, close proximity to campus, and social bonds that are generated within residence halls provide social support and a closer connection to the institution. These outcomes could also be linked to the notion that students find more support in living groups with whom they share the dominant group interests or personality. Furthermore, by living with those of similar racial or ethnic backgrounds students can develop stable relationships with one another and a better understanding of their environment (Schroeder, 1987). The aforementioned might best explain how a racially homogenous living learning center might impact its students.

Research has also suggested that a positive relationship exists between being a part of a living learning center and institutional satisfaction, and cognitive and intellectual development. In Pascarella and Terenzini's (1980) investigation, students living in learning centers indicated higher gains in cognitive development and rated their institution's environments higher than students living in traditional residential facilities. As a result, there is a greater potential for intellectual development and overall campus satisfaction from living in certain communities (Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991).

It is also important that living learning centers provide intercultural programming. Intercultural programming acts as a tool for enhancing the learning and communication skills of a particular group (Cox, 1985). Suggested intercultural programs might encompass the observance of cultural/spiritual holidays, such as Kwanzaa, that directly reflect the culture of the students inhabiting the center.

In spite of the research on college students and residence halls, few studies have assessed the impact of living learning centers on African American students in particular. Research regarding the correlation between African American students and the impact of

attending college vaguely alludes to the residential component and places heavier emphasis on the collegiate experience as a whole. Studies have determined that many White institutions provide inadequate support for Black students (Fleming, 1988). Further, Farver, Sedlacek, and Brooks (1975) suggested that Black students face challenges in adjusting to traditionally White campuses (as cited in Shingles, 1979).

Difficulties in adjusting to college may be attributed to an upsurge in African American students on predominantly White campuses in the last three decades. Blacks experienced a thirty-year shift from attending all-Black schools (90 %) to one of minority attendance in largely White institutions (Fleming, 1988). Also, Fleming cited Bowles and Decosta (1971) in stating that contact between Black students and major colleges was tremendously limited in the past, as well as institutions' experience with serving them.

What has resulted is a lack of responsiveness in meeting African American students' needs. Fleming (1988) determined that very few institutions have made efforts to promote interracial harmony and positive campus interactions. In spite of these setbacks, however, African American students continue to thrive under difficult and sometimes inhospitable circumstances. Asante and Al-Deen (1984) determined that while there are challenges to endure, Blacks continually strive to make a place for themselves within inhospitable and often tumultuous climates.

Regarding solutions to the problem, Shingles (1979) recommended that racial and cultural considerations be given attention when approaching the development of students. Neglecting this important component could undermine attempts to strengthen the quality of higher education. A study by Bennett (1984) at Indiana University recommended developing educational, culturally based programs that cater to the best determined learning styles of racially diverse students and creating a living learning center where positive interaction and learning could occur.

Methodology

Participants

The residence life department at the institution provided the researchers with a list of students who had lived in the Adams Living Learning Center during the two years prior to when the study was conducted. Participants were sixteen African American traditionally aged male and female sophomores, juniors, and seniors attending a

large mid-western university. The participants' ages ranged between 18 and 21.

Procedure

The students were notified of the study by telephone and e-mail and asked to participate. The researchers were aware of the potential for receiving more responses from females, because of the relatively few African American males that resided in the residence hall and who attend the institution. Each student who agreed to take part in the study was contacted by phone and scheduled for an interview at a location chosen by the researcher.

The researchers originally deemed 30 participants to be a sufficient sample size considering the time constraints of the study. However, only 16 participants agreed to be interviewed. The researchers later discovered that not all individuals listed as former residents of the living learning unit had, in fact, resided there.

All interviews were conducted over a period of two weeks. Each interview lasted approximately one hour in length and some interviews were audio taped at the researchers' discretion. With the participant's permission, before beginning the interview each researcher informed the participant of the study's purpose and the steps the researcher employed to ensure the confidentiality of the participants' identities.

Semi-structured questions were asked about the participants' satisfaction with the services that the Adams Center offered, their decision to live in the center, their perceptions of the residence hall climate, their relationships with other students residing in the center, and their use of the Adams Center's services. These questions were asked because they could provide the researchers with explanations of how beneficial the center's services were for students; how, if at all the climate facilitated the development of peer relationships; and how best the center served the students' needs. A general outline of questions was utilized while additional questions were asked that were not on the list. Each interviewer took notes as well as audiotaped participants' responses during the interview.

Based on the participants' responses, implications for improving the overall climate and services of the center were listed, as well as implications for providing services in all residence halls that are most beneficial for and most favorable to African American students living on campus. Pseudonyms were used for the participants during a discussion of the results.

Limitations

There are some limitations to this study. The first pertains to the small sample size. The Adams Center has been in existence for approximately five years. However, the residence life department only provided the researchers with the names of individuals who lived there from two of the five years previous to when the study was initiated. It was further discovered, upon contacting persons, that not all individuals on the list had, in fact, resided in the center, but rather had resided in the quadrangle where the center was housed.

Second, as indicated before, sixteen participants were interviewed. This small sample was due to some individuals declining to be interviewed, not returning telephone and e-mail messages, and the investigators having incorrect contact information for potential participants. Some individuals may have been reluctant to be interviewed because they were not comfortable giving negative feedback about the living learning center.

Third, there was limited time in which to perform the study. This hindered the researchers' ability to perform a more in depth investigation of the center and a more thorough analysis of the participants' experiences. Therefore, the results and implications that could be drawn were minimized although certain themes could still be extrapolated.

A final limitation was the period in which the interviews were conducted. The participants were asked to recall events, situations, and conversations that happened between one and two years ago. What may have been lost were the details and the feelings behind such events, situations, and conversations. Participants may have forgotten some of their experiences altogether.

Results

Salient themes emerged while conducting the interviews with the participants, such as 1) the students' reasons for choosing to live at Adams; 2) perceived benefits from interacting with other residents at the center; 3) students' perceptions of the center's professional staff; 4) students' feelings of the center's freshman seminar course; and 5) suggested improvements for the center.

Reasons For Choosing Adams

Upon being asked what the primary factors were that influenced the participants' decision to live in the Adams Living Learning Center, two themes emerged: 1) the idea of living among African

American residents; and 2) the attractiveness of the center's Afro-centric theme.

