JOURNAL OF STUDENT AFFAIRS

Colorado State University

Knowledge to Go Places

In remembrance of September 11, 2001

Colorado State University Journal of Student Affairs

Mission Statement and Goals

Mission Statement

The mission of the *Colorado State University Journal of Student Affairs* is to develop and produce a scholarly publication that reflects current education issues and the professional interests of student affairs practitioners. Specifically, the *Journal* provides an opportunity for the publication of articles by current students, alumni, and faculty of the Colorado State University Student Affairs in Higher Education graduate program.

Goals

The *Journal* will promote scholarly work reflecting the importance of professional and academic writing in higher education.

The Editorial Board of the *Journal* will offer opportunities for students to develop editorial skills, critical thinking skills, and writing skills while producing a professional journal.

The *Journal* will serve as a communication tool to alumni and other professionals regarding the status of the Student Affairs in Higher Education graduate program.

Colorado State University
Journal of Student Affairs

Volume XI, 2002

To contact the Editorial Board, please call or write:

Student Affairs in Higher Education
Colorado State University
220 Palmer Center
1005 West Laurel Street
Fort Collins, CO 80521
970.491.4731

The Journal can be found on the World Wide Web at: http://sahe.colostate.edu/

Table of Contents

Director's Perspective

Grant P. Sherwood
Director
Student Affairs in Higher Education

It is with renewed enthusiasm that I am writing this year's *Director's Perspective*. As many of you know, last year I spent some time away from the program to serve as Colorado State University's Interim Vice President for Student Affairs. I would like to give special thanks to Dave McKelfresh, who served as Interim Director in my absence.

This is an exciting time for the program, as many positive changes and events have occurred over the past year. Dr. Linda Kuk, a 1973 graduate of our program, has begun her tenure as the new Vice President of Student Affairs and is also a faculty member in our program. Our new leadership has brought a number of structural changes in our division, providing an excellent learning opportunity for our students to learn about organizational behavior and change first hand.

In addition, this past year has seen many accomplishments both within and outside of the classroom. Our faculty continue their efforts to infuse more diversity into the curriculum. This spring, we will continue the commitment to include an international perspective in the program by sending eleven students to Belize to observe the educational system of a foreign country. Back on campus, many faculty and volunteers have been instrumental in continuing with the development of a career workshop series specifically aimed towards student affairs professionals. Finally, in the summer, we look forward to a hosting collaborative higher education institute between Colorado State University and the University of Northern Colorado, followed by a CSPA/SAHE Reunion at Pingree Park.

As always, the production of the journal coincides with the final semester for some of our students, and the selection process for our next cohort. This year our application pool has grown, and initial feedback from those on the selection committee reassures me that we will have some outstanding candidates to replace the fifteen successful students set to graduate this spring.

In closing, I wish to thank the student editors, their faculty advisor, and the many readers, whose commitment to excellence is crucial to the maintenance of the *Journal* as one of our program's strong, visible traditions.

Advisor's Perspective

Paul Shang
Advisor
Journal of Student Affairs

During the past year, it has been my pleasure to serve as the faculty advisor to the editorial board of the Student Affairs in Higher Education *Journal of Student Affairs*. This is always an eagerly anticipated responsibility because of the opportunity to become acquainted with other Student Affairs in Higher Education graduate students in addition to the students I advise. As with the experience of previous years, I am greatly impressed by the intellectual vitality of the Editorial Board members, their humor, leadership, commitment, colleagueship, and the dedication of all the many readers whose efforts ensure the high quality of the *Journal*. The significant time and effort seemed easily sacrificed, as the process was enjoyable and stimulating.

One other quality I observed this semester is the remarkable resilience demonstrated after the attacks of September 11, 2001, and throughout the remainder of the year as the nation came to grips with new realities. The optimism and commitment of the students on the Editorial Board, how they coped with grief, their determination to succeed, were impressive and inspirational. I admire them and am fortunate to have been part of their experience.

Student Affairs in Higher Education
Diversity Scholarship Recipients

Spring 2001 Recipients

Portia Bacor

Wendy Stultz

Carl's Jr. in the Lory Student Center has donated funds to establish grants for the Student Affairs in Higher Education program to enhance racial and ethnic diversity.

Congratulations!

Note from the Editors

Jody E. Jessup
Jason W. Borges
Nicole Manley Kerber
Wendy Dawn Morgan Butts
Zane S. Reif
Lea R. Hanson

The *Colorado State University Journal of Student Affairs* has become an enduring tradition for the Student Affairs and Higher Education graduate program. While the commitment to excellence continues from year to year, each edition remains unique, reflecting the personalities of all who dedicate themselves to transform ideas into publishable works, be they authors, editors, or Reader Board members. This year's *Journal* is no exception.

This past Fall, during our first few meetings as an Editorial Board, we brainstormed ideas about what values we wanted this edition to encompass. Several themes emerged; among them were the desires that the publication provides an avenue to explore a variety of perspectives and encourage intellectual creativity.

In the aftermath of the attacks on the Pentagon and the World Trade Center on September 11, 2001, and the subsequent beginning of the war on terrorism, never has it been more crucial to express our diverse perspectives. While we often lamented to one another during this challenging time that we were struggling with our job responsibilities, class work, and other obligations, we never questioned our commitment to, nor the importance of, continuing the tradition of publication.

We hope you will enjoy the eleventh edition of the *Colorado State University Journal of Student Affairs* and find it provides you with diverse perspectives and new ideas.

Acknowledgements

The 2002 Journal of Student Affairs Editorial Board wishes to thank the following individuals for their contributions:

- Paul Shang, who is the Director of the Help/Success Center and a SAHE faculty member. In Paul's second year as advisor of the *Journal of Student Affairs*, he continued to raise questions and encourage us to think critically about the format, content, and purpose of the *Journal*.

- Grant Sherwood, Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs and Director of the SAHE program at Colorado State University, for his continued support of the *Journal*.

- Linda Kuk, Vice President for Student Affairs and SAHE faculty member, for her support of the *Journal*. We are pleased that you have returned to Colorado State University.

- Donna Aurand, Associate Legal Counsel and SAHE faculty member, whose legal expertise and language was utilized when we drafted the contracts for contributing authors.

- James Banning, SAHE faculty member and professor in the School of Education, for his contributions to the *Journal of Student Affairs* over the years. The SAHE program appreciates his knowledge and passion for campus ecology.

- Mark Denke, Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs and SAHE faculty member, for his web expertise and unwavering enthusiasm.