Living among African American students. Many of the participants were concerned about being the minority at a Predominately White Institution and thus desired to live within a concentrated environment where African American students were the majority. It was important for many of the participants to live within an environment where other residents shared the same racial background:

> *Flora: I wanted to live with Black people. I saw a brochure for the center and I realized that Black people were going to be there and that's where I wanted to be...I wanted to be around people whom I most identified with.*
> *Caroline: I knew that I was coming to a majority White school, therefore I wanted to remain close to my own.... I liked the idea of having a family type setting to learn about my culture.*

The attractiveness of the center's Afro-centric theme. A second sub-theme that emerged in response to students' motivations for living at the center was the attractiveness of its Afro-centric theme. The living unit, named after the university's first African American student government president, is promoted as having a heavily infused, cultural component. Many of the participants indicated that this deeply influenced their desire to live within the center:

> *Sally: In coming to [the institution], I knew the African American population would be a small section of the population. I thought that I might want to live somewhere I could study under an Afro-centric theme.*
> *Kris: I wanted to live in the center because it sounded like a place with a goal and purpose of teaching African American history and providing cultural activities.*

Overall, the participants' motivations for choosing an African American living learning center were self imposed yet diverse. Participants believed they would be content living at Adams either because they would be living among members of their affinity group or because the center's theme encompassed the teaching of their culture.

Development of Relationships

A predominant theme was perceived benefits from the interactions that resulted from living in the Adams Center. Three sub-themes emerged in a majority of the participants' responses, which consisted

of 1) socialization due to similarity in cultural experience or background; 2) continuing friendships/interaction; and 3) the perception of the Adams Center as a "family" unit.

Socialization from cultural affinity. Students discussed their experiences of successfully being socialized to the campus from living in the center and meeting others who shared similar cultural experiences. Sharing ranged from discovering commonalities, to the shared feeling of isolation students encountered as minorities within a Predominately White Institution:

> *Sam: It would have been more difficult to adjust to the college and the climate [without the center]. [Living in the center] helped me adjust [to the university] better because we met people that had the same background or did the same things.*

Students also expressed the benefit of socialization through events that took place throughout the center, and moreover because the center was seen as a "hub" for African American students living inside and outside of the center:

> *Will: [The Adams Center and another hall]...as a whole was the center of campus life here for the Black community. The [African American] fraternities were tied in and threw parties regularly.*

Continuing friendships/interaction. Among those interviewed, participants indicated that they developed long-standing friendships with former residents. Friendships grew beyond the physical boundaries of the center, with many participants either maintaining relationships or relocating to their current location because of those they met in the center.

> *Angela: That was the best thing about the center. I'm still friends with the people that used to live there. We're great friends now. There's not one person who lived in the center who doesn't communicate with someone else who lived there. We were just hanging out or going to parties together in packs eight deep.*
>
> *Jeff: As a matter of fact, I met my first group of friends here and we still kick it to this day.*
>
> *Sam: People who lived in the center are still friends now. We still hang around as we did in the center before.*

Group interaction was seen as a benefit, as was the opportunity to develop personal, one-on-one meaningful relationships.

Friendships have created a close-knit group of people that have taken these relationships beyond the physical boundaries of Adams. The perception, in some cases, is that these friendships will be more difficult to find outside of the center:

> *Sally: You have to go out to other places to meet friends. My dorm now [not at Adams] feels like a hotel. It's depressing. I hate my dorm—I don't even know my next-door neighbors. The only reason I moved there was because a friend from Adams was moving there.*

The center as a "family" unit. The final sub-theme under socialization deals with the students' perceptions of the center operating as a "home away from home," or as "one, big, happy family." This was mentioned in several of the interviews and was viewed as an important part of life in the center:

> *Caroline: Overall, I enjoyed it. I felt like I had big brothers and sisters...I got along with everyone...I liked the idea of being able to return "home" after being on a [predominately White campus].*
>
> *Don: I liked it. It was great. Overall, there was no fighting among us. It was a big family and we had much fun together.*

The notion of feeling "at home" helped in easing some of the discomforts of transitioning to the institution not only from the position of being a campus minority, but also as a diversion from the feeling of separation most students face resulting from detachment from family and home life in their first year.

The Adam's Center Staff

A predominant theme that emerged involved residents' perceptions of the Adams center's staff. Two types of staff were identified: 1) the "ally," and 2) the resident assistant. The ally is a residence life staff person that serves as a mentor to the center.

The "Adams Ally." Several comments were made regarding the "Adams Ally." The ally provided what students deemed as "an escape from campus." The ally would invite residents of the center to *[his/her]* home for "home cooked" meals. The relaxed home environment gave the residents of the center the opportunity to interact in different surroundings:

> *Sally: [The ally] was like a house mom. She made sure we stayed involved in different activities. We went to [the ally's]*

house once a month for chili dinners.

Kris: Going to [the ally's] house was just something to do to get away from campus. It was nice to have someone who was open to inviting us to their house and a good number of people went – former and current residents.

The ally served as an advocate for the students of the Adams Center by focusing on students' needs within the scope of the university. In total, the ally proved to be a positive element of the program's success.

The resident assistant. Responses regarding the performance of the resident assistant were varied, but on the whole were positive. All of the respondents were generally satisfied with the performance of the resident assistant. The resident assistant seemed to have a positive influence on the residents, and was responsive to their needs:

Caroline: She was like a big sister or like a mother. You could sit down and talk to her. She was just really good. She made you feel at home. She was like a mentor or a role model.

Don: Yes [my resident assistant was responsive] if we had a problem. I never went to them for problems though. The women mostly went to the resident assistant or some of the guys did. They [resident assistants] weren't overbearing. They were on the same level as we were. They were understanding.

The students viewed the resident assistant as an understanding role model. The resident assistant is a supportive, integral part of the environment who also aids in the tremendous adjustment that occurs during the transition to college life.