- Wendy Wallace, Assistant Director for Residence Life at Colorado State University, for her continued dedication to the *Journal of Student Affairs*. Though we will sincerely miss her guidance, we wish her well on her move to Washington.

- Andrea Quintana, Graphic Designer Paraprofessional for Residence Life at Colorado State University, whose creative expertise contributed to artistic changes on the cover.

- Becky Bell, Staff Member in the Office of the Vice President for Student Affairs, for her invaluable assistance in the final production of the *Journal*.

- The alumni of the CSPA/SAHE Program at Colorado State University, for the time they have taken over the last several years to submit articles to the *Journal* and their continued support of the program.

- The Reader Boards and fellow classmates, for their professionalism, patience, and dedication to their work on behalf of the *Journal*.

- Those who submitted articles for the eleventh edition of the *Journal of Student Affairs;* their research and hard work were instrumental to the quality of the journal.

The Climate in Higher Education:
The Impact of Diversity and Multiculturalism on
the Campus Climate and Today's College Students

Portia O. Bacor

Increased enrollment of students of color in institutions of higher education has significantly impacted the demographics of today's college campuses (National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities, 1991). As a result, campuses are becoming increasingly diverse and students are being impacted in various ways by the diversity and multiculturalism they are encountering. This increased participation of students of color demands a shift in thinking. Institutions must begin to recognize the impact changes in campus demographics will ultimately have on the campus climate, the opportunities for interaction among diverse students, and the educational outcomes for students, particularly for students of color. The author offers recommendations for student affairs practitioners and other campus administrators to effectively respond to the challenges of diversity and multiculturalism.

Increased participation by students of color in higher education has contributed significantly to the changing demographics of today's college and university campuses (National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities, 1991). According to a report from the Colorado State Advisory Committee to the United States Commission on Civil Rights (1995), the percentage of all students of color in higher education has exceeded their proportion in the general population, with the exception of African-Americans whose enrollment percentage remains below their proportion in the general population. As colleges and universities throughout the nation are becoming increasingly diverse, they are experiencing the effects of diversity and multiculturalism on their campuses. Students from numerous backgrounds are struggling with the diversity they face inside and outside the classroom. At many institutions, students of color have described the campus climate, which is defined as "the current perceptions, attitudes, and expectations that define the institution and its members" (Hurtado, Clayton-Pederson, & Allen, 1999, p. 1), as volatile and unwelcoming.

Today's college students hold differing views about diversity and the state of race relations. In a survey conducted by Krane and Cottreau (1998), a majority of the participating college students reported that they perceived the state of race relations in the United States as negative. While many students agree that race relations are an issue, few know how to respond to the problem. Race relations

and racism are sensitive topics and often students avoid talking about them. Levine and Cureton (1998) have conducted several studies about the attitudes of college students in the early 1990s. Between 1993 and 1995, they interviewed representative samples of over 9,100 undergraduate students from 28 different institutions. In their focus group interviews, Levine and Cureton (1998) noted that students seemed more willing to disclose "intimate details about their sex lives than to discuss race relations on campus" (p. 72). This comment reflects the highly sensitive nature of race relations as a topic of conversation among students.

Student perceptions and attitudes about racism, diversity, and multiculturalism help shape the campus climate, which ultimately impacts the experiences of all college students. Researchers who have studied the impact of college on individuals have documented the relationships "between racism, and diminished academic performance, reduced degree persistence, and alienation from the institution" (Springer, Terenzini, Pascarella, & Nora, 1995, p. 1). If institutions of higher education are concerned about their students' educational outcomes, then they must make a concerted effort to understand the campus climate and its impact on the quality of students' experiences in college.

Students' Views on Diversity and Race Relations

The plea, "Can't we all just get along?" was made by Rodney King, the African-American man beaten by four white policemen in Los Angeles in 1993. In time, his plea would reverberate with a sense of urgency. The plea for better race relations is a rallying cry for our nation and our institutions. In the 1990s, 24% of colleges and universities surveyed by Levine and Cureton (1998) saw increases in racially motivated hate incidents. Campuses in academia have become the settings for tension and friction among students of diverse backgrounds. Pronounced differences among students who either have very little exposure to the diversity they encounter on campus or those who have difficulty negotiating differences from their own cultures have contributed to some of the tensions.

White students and students of color often have found themselves at odds with each other about their views on race relations today. Division exists among white students, as a group, on whether the state of race relations is positive or negative. According to Krane and Cottreau's 1998 survey, 48% of white students view race relations today as positive, while 52% view race relations negatively. On the other hand, 71% of African-American students hold very strong views that race relations are still negative in the United States. Similarly, 60% of Hispanics and 58% of all other ethnic minorities also believe race relations are still negative. Although many might assert that society has come a

long way since the civil rights movement of the 1960s, it cannot be denied that there are still many needs to be met.

On college and university campuses, the reality of an increasingly multicultural environment confronts students. Many white students come to college with deeply entrenched stereotypes about racial and ethnic groups that may reflect their learned values from home, their peers, and society (Bourassa, 1991). Some white students feel guilty while others deny that racism still exists. Comments like, "We had a civil rights movement; why do they keep bringing it up?" (Levine & Cureton, 1998, p. 74), reflect the denial or lack of knowledge and recognition that racism remains a reality for some groups.

Furthermore, there are white students today who harbor some resentment for what they believe is reverse discrimination, of being victimized or "disadvantaged to the perceived advantage of other students" (Levine & Cureton, 1998, p. 90). Affirmative action has sparked a backlash among many white students who believe African-Americans and other students of color are afforded an unfair advantage and are receiving a free ride to college (Bourassa, 1991). Some students hold the view that students of color should not receive special considerations in admissions or employment decisions. Many feel even more strongly when the perception is that a qualified white candidate is passed over for a qualified candidate of color on the basis of race (Krane & Cottreau, 1998).

On the other hand, many students of color strongly believe racism still exists and contend that they continue to perceive and experience acts of discrimination and prejudice. Students of color are acutely aware, and many have grown weary, of the racial and ethnic stereotyping they encounter (Levine & Cureton, 1998). The misconceptions and stereotypes existing about students from non-dominant racial or ethnic backgrounds have contributed to a climate that is unwelcoming and sometimes hostile towards students of color. A comment one student of color shared during a focus group conducted by the National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities (1991) reflects the nature of the classroom climate at many institutions:

> [In my classes,] when there are issues of poverty being discussed, people's heads start swiveling around to me even though they don't know if I'm poor or not. They see a connection between blacks and poverty, and I feel uncomfortable. (p. 21)

Unfortunately, racist and prejudiced viewpoints continue to surface in different facets of campus life. Since racism is such a sensitive issue, students often are uncertain of how to interpret or respond to the racist attitudes and behaviors of others from different backgrounds. The sentiment is that students are uncertain about how to approach the subject of racism and engage in meaningful

discussions without overstepping the boundaries of civility by taking part in offensive exchanges. Some white students have asserted that they do not know how to respond to students of color when conversations lead to contentious discussions about diversity and race relations (National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities, 1991). A sophomore at the University of California at Los Angeles complained, "I feel like I can't say anything. If you try to help them, they don't like it. No matter what I say, somebody will twist it to where I'm a racist or just a bleeding-heart liberal" (Bourassa, 1991, p. 14). At Wayne State University, an African-American student commented that it was impossible to talk about diversity in her courses. "In class you don't make remarks in terms of ethnicity—no, no, you can't say anything about the topic" (Levine & Cureton, 1998, p. 77).

Today's campuses reflect the tensions and friction among students, and some campuses are noticeably self-segregated, with members of different racial or ethnic groups occupying particular spaces on campus. As Levine and Cureton (1998) stated, "More than one-third of all colleges and universities (35%) reported that there are locations on campus that belong to particular groups by virtue of squatters' rights" (p. 86). Campus cafeterias have come to represent this division, with certain sections claimed by specific groups. According to a student at Catholic University, "There is separation at the dining room...The (lower) lounge is black. The other lounge is Hispanic. The engineering lounge is Asian" (Levine & Cureton, 1998, p. 86).

Without a doubt, racism and diversity are contentious topics in higher education. Students find themselves fragmented along racial and ethnic lines, and differences seem more pronounced and difficult to negotiate than ever before (Dalton, 1991). This has resulted in a campus climate that may sometimes be characterized as hostile and unwelcoming for students, particularly for students of color. Incidents involving bias and perceived acts of discrimination against racial or ethnic groups are occurring throughout campuses across the country and administrators can no longer afford to ignore the problem. The negative experiences of students of color on college campuses threaten their academic persistence and their commitment to the institution (Hurtado et al., 1999).

Indeed, the educational, social, and cultural dimensions of campus life impact students' overall college experience. The negative experiences and perceptions of students of color with regard to campus life and the campus climate may ultimately impact their decision to withdraw from the institution (Cabrera, Nora, & Terenzini, 1999). Therefore, examining the perceptions of today's college students about racism and diversity is critical. A hostile and unwelcoming campus climate has been found to be a barrier to the completion of degrees for students of color (Cabrera et al., 1999; Hurtado et al., 1997). Although the numbers of students of color have increased in higher education, the troubling

fact remains that many do not stay to complete their degrees. According to reports from the American Council on Education, "African American, Hispanic, and American Indian students withdraw from college before graduation at much higher rates than their white counterparts" (as cited in Colorado State Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1995, p. 3). Attrition rates for students of color in higher education are discouraging and should cause concern for higher education administrators.

Recommendations

Student affairs professionals play critical roles in helping create a campus climate that fosters an understanding and an acceptance of diversity and multiculturalism. These professionals have great potential to be catalysts for positive changes in student attitudes and behaviors about divisive issues because of the nature of their interactions and relationships with students. The Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS) has developed standards to guide the work of professionals who work with college students. The writers of the CAS manual (1997) have acknowledged the critical issue of diversity and multiculturalism in their statement:

> In an increasingly complex world, it is essential that the students of today, the leaders of tomorrow, learn to function effectively when faced with diverse ideas, values, and cultures. To do otherwise would be to perpetuate a world in which contention and strife predominate, to the detriment of all. (as cited in Miller, 1997, p. 8)

The increased participation of students of color in higher education has deemed it necessary for administrators, faculty, and staff to realize the necessity for addressing diversity issues as a top institutional priority. Campus administrators, faculty, and staff can no longer speak about changes in numbers of diverse students without recognizing how this change will impact the campus climate or the opportunities for interaction among its diverse students (Hurtado et al., 1999).

The perceptions of students, particularly students of color, of a hostile and unwelcoming campus climate make it imperative for administrators to address this issue and make appropriate interventions to ensure that campuses are safe and welcoming places for all students. Student affairs professionals and other campus administrators should be proactive in facilitating the process of dialogue and understanding among white students and students of color through teaching and programming. Programmatic efforts should aim to help students of color acclimate to their new environment and to the campus culture, which may sharply contrast with their own cultures. Administrators should encourage the active participation of all students in programs that promote diversity and

cultural awareness. Furthermore, all students should heighten their awareness of the dynamics of racism and the role it plays in their interactions with other students on campus, particularly with students of different backgrounds. It is feasible to achieve this through open forums and discussions that foster dialogue among white students and students of color, or through multicultural and diversity related workshops or conferences that expose students to a myriad of viewpoints and perspectives. Bourassa (1991) also suggested that comprehensive program interventions must be "aimed at all three distinct audiences: white students only, students of color only, and all of them together" (p. 17).

White students should be made aware of the differences around them through programming efforts that will expose them to new cultures and diverse perspectives. Effective programming interventions for white students should increase their awareness of the dynamics of racism, as well as explore the meaning and significance of their whiteness and the privileges conferred upon them in our society. These programming interventions should not focus on guilt and blaming. Rather, the programs should aim to develop an understanding that with privileges come responsibilities, such as becoming an ally to students of color and taking a more proactive stance in their own education about diverse issues and in helping to improve race relations. As Bourassa (1991) noted, "White students should be challenged by these interventions to create attitudinal and behavioral changes that result in an atmosphere that promotes positive race relations" (p. 19).

Types of traditional programming that focus on students of color have included, but are not limited to, orientation activities, cultural events, heritage celebrations, peer counseling, and mentoring (Bourassa, 1991). The principles underlying these programs are of empowerment and affirmation. Cultural and heritage celebrations, for example, affirm the richness of the backgrounds and roots of students of color, while orientation activities and peer counseling empower students of color by providing the necessary support for the challenges they may encounter in academia.