Impact of Freshman Seminar

Residents were required to take the freshmen seminar course entitled, "Community Living in the Adams Center," which is a one-credit hour, eight week course that allows new residents to get acquainted with one another, encourages academic success, introduces the student to university resources, and focuses on Afro-centric themes. Participants' responses centered on three main components they perceived as beneficial. These sub-themes were 1) the opportunity to interact with one another and develop friendships; 2) the discussion of African American history and issues, with activities that complimented the curriculum; and 3) the introduction of campus resources and tips on how to adjust to campus life in general.

Classroom Interaction

The class provided an opportunity for everyone to get better acquainted. From this interaction, friendships developed. Students perceived this to be a primary asset of the class:

Sally: The class helped us to get to know each other because we took it the first eight weeks, and it helped me to develop friendships —— long lasting friendships.

Caroline: We all got along pretty well, and...everyone was like a big brother and sister — that's why I miss it...

Friendships from this interaction have persisted, in some cases throughout the student's first three years of college and beyond.

Curriculum and activities. The class also provided a means for students to learn about African American history and current issues affecting the African American community, both on campus and across the nation. According to a former resident assistant, the class made them "take a step back and say, 'Hey, let's look at our culture:'"

Sam: It was the course that let you know a lot about African American culture.

Will: The instructors made an impact with presentations and an assignment on how the media views African Americans. I viewed that as a learning experience.

In addition, students noted that the instructors not only gave lectures and led discussions in class, but also organized outside activities such as a Black Trivia Competition. Some residents viewed this activity as a positive outside learning activity.

Adjustment to campus life. In addition, the class provided information about university resources and taught students standards on how to live on campus. Some students discussed how these topics benefited them:

Caroline: The class taught us about important issues on campus so it would not be such a shock once I hit [the campus].

Jeff: It just really helped me to adjust and learn more about the overall community here at [the university] and surrounding area as a whole.

Overall, students viewed the class as a tremendously worthwhile experience.

Suggested Improvements

The points that consistently stood out in the theme of suggested improvements for Adams can be divided into two categories: overall programming and better supervision. The participants were very concerned with having some type of structure when it came time for planning trips and programs. Most of them described the supervision in the Adams Center as being very little if any at all.

Overall programming. Probably the most echoed factors dealing with the improvement of the Adams Center had to do with the overall programming of events. The students wanted more scheduled events and community services:

> *Kris: Adams needs to have more scheduled events, more residents, and have more people participate in its programs. Having a professional person there would help a lot because at times it could have been more quiet.*

Students living in the Adams Center were also concerned about the center being labeled as "a place where African American students lived." It was implied that the center needed to market itself and its events to the entire campus and not just to the minority students.

Closer supervision. The most surprising concerns that were articulated had to do with the overall supervision of the center, or lack thereof. While the participants were generally pleased with their resident assistant, they still wanted more supervision and structure within the center. It was also suggested that the center have some type of adult supervision or full-time coordinator to help plan and carry out the activities for the center:

> *Angela: Adams needs to have an adult to oversee the programs and ensure that things get done [trips, community service activities, campus leadership opportunities, etc.]. They [the Adams ally] took it upon themselves to do some things but the responsibility was [primarily] on us.*

The participants believed that there was definitely room for improvement toward the center itself. They believed they would have been more satisfied if the center had improved its programming/ structure and supervision.

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to assess the overall satisfaction with the environment and services/programs in the Adams Living

Learning Center and to examine both its attributes and shortcomings. The study indicates two outcomes: 1) that the participants in the center were generally satisfied with the environment; and 2) that the services/ programs needed to have more structure. The conclusion can also be drawn that, according to the study, the Adams Center directly impacted their decision to return to the university.

Of the emerging themes, one that was consistent among most of the participants was the desire to live among other African American students. The Adams Center provided an atmosphere that was hospitable and communal during the "transition" from high school to the university (Hurtado & Carter, 1997). Other students were attracted by the center's Afro-centric theme, citing events and classes devoted to learning about African traditions about which they previously lacked knowledge. From the researchers' findings, it is still important to note that the Adams Center may not be the ideal living environment for all African American students, but it is a viable option. It provides one way of supporting minority students as they move toward graduation, and whatever the reasons that students chose to live there it provided a positive environment for them.

The respondents expressed three outcomes from living in the center. First, the center helped the participants to develop strong "family" ties among its residents. This helped alleviate the fact that African American students in Predominantly White Institutions are often confronted with an environment that does not adequately support their needs (Fleming, 1988). Second, the center created a safe, supportive environment in which the participants felt less restricted to being outgoing, outspoken, and assertive. By creating this safe environment, the level of psychological distress was lessened (Hurtado et al., 1996). Third, adjusting to the university environment became easier because the center provided opportunities for peers to "share knowledge" and to "scale down" the campus (Attinasi, 1989). By living in the scaled down, accepting environment of the Adams Center, the participants felt increased liberty to take risks, ask questions, and develop new behavior patterns.

According to Winston and Anchors (1993), the resident assistant is an "institutionally designed role model." All of the respondents were generally satisfied with the performance of the resident assistant. The resident assistant influenced the center through programming, creating community (family), and teaching the class, "Community Living." Respondents believed the resident assistant was accessible, attentive to their needs, and served as a mentor (Attinasi, 1989).

Also, the "Adams Ally," who is a residence life staff member who works with the center, provided a "home away from home." This ability to get away from the campus environment was very important to the participants. The ally on several occasions had the participants visit [his/her] home for dinner and other activities. However, since this particular staff person was of a different race, the aspect of a "reference group" (Hurtado et al., 1999) may not apply.

The class, "Community Living in the Adams Center" allowed participants the opportunity to bond more closely through in-class interaction. Icebreakers and group projects helped students to begin developing long lasting friendships. The participants also enjoyed learning about African American culture and history. Being able to personalize the history to African Americans at the university was an advantage as well. The ability to have the participants get first hand knowledge about other African Americans who have successfully negotiated the university was beneficial from the standpoint of a reference group (Hurtado et al., 1999). The class allowed students to become more familiar with the university through such activities as developing study skills and utilizing library resources.

The Adams Center plays a valuable role in the development of African American students. It provides a safe supportive environment that allows for better adjustment to the greater campus community. The center also provides opportunities to develop long-lasting relationships with other African American students. In spite of all of the positive influences and data, the participants did express concerns about having increased structure and consistency in the areas of programming/services, tighter supervision, and a consistent adult presence in the center.