Multicultural programs celebrating the history and cultures of different racial or ethnic groups are important for students of color. In addition, these programs have great potential to benefit white students by exposing them to different cultures and customs. Program administrators should consider providing incentives for white students to participate in the programs in order to build bridges across the different communities (Hurtado et al., 1999). Administrators should be cognizant of the fact that continued institutional support and encouragement of these programs sends the message that the programs and the students who benefit from them are valued as an integral part of the campus culture.

For diversity and multicultural programming interventions to be effective, they must include students in the planning and implementation processes. Doing so will enable students to gain valuable experiences as a result of their active participation. In addition, involving students in the planning and implementation processes ensures that the voices of students impacted by the programs are represented fairly and that their needs are met. Failure to include students' input in programs that affect them is essentially antithetical to the purpose of developing the programs in the first place.

If the goal of institutions is to achieve a more diverse student body and to create a welcoming campus climate for diverse students, then institutions also must examine the compelling need to diversify their faculty and staff. As Hurtado et al. (1999) noted, "A diverse faculty and staff serve as important representatives of the commitment that the institution has to issues of diversity" (p. 22). Students of color are more likely to seek out faculty and staff whom they believe can identify with them and the experiences they are going through. However, it is important to note that changes in numbers of diverse faculty and staff are not enough to change the culture and climate of a campus. Faculty and staff must have increased cultural sensitivity and awareness of the diverse student populations they serve. Diversity training ought to be strongly encouraged, if not mandated, as part of faculty and staff development initiatives.

Like student affairs administrators, faculty can be key players in facilitating greater understanding and acceptance of diversity among students by involving them in institutional efforts to increase diversity. Faculty should incorporate more group projects into their curriculum that encourage interaction among students of diverse backgrounds; greater exposure to differences has the potential to increase students' understanding of diversity. Faculty development training and workshops should focus on giving faculty tools to effectively facilitate discussions and dialogues around issues of diversity and multiculturalism. Institutional reward structures also should provide faculty incentives to infuse diversity in their curriculum (Hurtado et al., 1999).

It is critical that diversity in higher education is welcomed and not viewed as a source of contention among students. Bias and intolerance need not signal the premature withdrawal of students of color from academia. In an increasingly diverse world, an understanding and awareness of diversity and multiculturalism should be a requirement for *all* students and not merely an elective for the majority population. Diversity efforts should involve all members of the campus community, from front line staff to administrators to faculty.

Conclusion

Although colleges and universities across the nation strive to promote positive race relations as they continue to achieve diversity, the consequences of diversity have sometimes resulted in tension and discord among students from diverse backgrounds. For many students, college may be the first time they are exposed to diversity beyond the norm of their home communities. On college and university campuses today, students are grappling with issues of diversity and multiculturalism. White students and students of color have clashed in their views about racism and race relations. While some white students maintain that racism no longer exists, students of color contend that they are still victims of discrimination and racial or ethnic stereotyping. The result is a campus climate that is sometimes hostile and volatile.

Higher education administrators need to pay particular attention to the experiences of students in relation to their campus environments because of the correlation between campus climate and educational outcomes. Students' interactions in the social and academic systems of higher education influence their integration, which in turn affects such educational outcomes as their level of satisfaction with the institution, their commitment to college and, ultimately, their decision to persist or drop out (Hurtado et al., 1999; Cabrera et al., 1999). Exposure to a climate of prejudice and discrimination has gained notice as one factor accounting for withdrawal behaviors of students of color. As Cabrera et al. (1999) remarked:

> Perceptions of racial prejudice and discrimination on campus and in the classroom are expected to have a direct impact on withdrawal decisions, while at the same time affecting a student's academic performance and his or her social and academic experiences at the institution. (p. 140)

Examining students' views on diversity and multiculturalism have significant implications for student affairs and other campus professionals due to the impact students' experiences have on their educational outcomes. In this article, the author has discussed the importance of integrating students into the academic and social systems of campus, as well as facilitating students' understandings of the dynamics of racism through programming and in the classroom. Key to effective programmatic efforts is the involvement of students, for whom the programs are designed, throughout the planning and implementation processes to ensure fair representation of their ideas. Student affairs professionals and other campus administrators are key players in creating harmonious and welcoming communities that promote diversity and multiculturalism. Such efforts need to be a requirement for everyone and not merely an elective for the majority population. People in academia, whether faculty, staff, or students, should recognize that although the demands imposed by an increasingly diverse

world may be difficult, it is important to value the rich contributions of a diverse student body to the complete college experience. It is everyone's responsibility to contribute positively to the campus climate so that all students, regardless of ethnic or racial background, can thrive and succeed in their academic endeavors and become contributing citizens in a more pluralistic society.

References

Bourassa, D. (1991). How White students and students of color organize and interact on campus. In J. C. Dalton (Ed.), *Racism of campus: Confronting racial bias through peer interventions* (pp. 13-23). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Inc.

Cabrera, A. F., Nora, A., & Terenzini, P. T. (1999). Campus racial climate and the adjustment of students to college: A comparison between White students and African-American students. *The Journal of Higher Education,* 70, 134-160.

Colorado State Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. (1995). *The retention of minorities in Colorado public institutions of higher education: Fort Lewis and Adams State Colleges.* Washington, D.C.: Commission on Civil Rights.

Dalton, J. (1991). Racial and ethnic backlash in college peer culture. In J. C. Dalton (Ed.), *Racism of campus: Confronting racial bias through peer interventions* (pp. 3-12). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Inc.

Hurtado, S., Milem, J., Clayton-Pederson, A., & Allen, W. (1999). *Enacting diverse learning   environments: Improving the climate for racial/ethnic diversity in higher education* (Report No. EDO-HE-1999-2). Washington, D.C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction No. ED 430 513)

Krane, D., & Cottreau, A. (1998). *Generation 2001: A survey of the first college graduating class of the new millennium.* New York, NY: Harris and Associates, Inc.

Levine, A. & Cureton, J. S. (1998). *When hope and fear collide: A portrait of today's college student.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Miller, T. K. (Ed.). (1997). *The book of professional standards for higher education 1997.*Washington, D.C.: Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education.

National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities. (1991). *Understanding campus climate: An approach to supporting student diversity.* Washington, D.C.: National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities.

Springer, L., Terenzini, P., Pascarella, E., & Nora, A. (1995). *Do White students perceive racism toward minority students on predominantly White campuses?* Washington, D.C.: Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

Portia Bacor ('02) currently works at Colorado State University as the Coordinator for Central Programs and Staff Development for Apartment Life and is a graduate student in the Student Affairs in Higher Education program.