What is needed to increase the effectiveness of the center and satisfaction of those who benefit from its existence is a change in the staffing structure. It is recommended that a graduate student be added to the staff in order to supervise the resident assistant, provide leadership and consistency in programming/services, and to serve as the contact person and chief coordinator of the center. The graduate supervisor would be able to implement a stronger academic component to the Community Learning class by adding such components as time management, note taking, and test taking strategies. The planning of field trips and community service projects should also become a staff responsibility as well. In this manner, the graduate supervisor along with the resident assistant and ally would develop a strong, cohesive support system for the residents.

References

Asante, M. K., & Al-Deen, H. S. N. (1984). Social intervention of Black and White college students: A research report. *Journal of Black College Students, 14*(4), 507-515.

Astin, A. W. (1977). *Four critical years.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Attinasi Jr., L. C. (1989). Getting in: Mexican Americans' perceptions of university attendance and the implications for freshman year attendance. *Journal of Higher Education, 60*(3), 247-277.

Bennett, C. (1984). Interracial contact experiences and attrition among Black undergraduates at a Predominantly White University. *Theory and Research in Social Education, 12*(2), 19-45.

Chickering, A. W. (1974). *Commuting versus resident students.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cox, E. (1985). *Spelman College is tying it all together through the living learning program.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Fleming, J. (1988). *Blacks in college.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hurtado, S., Milem, J., Clayton-Pedersen, A., & Allen, W. (1999). Enacting diverse learning environments: Improving the climate for racial/ethnic diversity in higher education. *ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, 1*(8). Washington, D.C.: The George Washington University, Graduate School of Education and Human Development.

Hurtado, S., & Carter, D. F. (1997). Effects of college transition and perceptions of the campus racial climate on Latino students' sense of belonging. *Sociology of Education, 70*(4), 324-345.

Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (1980). Student-faculty and student-peer relationships as mediators of the structural effects of undergraduate residence arrangement. *Journal of Educational Research, 73*(6), 344-353.

Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (1991). *How college affects students.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Shingles, R. D. (1979). College as a source of Black alienation. *Journal of Black Studies, 9*(3), 267-289.

Turner, C.S.V. (1994). Guests in someone else's house: Students of color. *The Review of Higher Education, 17*(4), 355-370.

Williams, D. E., & Reilley, R. (1972). The impact of residence halls on students. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 13*(5), 402-410.

Winston, R. B., Jr. & Anchors, S. (1993). *Student housing and residential life.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Behavioral Responses to Hate Crimes: A Study of Asians and Asian-Americans on a University Campus

By Shannon L. Burns, Shaun R. Harper,
Emily S. Hildebrand, Megan N. Moore

The researchers hypothesized that when a student of a particular ethnicity is the victim or target of a hate crime, members of that student's ethnic community may experience behavioral changes as a result. The study was conducted three months after a hate crime at the study institution claimed the life of a minority student. Changes in extracurricular involvement, multiple support systems, and emotional responses manifested through behaviors were reported by the participants.

An apparent rise in campus homicides and assaults through shootings, beatings, and other random acts perpetuated by hate (Barnes & Ephross, 1994) demands action on the part of higher education professionals dealing with the aftermath of such crimes on their campuses. In order for higher education professionals to sufficiently address the issues and actions that result from hate crimes on college and university campuses, they need to be aware of the emotional and behavioral effects on members of the student body. The purpose of this study is to examine how a hate crime at a college or university affects members of the targeted racial or ethnic group. In contrast to the significant research concerning the emotional responses of victims, there is a paucity of research focusing on the behavioral responses of hate crime victims which provides the impetus for further research in this area. Behavioral responses in this study center specifically around utilization of counseling and community support services, changes in campus involvement, and steps taken to prevent personal injury.

In response to the lack of information focusing on the behavioral responses to campus hate crimes, this study strives to determine what those responses are by seeking answers to the following research questions. First, do members of the targeted community seek counseling and/or turn to community networks for support? Second, do academic and extra-curricular involvement of members of the target community change as a result of the hate crime? Finally, are greater steps taken by members of the targeted community to avoid personal injury?

Literature Review

In this section, the researchers outline what it means to be a victim and specifically a victim of hate crimes or the subset of hate crimes motivated specifically by race, ethnicity, and religion known as ethnoviolence (Jenness & Broad, 1997). Next, the researchers show that victims are not just defined as the persons who are targeted in the crime, but are also members of that person's community, specifically those members who share the same ethnicity of the targeted person. The psychological, emotional, and behavioral effects of being victimized by ethnoviolence are given and applied to members of the victim's ethnic group where a hate crime has occurred. Finally, the research hypotheses are stated, placing particular attention on the behavioral effects on the victim's ethnic community at a college or university.

In 1990, the National Institute Against Prejudice and Violence reported that each year one out of every five minority college students will be a victim of a racial act (Ogawa, 1999). Acts of racism include written and verbal epithets, damage to property, threats to personal safety, physical assault and murder. Some of the worst forms of racism are violent crimes motivated by hate. A hate crime is defined by the U.S. Department of Justice (as cited in Downey & Stage, 1999) as: "a criminal offense committed against an individual, group of individuals, or their property because of their race, religion, sexual orientation, or ethnicity" (p. 3). The most frequently cited incidents of hate crime include verbal harassment, physical assault, and mail or telephone threats. Other forms include acts of vandalism, attempted robbery, and theft (Barnes & Ephross, 1994).

Although acts of hate are not new to society nor to higher education, they have become more publicized and increasingly violent (Barnes & Ephross, 1994). Unfortunately, today's college students are experiencing such acts at higher levels and are more likely than ever to be victims of hate crimes (Barnes & Ephross, 1994). Bayley (1991) states that people are victims of crime:

> "...if and only if, 1) they have suffered a loss or some significant decrease in well-being unfairly or undeservedly and in such a manner that they were helpless to prevent the loss; 2) the loss has an identifiable cause; and 3) the legal or moral context of the loss entitles the sufferers of the loss to social concern" (p. 53).