Student Development: In-Between Buildings

James H. Banning

Informal learning is the learning that emerges from conversations and discussions between and among students, faculty, and staff and the learning attained from reading the nonverbal messages of campus artifacts. It often provides the ingredients important to student development – the delicate balance between support and challenge of attitudes, beliefs, and ideas (Chickering, 1969). Informal learning occurs beyond the boundaries of programs, formal classroom experiences, exams, and term papers. It is learning that is not scheduled and often has the unique feature of occurring outside and in-between buildings, on sidewalks, on plazas, and on campus lawns. This article examines the relationship between student development and the campus environment in-between buildings and makes recommendations for using this environment to promote student development.

The spaces between buildings are not empty spaces, but rather are spaces that directly relate to the development of students. Numerous theorists have defined student development (Moore & Upcraft, 1990), but the general theme imbedded in all theories is that through campus experiences, students become more differentiated in their responses to life's challenges that center on identity, moral, and cognitive development. Theorists have focused on different aspects of this definition. For example, many have focused on "developmental content" (e.g., identity development (Erickson, 1968); moral development (Kohlberg, 1975); women's moral development (Gilligan, 1982); and intellectual development (Perry, 1970)). Other theorists have focused on the nature of student development processes. For example, Sanford (1962) focused on the cycle of differentiation and integration associated with growth and development while Chickering (1969) presented a similar notion emphasizing the concepts of challenge and support. In all student development theories, the idea of "fostering" focuses on the campus environment and the identification of the challenges and support structures students encounter.

The important role environment plays in student development has been noted by many observers of the collegiate setting (Astin, 1993; Banning, 1989; Shang & Moore, 1990). Astin (1993) presents a framework called the "input-environment-outcome (I-E-O)" model that ties the environment directly to student development (p. 7). In Astin's model, inputs refer to the individual characteristics of students as they enter their college experience. Environment refers to the many aspects of the campus environment - educational experiences,

programs, policies, faculty, living arrangements, other students, and the spaces in-between buildings - students encounter. Outcomes refer to the characteristics of the students following their encounters with the campus environment. Within this model, little attention has been given to the in-between buildings environment.

This article examines the role the in-between buildings environment plays in student development. The in-between buildings environment is defined as the "intervening spaces between (buildings) the spaces that surround, enclose, and channel our activities" (Ford, 2000, p. xii). This in-between environment includes, but is not limited to, the following features: walkways, plazas, parking lots, green spaces, sitting opportunities, signs, posters, artwork, and graffiti. Two concepts allow these features of the in-between environment to impact student development. First, in-between environments can be conceptualized as places for informal learning. The nonverbal messages associated with campus physical artifacts residing within the in-between buildings environment directly communicate messages regarding important campus social issues, such as diversity. Second, the in-between buildings environments can foster informal discussions (places to sit and talk). Through these discussions, student attitudes and beliefs become exposed and the "give and take" or the "challenge and support" involved in informal learning promote student development.

Informal Learning In-Between the Buildings

The student's learning experience between the buildings is similar to the learning that occurs during a museum visit. Loomis (1987) captures the essence of this experience when he notes that learning in a museum usually occurs in an open setting as compared to closed settings like classrooms and lecture halls. He points out there are no assigned seats and visitors are free to roam about. In a similar manner, as students walk in-between buildings, through the parking lots, and across the green spaces, they have the opportunity for informal learning to occur as they encounter the physical artifacts on their travels. Banning (1997) presents a classification system for the artifacts most likely to be encountered by students in-between the buildings. He suggests the nonverbal messages associated with these artifacts (posters, artwork, graffiti, and architecture) can send potent messages regarding issues important to students (belonging, safety, equity, and roles). These messages often focus on race, ethnicity, gender, ability, sexual orientation, and religion (Banning, 1997). The messages, when encountered by students, become input for the processes associated with student development – challenges and supports. From this perspective, the in-between buildings environment holds many "teachings" that have directly affected the development of students' attitudes and beliefs. These teachings can be designed intentionally by the institution, for example by displaying or creating artworks

that support diversity. However, some "teachings" may be derived from user designs, such as graffiti, which may not be supportive of the institutionally designed messages.

The In-Between Buildings Environment as a Place for Social Discourse

Three major publications serve to support the idea that the in-between buildings environment is a place that fosters social discourse. Gehl's (1987) *Life Between Buildings: Using Public Space*, Whyte's (1980) *The Social Life of Small Urban Spaces*, and Ford's (2000) *The Spaces Between Buildings* each outline the physical conditions in public spaces that influence the opportunities to meet, see, and hear other people. These basic ingredients foster the informal learning associated with social discourse. A major component of student development theory is the importance of social interaction as a powerful impetus for student growth and development (Drum, 1980). Indeed, it is often in the environment of social discourse and discussion that many students challenge ideas and where these ideas become more differentiated and integrated.

In addition to pointing out the relationship between the in-between physical space and social interaction, Ford (2000), Gehl (1987), and Whyte (1980) indicate that institutions can intentionally design outdoor space between and among buildings to foster and support social interaction among their users. For example, there are likely to be fewer lengthy discussions between two students walking from a classroom building to a student union if there is not a place to sit down.

In summary, the in-between buildings environment impacts student development through the mechanism of informal learning from campus physical artifacts and the informal learning that occurs from social discourse. In both cases, the environment can be designed intentionally for particular messages and to promote or hinder social discussion. In support of intentionally designing the space in-between buildings, recommendations are presented.

Recommendations for Increasing Student Development In-Between Buildings

Building on the work of Ford (2000), Gehl (1987), and Whyte (1980), the following recommendations are provided to foster the intentional design of the in-between buildings spaces as places for student development:

1. Diverse groups of students, faculty, and staff should conduct periodic audits of the campus artifacts and the messages found in-between the buildings. These audits should lead to

discussions regarding the content of the nonverbal messages and their potential impact, both positively and negatively, on student development.

2. Personal safety must be ensured in-between the buildings. Students and others need to feel they can stop, tarry, and visit on the walkways and in the parking lots. For example, messages regarding safety can be communicated by the presence of adequate lighting, emergency phones, etc.

3. The in-between buildings environment should be designed with disability issues as a design criterion. If spaces are planned with the mobility-impaired user in mind, they tend to be more functional for everyone (Whyte, 1987).

4. Provide ample, comfortable seating that invites students, faculty, and staff to sit and engage in discussions.

5. Provide the opportunity for food and beverage vending. The presence of these amenities draws students together.

6. Provide a space for public speakers, music programs, and other programmatic efforts that impact student development.

7. Review the "night-time" in-between buildings environment. A walk across campus in the evening and late at night will highlight the fact that informal learning is not restricted to daylight hours.

Conclusion

Reading nonverbal messages of cultural artifacts and engaging in discussions are important processes that impact student development outcomes. The in-between buildings environment can directly impact these processes. Campus artifacts send important messages to passers-by that can stimulate thoughts and discussion. Likewise, having a place to sit can encourage discussions. Campus designs need to provide for sitting and walking in safe, attractive, and pleasant spaces in order to foster conversations and discussions important to the processes of student development. However, campus student affairs professionals and campus planners often overlook the in-between environmental influences and do not recognize these as important to Astin's (1993) (I-E-O) model. The lack of knowledge, time, and resources may divert attention away from the in-between buildings environments; however, by intentionally auditing existing designs and creating new ones that recognize the impact of these environments, greater promotion of student development outcomes can occur. These spaces are not empty. They contain important messages and places for discussions that promote student development.

References

Astin, A. (1993). *What matters in college?* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Banning, J. H. (1997). Assessing the campus' ethical climate: A multidimensional approach. In J. Fried, (Ed.), *Ethics for today's campus: New perspectives on education, student development, and institutional management* (pp. 95-105). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Banning, J. H. (1989). Creating a climate for successful student development: The campus ecology manager role. In U. Delworth & G. R. Hanson (Eds.), *Student services: A handbook for the profession* (pp. 302-322). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Chickering, A.W. (1969). *Education and identity.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Drum, D. (1980). Understanding student development In W. H. Morrill, J. C. Hurst, & E. R. Oetting, (Eds.), *Dimensions of intervention for student development* (pp.14-38). New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Erickson, E. H. (1968). *Identity: Youth and crisis.* New York: W. Norton and Co.

Ford, L. R. (2000). *The spaces between buildings.* Baltimore, MD: The John Hopkins University Press.

Gehl, J. (1987). *Life between buildings: Using public spaces.* New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.

Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Kohlberg, L. (1975). The cognitive development approach to moral education. *Phi Delta Kappa, 10,* 670-677.

Loomis, R. J. (1987). *Museum visitor evaluation: New tool for management.* Nashville, TN: American Association for State and Local History.

Moore, L. V., & Upcraft, M.L. (1990). Theory in student affairs: Evolving perspectives. In L.V. Moore (Ed.), *Evolving theoretical perspectives on students.* (pp. 3-23). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Perry, W. (1970). *Forms of intellectual and ethical development in the college years: A scheme.* New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

Sanford, N. (1962). *The American college.* New York: Wiley.

Shang, P., & Moore, L. V. (1990). Applying cultural theory: The environmental variable. In L. V. Moore (Ed.), Evolving theoretical perspectives on students. *New Directions for Student Services, 51, 73-82.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Whyte, W. (1980). *The social life of small urban spaces*. Washington, D.C.: The Conservation Foundation.

James H. Banning currently works at Colorado State University as a Professor in the School of Education.

Women Administrators' Leadership Stories: Another Piece of the Puzzle

Stephanie A. Clemons

Leadership stories offer insight into experiences not otherwise gleaned from statistics, surveys, and charts. As part of a larger study (Clemons & Gloeckner, 1999), this article uses a framework of storytelling (Schon, 1985) to understand leadership stories shared by women administrators working in higher education institutions. Participants in this qualitative study used powerful stories to depict personally held values and significant events that shaped their leadership styles. Their narratives offer a piece of the puzzle by which to understand the phenomenon of women working in administrative positions at two and four year educational institutions.

> **"A story, once told, no longer belongs solely to the storyteller. It has existence independently of will, intentions, or analysis. It is an object accessible to others. Others may see in it what the storyteller does not. Story is not narcissism or subjectivity, but its' opposite: the making of an independent object." Anonymous**

Traditional leadership theory and higher education theory have been outlined over the decades (Stodgill, 1974; Bass, 1985; Bennis and Nanus, 1985; Schon, 1984; Chaffee & Tierney, 1988; Neumann & Binsimon, 1990). The status of women as leaders in higher education administration also has been reported (Clemons, 1998), yet few women administrators' leadership stories are making their way into journals and other publications concerning leadership practices that affect their administrative styles.

Narratives or stories reveal personal perspectives on events or situations that can provide further understanding of the context and setting. "Narratives, stories, and tales...connect the person and the personal to social events, processes, and organizations" (VanMaanen, Manning, & Miller, 1998, p. v).

The purpose of this article is twofold: first to share stories from ten female higher education administrators that portray decisions and events that have shaped their leadership practices. Second, it hopes to aid student affairs administrators, graduate students, and faculty in developing a deeper understanding of the environment in which women work.

Background

The study of leadership has a long and multifaceted history rich in rituals, metaphors, symbols, and stories. Ideas of leadership are embedded in mythology, legends, sagas, and religions of the oldest civilizations on record. The traditional American concept of management and leadership is based on a masculine ideal of competition, combat, control, creativity, aggression, and self-reliance (Lipman-Blumen, 1992). Klenke (1996) writes that leadership has been conceptualized as a "man on the white horse." In other words, the study of leadership has been seen as the study of great men.

Studies of women in leadership roles were rarely conducted until the 1980s (Belenky, Clinchy, Golberger, & Mattuck, 1986; Gilligan, 1982; Noddings, 1984). Numerous articles have been published concerning gender differences in leadership styles (Golde, 1987; Offermann & Beil, 1992; Watson, 1984). In addition, many studies have been reported concerning women in leadership positions in primary and secondary education (Fennell, 1994; Irby & Brown, 1995; Ortiz & Marshall, 1988; Slauenwhite & Skok, 1991) providing practical information to women interested in educational leadership positions. Interestingly, women administrators have indicated that despite many challenges, there are numerous reasons for wanting to become educational leaders (Ryder, 1994). Some of these reasons include:

- Ability to affect change
- Opportunity for higher status
- Encouragement by mentors to apply for positions
- Readiness for personal change
- Opportunity for higher salary
- Ability to make a positive change with teachers
- Capability for leadership
- Opportunity for power

It was not until the 1990s that significant research studies analyzed women's ways of leadership in business settings (Helgesen, 1990) and women as leaders for social change (Austin & Leland, 1991). Numerous tips concerning women's leadership techniques have been ascertained from these related professions and disciplines.