One may assert that these criteria also apply to the surrounding community of a victim of a hate crime. In fact, Stephenson (1985)

theorizes that a community also experiences a psychological assault when someone close to them is victimized. One study, conducted on victims of sexual assault, found that the victims experienced a loss of trust in others, the environment, and their own judgement, and that those close to the victims also displayed some of the same sentiments (Roark, 1989).

It may also be reasoned that much of the research previously conducted to determine effects to the direct victim of a hate crime apply to the victim's community as well. Downey and Stage (1999) support this reasoning and report that such effects are not strictly limited to the person that was directly and personally victimized but also apply to the members of the targeted group.

Additional research proposes that victims of hate crimes experience similar effects as victims of non-race-related crimes (Barnes & Ephross, 1994). These studies indicate that people who are of the same ethnicity or sexual orientation as the direct victim of a hate crime are, in essence, victims themselves. As a result, they will exhibit psychological and behavioral responses similar to those of the direct victim, though to a lesser degree. Violence on campus impacts the psychological, social and academic lives of students even outside the bounds of their established populations (Cerio, 1989). Because of this, classmates and other peers may be indirectly and emotionally damaged by the occurrence. Although the research shows that effects of hate crimes can go beyond racial or ethnic lines, this study will focus specifically on the effects to the ethnic community of the victim. It is worth mentioning for clarification purposes, that the authors are using the terms *targeted group* and *victim's community* interchangeably throughout this study. It is the goal of this study to examine the effects and responses of the victim's community when one of their community members is targeted in a hate crime.

Victimization produces "a collection of reactions" (Cerio, 1989, p. 55). Research reveals that hate crimes provoke both emotional and behavioral reactions or responses. Emotional responses include anger, fear of injury, denial, selective ignoring, sadness, passive acceptance, the feeling of being out of control, and feelings of helplessness (Barnes & Ephross, 1994; Bird & Smith, 1991; Phillips, 1993). Feeling a loss of control is one of the more commonly cited effects and often triggers maladaptive responses to stress, eventually leading to attempts to accommodate, adapt, and regain control (Phillips, 1993; Roark, 1989).

Emotional responses, such as feeling powerless, often cause a

victim to change behaviors that were once part of his or her daily routine and may continue into the long-term stages with lasting results (Hoffman, Schuh & Fenske, 1998; Roark, 1989). Emotional responses are often manifested in the victim's behaviors, thus creating behavioral responses. Fear of one's safety and the desire to regain control of one's life may cause victims to move geographically, purchase a gun, and increase safety precautions (Barnes & Ephross, 1994). Anger may motivate the crime victim to speak out against racism and hate speech. Depression and guilt may prompt a victim to seek counseling or turn to community groups for support. These feelings might also cause the victim to isolate himself or herself and decrease participation in social activities. Acts fueled by racism marginalize particular groups, force them to live in fear, and diminish efforts to improve relations between different social and ethnic groups (Downey & Stage, 1999). In the area of higher education specifically, Asian or Asian-American students who experienced racism did not adjust as well academically or socially compared to Asian or Asian-Americans not subjected to racism (LeSure, 1994).

Thus, the researchers hypothesize that when a student of a particular ethnicity is the victim or target of a hate crime, members of the student's ethnic community at the university will experience behavioral effects as a result. In addition, we hypothesize that these effects will include the following behavioral responses: changes in methods of seeking community support and counseling; efforts to take greater steps in ensuring one's personal safety; and changes in the type and level of involvement on campus. For the purposes of this study, we have adopted Astin's (1993) definition of the second class of involvement measures that includes academic involvement, involvement with faculty, and involvement with student peers. This is distinguished from the first class of involvement measures, bridge measures, that include characteristics of the entering student as well as environmental characteristics (Astin, 1993). These are the measures that all students who are enrolled in college are exposed to simply by virtue of attending college.

Examples of the second class of involvement, those that result from curricular and co-curricular choices the student makes, can be seen in the following measures. Academic involvement may be measured through such means as determining the amount of time a student attends classes and labs, studies, or does homework. Faculty involvement can be measured by the amount of time a student spends interacting with his or her instructors outside of class or working on a

research project with a professor. The frequency with which students socialize with friends, participate in student clubs or groups, and attend parties are all measures of student peer involvement (Astin, 1993).

It is the researchers' intention that this study will add to the body of research and add support to existing theories on community effects of hate crimes. Furthermore, it is suggested that the results of this study be used as a basis for developing support for the community of victims of hate crimes, specifically at colleges and universities where the number of hate crimes is increasing.

Method

The Incident and Response

This study was conducted at a large, public university in a small Midwestern city of approximately 65,000 residents (including students of the University). Most of the ethnic diversity in the city is due to the University population, which is approximately 17 percent minority. The local community recently dealt with hate speech that was distributed in the form of flyers throughout town and the neighborhoods surrounding the University. The incident that motivated this study occurred on a Sunday morning in July, when a Korean graduate student was shot and killed in front of a church located just yards from the edge of the University campus. The perpetrator was a young, white male, who was a former University student and a known distributor of hate literature.

Sample

A purposive sample was used in this study due to time constraints and convenient access to participants. The intent of the study was to examine the effects of a hate crime on the ethnic community of the victim. For that reason, only Asian or Asian-American students were selected to participate. The sample consisted of both graduate and undergraduate members of three Asian student organizations. Graduate students were included in the sample because the victim was a graduate student, and therefore it is likely that his peer group would include members of this population. Undergraduates were also surveyed because all members of the targeted group, regardless of class standing, may have been affected by the incident.

The sample included both American and international students because the Asian student groups on campus are comprised of both citizenry, and the potential for interaction between the two groups is high. Furthermore, the perpetrator did not know the victim personally

and thus did not know whether he was a graduate or undergraduate, American or international student. Finally, because an ethnic community is comprised of males and females, both genders were also included in the study.

The Asian and Asian-American student organizations that were contacted were chosen based on the number of members and the diversity they represent in terms of age, year in school, gender and citizenry. Forty-four participants were involved in the study. The actual number of participants from each of the student groups was dependent upon the size of each group and the number of members present at the time data were collected.

Survey Procedure

A survey, consisting of 64 questions, was administered during the general meetings of Asian and Asian-American student groups. The participants were given approximately 15 minutes to complete the questions. The first set of questions related to participants' demographics, followed by questions assessing their level of involvement in their organization. Demographic information included items such as gender, year in school, citizenship, and race or ethnicity. Organizational involvement questions centered on status within the group, frequency of attendance, and length of membership.

The majority of the survey focused on potential behaviors that may occur among a group targeted by a hate crime, specifically changes in levels of involvement, changes in academic performance, changes in safety precautions taken, and changes in use of community support and counseling. Participants were asked to indicate how certain actions have or have not changed as a result of the campus tragedy. Answers to these questions were given using a five-point Likert scale ranging from "Increased Significantly" (5) to "Decreased Significantly" (1). Changes in behavior were determined by phrases such as "Your participation in class discussions has..." followed by the participants' choices on the Likert scale.

Questions relating to involvement explored changes in campus and academic life and peer interaction. Phrases such as "Your involvement in campus activities in general has..." and "Your interaction with faculty has..." were presented in this section. The section highlighting changes in safety included expressions such as, "Walked a different path on or around campus after dark" and "Participated in a self-defense course." Examples from the support category included "Attended health/personal wellness workshops in the community" and

"Spoke with your friends regarding your feelings about the tragedy."

In order to address the behavioral manifestations of emotions commonly exhibited by victims following a crime, a section was added exploring the degree to which participants experienced anger, fear, depression, guilt and anxiety. In this section, respondents were asked to use a Likert scale to indicate whether the emotion was felt "Severely" (5) to "Not at all" (1). One open-ended question requesting participants to indicate the ways in which they dealt with any of the five emotions completed the section.

A brief section addressing whether respondents had experienced certain racial incidents, such as being ignored or threatened because of their race or ethnicity, was also included. Again, a Likert scale was used ranging from "Frequently" (5) to "Never" (1). The last set of questions focused on information such as if participants were living in town when the tragedy occurred and whether or not they knew the victim or perpetrator. Finally, an open-ended question soliciting additional comments or thoughts concluded the survey.

Limitations

In conducting this study, there were several limitations. A few were inherent to the nature of the study while others were a result of the population researched. The final sample size of forty-four students, in part due to the small number of Asian or Asian-American students on the University campus, limited the effectiveness of the study. In choosing to survey students in organizations, survey-gathering activities were limited to student organization meetings and activities. The relative disorganization of many of the student groups made it logistically difficult to reach large groups of Asian and Asian-American students. This limitation was further exacerbated by the amount of time allotted to complete the study.

The shortage of previous research about behavioral effects on members of target populations was also identified as a limitation because of a lack of theoretical knowledge to guide the researchers in formulating the methodology and the survey instrument. Moreover, there was no way to have a measure of behavior prior to the incident because the researchers were not able to collect these data before the tragedy occurred. Rather, they were asked to recall their previous behaviors and determine whether or not any behavior changes were directly attributable to the shooting. This situation may have caused some data to be reported differently.

The survey did not inquire if students were aware of counsel-

ing and psychological services that were available to them when they made the decision to not seek support from counselors. It should not be assumed when reviewing the results that students knew that support services and student affairs professionals were in place to help them cope after the tragedy occurred. Furthermore, it should be understood that first-year students were included in the sample and answered questions regarding change in their levels of involvement. Since they were not given the opportunity to be involved in the groups that were surveyed prior to this semester, their reported involvement in those organizations clearly shows an increase. While it could be inferred that some students chose to join these organizations because of the shooting and would not have otherwise, this cannot be assumed. Finally, only three areas of behavior were surveyed. It is possible that more areas could be identified and surveyed that may add to the body of research on behavioral effects of hate crimes.

Results

The goal of this study was to increase the amount of information regarding behavioral responses to campus hate crimes by answering the following research questions: 1) In what ways do students who are members of a hate crime victim's community respond to that crime? 2) Do members of the targeted community seek counseling and/or turn to community networks for support? 3) Do academic and extra-curricular involvement of members of the targeted community change as a result of the hate crime? and 4) Are greater steps taken by members of the targeted community to avoid personal injury? The answers to these questions are explored in greater depth in the following section, which is broken down into several primary areas labeled "demographics," "involvement," "safety," "support," and "emotional responses."

Demographics

Forty-four surveys were completed. Twenty-six of the respondents were female students and 16 were male. Two students did not report their gender on the survey. The survey participants represented a total of 11 different ethnic identities, nine of them of Asian descent. The greatest number of participants identified themselves as being Korean or Korean-American (12 students) or Chinese or Chinese-American (10 students), followed closely by Indian or Indian-American students (7). In addition, one Caucasian student, one African-American student, and one student of both African-American and

Asian-American heritage completed the survey because they identified themselves as being part of the Asian community. When asked how long they had been a member of their particular organization, over one-third (36.4%) reported that they had just joined the group this year, and just over one-quarter (29.5%) indicated that they had been a member for at least two years. Over one-half (63.6%) of the survey participants were officers in their organization, eight were members, and eight were visitors.

Involvement

In response to the question of whether or not academic and/or extra-curricular involvement of members of a targeted group change as a result of a hate crime, the findings suggest that some change does occur. Approximately one-third (36.4%) of respondents reported that their level of involvement in their organization had "increased" or "increased significantly" as a result of the tragedy, and an even larger percentage (43.1%) reported an increase or significant increase in their overall involvement in University organizations.

The mean scores for change in involvement in Asian or Asian-American organizations for female students (3.75) compared to that of male students (3.13) indicate that involvement increased more for females than males after the incident. This difference was found to be statistically significant through t-test analyses. In addition, t-test results show that the greater increase in the level of overall involvement of students who are officers, compared to that of other members or visitors, was also statistically significant.

These findings were supported by comments students made when responding to an open-ended question about the ways students deal with emotions evoked by the incident. For example, one organization officer stated that her political and student involvement had greatly increased within the University as well as the community. Another officer wrote that she dealt with the tragedy by "taking up a 'crusade' to ensure that diversity remains a priority goal" at the University.