The last two decades have also revealed widespread interest in the presence, needs, and contributions of women in higher education institutions (Pearson, Shavlik, & Touchton, 1989). One source of concern has been the lack of female administrators in higher education (Stokes, 1984; Chamberlain, 1988; Kaplan & Tinsley, 1989). The perceived need for women administrators has expanded beyond a simple concern with equitable numbers and salaries to include a consideration of decision-making styles used by women versus men (Wahl & Vocate, 1993). Yet, of all the published articles, relatively few studies have

reported stories concerning women's leadership practices in higher education administration.

Research in educational administration, similar to research in areas such as anthropology, psychology, and philosophy, is working toward changing how women's experiences in leadership and organizational change are studied (Fennell, 1994). Cook, Fonow, and Nielsen (1990) indicated that feminist researchers could implement all the methods and tools used by androcentric researchers, but in ways that highlight women's experiences and concerns. Use of dialectical processes involving contradictions, tensions, and dilemmas, which can sometimes form part of women's concrete experiences in patriarchal worlds, may assist in consciousness-raising about women administrators' experiences.

Methodology

Clemons & Gloeckner (1999) used the phenomenological method of qualitative inquiry to capture the meaning of the experienced reality of ten women in administrative positions at community colleges and universities. Sampling was performed using a theory-based or operational construct selection technique. Personal interviews ranging from 60 to 90 minutes were conducted at each participating administrator's institution. The interviews were transcribed and analyzed using grounded theory methods. Issues of validity and reliability were addressed in a number of ways (Clemons & Gloeckner, 1999).

As the participants of this study discussed the topic of conflict and battles in their professional and personal lives, they used leadership stories to illustrate and clarify meanings. Therefore, to capture additional meaning from the phenomenon studied, their stories are placed within the context of women's leadership.

Framework Used for Women's Leadership Stories

Narratives are being used to examine the intangible, interpersonal side of practice in professional disciplines including medicine, health care, law, education, and business (Remen, 1996; Bliss & Mazur, 1998; Lester, Piore & Malek, 1998; Cole, 1997; Elkins, 1996). Narrative methods are well suited for organizational study as well as for exploring the subjective, inner experiences of individuals' real life problems, and result in unique, rich data that cannot be obtained from experiments, questionnaires, or observations (Lieblich, Tuval-Mashiach, & Zilber, 1998). It is particularly appropriate for revealing the impact of the emotional experience of decision-making and the interpersonal dynamics related to leadership style and philosophy (Danko, 2000). Gardner (1995), one

of the foremost authors on leadership, analyzes leaders through stories or narratives of their fears, struggles, and dreams.

While Gardner (1995) uses characteristics of direct/indirect leadership style, authentic leadership stories, and counter-stories for his analysis of national and international leaders, Schon (1985) proposes four types of story-telling that can be used as a framework for stories of women administrators. The four types are:

1. *Manifest stories* of practice are personal stories concerning the participant's practice (i.e., what they did and why they did it). For example, how an individual learns on the job to reframe her way of thinking and acting within her professional role.

2. *Meta stories* of practice are stories that are bigger than the one person involved. For example "gender" or "diversity" stories can be found on many campuses throughout the nation and are not specific to one individual.

3. *Causal stories* are stories that lay out temporal sequences of events to provide causal explanations, for example "mentor" stories may explain how or why a leader was successful.

4. *Underlying stories* are stories concerning underlying themes such as competition, dignity, social justice, cooperation, resiliency, and conflict that explain why certain events may take place.

5. Schon (1985) indicates that a single story may fall into more than one category but that the categories are distinct from each other and effort should be made to distinguish them.

Findings

Six of the ten women interviewed for this study were employed by universities and four were employed by community colleges. Five held non-academic positions ranging from the dean to the president of the institution (see Table 1). The women described their leadership styles as participatory management, facilitator, collaborator, and consultant. Their process of problem solving was one of negotiation and/or cooperation to achieve the "common good."

Following are examples of some of the participant's leadership stories, placed under Schon's (1985) specific headings. Although many stories were offered during the lengthy interviews, two examples have been selected to highlight each framework category. These stories capture significant events concerning their leadership in higher education institutions. For the purpose of clarification, participants were assigned a letter to maintain anonymity while tracking their voices throughout the article.

Table 1

Participant Demographics

	Institution	Position	Years Served as Administrator	Ethnic Origin	Age
Community College	4				
University	6				
Academic		5			
Non-Academic		5			
0-5			2		
6-10			1		
11-15			2		
16-20			4		
21-25			1		
Hispanic				2	
African-American				1	
White				7	
46-50					5
51-55					2
56-60					3

Manifest Stories of Practice

The following manifest stories of practice, offered by two different women leaders, illustrate events that reframed their future leadership actions. One story discusses the political dilemma known as "hidden agendas" and the other story discusses the leadership tactic of respecting individual "voices."

Hidden agendas.

Sometimes administrators are not aware of hidden agendas that influence big decisions, such as who will be hired in a leadership position. One leadership technique used in the decision making process is to determine if the issue at hand is related to a personally held value or principle. One upper level administrator told a powerful story of a recent situation where she was not aware of a hidden agenda. She was a finalist for a presidential position at another institution. The outcome was a surprise to the majority of the finalists.

> I was a finalist for a presidential position. The selection committee had gone from 100-some applications to ten...and then to five. They brought all of us in to be interviewed. Well, in this group of five, I was the only Anglo. There were four women and one male...The women were sitting presidents at other institutions across the United States. After the interview, we met with the

Board. Later, I ran into the head of the search committee. She had shared with me that the search committee had voted me #1.

About a week and a half later, I got called from the chairperson of the Board -- female, Hispanic. The Board was ninety-nine percent Hispanic. And she said, they had selected a candidate and "she's" accepted. The chairperson asked if I would withdraw. And I thought, how can you withdraw? I thought, "They want me to withdraw so that if the search committee questions why the Board did not go with their recommendations, they can say...I withdrew. So, I said, "No, no, I don't need to do that. If I lose, that's fine. That's not anything to be ashamed of. So, I don't need to withdraw." But, I was shocked. The next day, I got a call from one of the other woman candidates. This woman was the one I thought had accepted the position. She said, "Did they ask you to withdraw? Did they call you on the phone? They have asked all the women to withdraw." Can you believe that? They hired the man. And he was the least prepared.