In terms of academic involvement, measured by such behaviors as class attendance and participation in class discussion, the greatest change was seen in student interaction with faculty. However, most students did not appear to considerably increase or decrease other academic involvement as a result of the tragedy.

Safety Measures

Upon examining whether or not greater steps are taken to avoid

personal injury, analyses of data revealed that, with the exception of being more aware of one's surroundings, there were no significant changes in behavior. Analyses showed that 47.7% of the students are more aware of their surroundings (lighting, presence of strangers, etc.) than they were prior to the incident. Other possible changes in behavior (i.e. taking a different path on campus, walking with a friend after dark, and participating in a self-defense course or workshop) did not yield any significant findings.

Support

The degree to which members of the targeted community sought counseling and/or turned to community networks as a result of a campus hate crime produced varying results. These results primarily depended upon a student's place of residence during the time of the crime, and his or her status in the student organization (officer, general member, or visitor). In general, students reported obtaining most of their emotional support from their parents, friends, and other members of their organization, but did not appear to solicit a significant amount of support from external sources such as faculty members, professional counselors, clergy, or campus health specialists.

The majority of participants (66.9%) indicated that they spoke with their parents regarding their feelings about the tragedy, 65.6% spoke with their friends, and 56.8% spoke with members of their organization. T-test analyses also indicated that participants who resided in the University town at the time of the incident reported speaking with members of their organization more frequently than did those participants who were not living in town ($p \leq .01$).

Additionally, t-test analyses revealed that participants who were officers in their organization spoke about the tragedy significantly more with their parents, friends, and other members of their organization than did other participants. One respondent stated that her organization held "open forums and lectures about these issues," while another wrote that her organization "gave students the opportunity to discuss issues concerning the tragedy." Finally, two participants indicated that they did not seek support from others, but instead, dealt with their emotions on their own.

Emotional Responses

The survey used in this study was designed specifically to obtain data regarding behavioral effects of hate crimes. However, in order to gain a more thorough understanding of the changes in behavior

that occurred as a result of this particular hate crime, the survey also included five questions asking participants about their emotional responses to the incident. These questions examined the five major emotions (anger, fear, depression, guilt, and anxiety) that psychologists report are most experienced by crime victims and members of the victims' communities (Downey & Stage, 1999). Although only six participants had heard of the perpetrator, and only one participant noted that they knew or had heard of the victim, they still reported being emotionally affected by the crime. Interestingly, t-test analyses show that participants who attended the same church as the victim indicated feeling lower levels of anger than participants who did not attend church or who attended other churches ($p \leq .05$).

Although a large number of students reported feeling anger and fear ranging from "somewhat" to "severely," and one-third experienced feelings of guilt as a result of the incident, most did not report feeling depression or anxiety to any notable degree. One particular finding of significance revealed by t-test analyses indicated that female participants experienced higher levels of fear as a result of the incident than did male participants.

Further analyses did not result in significant differences among males and females regarding the four remaining emotions. Other feelings were also noted in the responses to open-ended questions. For example, sympathy was expressed in the response of one participant who commented that she "felt sorrow for the family of the victim." Another participant noted that his feelings of anger were exacerbated by events following the incident in which members of a White supremacist group defended the actions of the perpetrator.

Discussion

Several conclusions can be drawn from the results of this study about behavioral changes regarding involvement, support, and safety of the target group, as well as implications for student affairs professionals working with members of a target group in the aftermath of a hate crime. It is important for student affairs professionals to understand how hate crimes affect college students in order to effectively address the behaviors and emotions that may result. The self-reported data from the study participants lend support to the theories that students who are members of the same ethnic or racial target group will exhibit behavioral responses somewhat similar to those of an actual hate crime victim. Although overall significant changes in behavior occurred less frequently than were originally anticipated by the researchers, there

were some behavioral modifications reported. It was also interesting to note the differences in behavior and emotional responses between males and females. Although the researchers did not expect to find any differences in gender, the fact that some were identified may indicate the need for further research or inquiry in this area.

Many of the surveyed students indicated that the crime did not affect them to a great extent, nor did they think very much about it. This may stem from the fact that 93.2% of respondents indicated that they did not know of the victim before the shooting. Furthermore, the victim had enrolled but had not yet started classes during the previous semester in which most of the respondents were last enrolled; therefore a lack of personal investment in the tragedy was to be expected. In addition, 50% of the participants reported being physically absent from the campus community at the time of the incident. Therefore, the absence of significant changes in behavior may be partly due to their distance, both emotionally and physically, from the actual crime and the victim. It is unknown whether or not the students would have been more strongly affected by the shooting had it occurred during a fall or spring semester when the majority of students are on campus.

Support

Contrary to our original predictions, some of the traditional victim support strategies (i.e. an increase in campus or professional counseling) were underutilized by the students in this study. Although a large number of respondents indicated no increased use in campus or community counseling services, some did report emotional changes, implying that such support services may have been helpful in the coping process.

Students who sought help in dealing with their emotions and issues regarding the hate crime often went to family and friends rather than counselors, faculty or staff members, clergy, or campus health professionals. Therefore, student affairs professionals may find it beneficial to make all students more aware of the availability of resources and counseling services on campus immediately following a campus tragedy, especially one motivated by hate or resulting in death. A particular emphasis might be placed on heightening the awareness of available services among the victimized community. Since the survey did not ask students if they knew that such services were available, it was not possible to determine if their failure to seek counseling was by choice or because they were not aware that the services existed. Even if students resist counseling, it may be beneficial for students to at least

know where to find information and professional help should they need it.

In another area of support, officers of Asian and Asian-American organizations were more likely to speak with their peers and other members of the organization about the tragedy than students who did not hold officer positions. Since students did not readily use the resources on campus to cope with any emotions regarding the incident, it may be helpful to provide family members and officers of organizations with literature and information to help them in responding to the needs of the target group. The direct influence of the counselor would be somewhat diluted, but more students would be served using this "trickle-down" approach. Since college-age adults are inclined to be more comfortable talking to and depending on their peers and family members as opposed to a "stranger" in the counseling office, student affairs professionals could enact special outreach efforts to these circles of familiar support. Other suggestions include having a counselor or student affairs professional ask to speak to student organizations during regular meetings and to offer group counseling sessions that would allow students to talk to, counsel, and support each other.

Involvement

The 36.4% of students that increased involvement in their ethnic group organization may have had very different reasons for doing so. Perhaps their Asian or Asian-American student group was viewed as a vehicle through which they could seek support from peers who were also dealing with the ramifications of the tragedy. This speculation implies that further action is needed from professionals working with student organizations on campus. The leaders of organizations whose student populations are targeted in the hate incident should be contacted immediately following an incident. Student affairs professionals should consider working closely with these organizational leaders to increase recruitment efforts and provide more programmatic interventions for that specific population. This may give target group victims a common forum to connect with, depend on, and help with assisting others in the group.

The fact that 43.1% of the participants indicated an increase in their campus and co-curricular involvement in general lends further support to the hypothesis of overall increased involvement. This increase may be attributed to the participants' need for support from other students of all races. Further, this behavioral change may afford additional opportunities for students to share their feelings and confide

in other students. Since involvement in student organizations increased to a greater degree, a stronger emphasis should be placed on marketing involvement opportunities to students of the hate crime target group.

Safety

In the area of personal safety, the hypothesis proposed by the researchers was not supported. While students did indicate that they had experienced an increased awareness of their surroundings, they did not report any significant behavioral changes as a result. Again, since the tragedy occurred during the summer months while exactly half of the respondents were away from the campus community, it is likely that these respondents had an opportunity to contend with their emotions prior to returning to campus. It is also possible that respondents felt that the tragedy was an isolated incident and they were no longer at risk. Students indicated virtually no changes in other behaviors that would seem to increase their safety on the college campus. While increased awareness may be seen as a behavioral response, it would not always lead to more observable modifications in behavior. These findings are somewhat alarming, as students seemed complacent about their personal safety following such a brutal murder close to the campus. While it would not have been prudent to incite fear in students, this incident presented an opportunity for campus safety personnel to provide timely and effective information regarding personal safety to the campus community. Furthermore, women may be more receptive to programming as they indicated a higher level of fear as a result of the tragedy.

Suggestions for Further Research

Le Sure (1994) recommends future research be done to investigate specific coping strategies (often demonstrated through one's behavior) that students of color use when faced by racism. Most of the research on the effects of crime on victims focuses on the emotional responses of being a crime victim or a member of the victim's community. The need for greater study of behavioral responses is apparent.

Additional inquiry into the differences regarding gender, status of involvement within the organizations, and the use of support networks is also suggested by the researchers of this study. Furthermore, studying the responses of students outside of the target group will provide a greater understanding of the effects of hate crimes on the community. If student affairs professionals are to respond effectively

and appropriately to the behavioral changes manifested by members of a hate crime target group, more literature must be written to assist them in achieving this goal.

References

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

Barnes, A., & Ephross, P. H. (1994). The impact of hate violence on victims: Emotional and behavioral responses to attacks. *Social Work, 39* (3), 247-251.

Bayley, J. E. (1991). The concept of victimhood. In D. Sank & D. I. Caplan (Eds.), *To be a victim* (pp. 53-62). New York: Plenum Press.

Bird, G. W., & Smith, S. M. (1991). Psychological resources, coping strategies, and negotiation styles as discriminators of violence in dating relationships. *Family Relations, 91* (40), 45-50.

Cerio, N. G. (1989). Counseling victims and perpetrators of campus violence. In J. M. Sherill & D. G. Siegel (Eds.), *Responding to violence on campus* (pp. 53-63). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Downey, J. P., & Stage, F. K. (1999). Hate crimes and violence on college and university campuses. *Journal of College Student Development, 40* (1), 3-9.

Hoffman, A. M., Schuh, J. H., & Fenske, R. H (Eds.). (1998). *Violence on campus: Defining the problems, strategies for action.* Gaithersburg, MD: Aspen.

Jenness, V., & Broad, K. (1997). *Hate crimes: New social movements and the politics of violence.* New York: Aldine De Gruyter.

Le Sure, E. G. (1994, August). *Ethnic Differences and the Effects of Racism on College Adjustment.* Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, Toronto, CA.

Ogawa, B. K. (1999). *Color of justice: Culturally sensitive treatment of minority crime victims.* Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Phillips, N. (1993). *Educational and psychological perspectives on stress in students, teachers and parents.* Brandon, VT: Clinical Psychology Publishing Co., Inc.

Roark, M. L. (1989). Sexual violence. In J. M. Sherill & D. G. Siegel (Eds.), *Responding to violence on campus* (pp. 41-52). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Smith, M. C. (1988). *Coping with crime on campus.* New York: American Council on Education and Macmillan.

Smith, M. C. (1989). The ancestry of campus violence. In J. M. Sherill & D. G. Siegel (Eds.), *Responding to violence on campus* (pp. 5-15). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Stephenson, J. S. (1985). Death and the campus community: Organizational realities and personal tragedies. In E. S. Zinner (Ed.), *Coping with death on campus* (pp. 5-13). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Indiana University Annual Fund
Higher Education and Student Affairs
Gift Form

As students of the Indiana University Student Personnel Association, we thank you for your contribution to the organization! Your continued support is crucial to the financial health of the *Journal*. We hope you consider sending a gift this year as you enjoy the 2000 edition of this continued high-quality student publication.

Please include my gift of $____________________

For: _____ IU Student Personnel Association (32-E009-15-7)

_____ Other ______________________ (38-E009-02-2)

Name: ____

Address: ____

City/State/Zip: ____

Please make checks payable to the Indiana University Foundation, the designated fundraising agent of Indiana University.
** Please be sure to note on your donation that the gift should be directed to the Indiana University Student Personnel Association (32-E009-15-7). All donations marked "Education" will be directed to the School of Education general account.

I/we wish to make my/our gift by (please check one):

_____ Mastercard _____ Visa _____ Check Enclosed

Card # ________________________________ Exp. Date __________

Signature____

The Indiana University Fund supports new and ongoing projects and special initiatives by providing funds for immediate use throughout the University. A portion of funds and/or income therefrom may be used to defray the direct costs of raising and/or administering the funds.

Mail to: IU Foundation/School of Education
PO Box 2298
Bloomington, IN 47402-2298