All the other women candidates -- Hispanic -- were furious and filed a complaint. They wanted me to do the same thing. And I thought to myself, "You know, this is not going to be a win situation." I'm not sure anyone else would perceive me as a presidential candidate again...and what would I have changed? (M)

This administrator's leadership style was to weigh possible consequences to determine if perpetuating conflict would harm her chances for future consideration of another presidential position. Although strong personal feelings were involved, she decided it wasn't worth the end result to submit a formal appeal. However, it taught her a powerful lesson concerning political hidden agendas.

Respecting others' "voices."

One woman administrator was raised on a farm in Nebraska in a large family where both brothers and sisters were encouraged to perform many types of chores, in and out of the home. Respect for others' opinions and the belief that there are many ways to achieve the same goal were part of her family environment. She indicated that her leadership style reflects these same philosophies. One example she gave was her decision to always provide a "forum" in which people can register their concerns. She said that the forum may not change her mind, but it offers the individuals a "voice" and a place to be heard. This is how she described it.

I believe it is important to provide a forum to hear others' "voices"...saying, "I understand that" and providing a forum for people to register their concerns. However, I make it clear that being heard and changing my mind are two different things. Just because you have an opinion that is different than mine and I don't change my mind, doesn't mean I haven't heard you. It's just that, for whatever reason, I feel that I have more compelling influence from my position -- because of information I hold -- that makes this [action] important. And [it is part of my job] to look at things holistically. (D)

This woman administrator was very conscious of the need to be inclusive, but clear in her mind that she may have additional information or a different opinion that may sway the final decision. As a leader, that seemed to be an important decision-making technique.

Meta Stories of Practice

Following are two meta stories of practice. Both stories involve gender issues, although one involves stereotypes and the other highlights learning how to use effective avenues of communication.

Gender/communication issues – two stories.

According to the participants of this study, given a group setting/meeting of men and women within higher education institutions, men will commonly assume the woman will not be in charge of the event or the spokesperson for the institution. Sometimes these perceptions or assumptions place the woman administrator in an awkward position. One woman related a story that highlights this perception.

This morning I was at a breakfast that was predominately men. I was with a person who worked for me -- who was male. People, who don't know us, always assume that he is in the higher of the two positions. When we walked into the breakfast, all contact and conversation went to the male. Yet, I was the one speaking for the institution. You don't know at what point you should say, "Excuse me. (Laughter). I'm the one that's supposed to be in charge." I feel uncomfortable doing that. So, how do you exert yourself without considering all the stereotypes that men have about women in leadership positions? (M)

Effective communication skills are critical in leadership positions in higher education administration. Careful listening and determining "how others may hear the message best" was a reoccurring aspect of this study. One woman administrator related a powerful story of working with ten to fifteen male

administrators. When she discovered her suggestions and ideas were not receiving serious consideration, she created a way for her colleagues to hear her better, while either negotiating or communicating. The leadership strategy involved the use of a man sitting on the same committee. This was her story:

> I was a single female administrator among ten to fifteen male administrators – the only female perspective and minority perspective. In discussions and in dialogue, I would be present at the table, but invisible in terms of what I had to say. They would, you know, nod their heads, but not hear what I was saying. For example, "How are we going to get people to buy into the vision of the college?" I would say, "Well, you need to begin by having them tell you what they think it means." The men said, "Yea, good idea." But then kept on going and nothing changed. Then a male said, "You know, we need to talk to the people about the vision." The group said, "Good idea. How are we going to do it?" So it's like, "hey, didn't I just say that ten minutes ago?" But the idea had come from one of my male counterparts, therefore it was acted on. The strategy that I began to develop was to lean over and whisper to the male next to me, and then that person would say my idea [to the group] and it worked...It was okay that I didn't get credit for the [idea]. I just wanted the problems to be solved and I needed solutions. (L)

This woman administrator found her leadership style didn't necessitate receiving credit for every idea she had that moved an initiative forward. Instead, determining a successful solution was the key leadership consideration.

Causal Stories

Causal stories illustrate sequences of events and give causal explanations for them. One story depicts that, similar to other research (Gupton & Slick, 1994), women are not always supportive of other women as leaders. The second story discusses the need to make hard decisions, even if it means the administrator loses popularity.

Women to women mentorship.

A number of women administrators in this study indicated that there is an assumption that women will mentor other women. However, that is not always the case. One woman administrator indicated a leadership technique for mentoring was to avoid judging the resulting vote of an issue by the gender composition of the committee/group. This was her story:

> I think I have seen women as always being allies, and that's not always true. I have, from the beginning, always assumed that

women would be supportive of one another, and would share with one another. (Laughter). And would help and nurture and mentor each other. The reality is unfortunately, that that's not always the case. I mean I used to walk into a room full of women saying, "We have some natural connections here." And we would support one another. Not just because we probably see things similarly, but we have similar values. But ...that's not true. I've oftentimes been surprised. I've learned that if I walk into a committee [meeting] that there are no guarantees based on women being there and men being there as to how I might influence that group. (M)

This woman administrator discovered that allies, in moving an initiative forward, were not always formed along gender lines. As a leader in higher education institutions, this seemed to be a key discovery.

Making hard decisions.

Women in higher education administration have critical decisions to make on behalf of the institution. Although the women involved in this study indicated their decision-making style was typically collaborative, as one top-level administrator indicated, it is critical at some point to make the decision and "get the job done." This was her story:

I worked for a guy once who moved up through the system because he never, never made a decision. He surrounded himself with very strong people who made the decisions. I never saw him make a decision. He became the president of the university, and he didn't even last two years. I mean, when it came down to it, he either couldn't or wouldn't [make the decision]. He was just a disaster. The reason he got the job was because he remained popular. It's easy to remain popular if you don't make any decisions. And it just came back, and poisoned him. He got the position that he probably always wanted, and he couldn't handle it because he couldn't or wouldn't make the decisions. (G)

Although relationships may be damaged, critical decision making skills are needed as an administrator. Based on some of the stories told, this leadership skill seemed to determine effectiveness and success in the appointed positions.

Underlying Stories

The following two underlying stories discuss the need to play by political rules and the importance of being treated equitably in employment positions.

Play by the political rules.

Leaders in higher education institutions quickly learn to play by the rules but sometimes these rules are not always in writing. One woman administrator learned rather quickly, from example, that going around a superior is a poor leadership practice.

> Let me cite an example here that has nothing to do with gender. [This gentleman] went around the president to the Board. He's no longer chancellor. Now he resigned, yes he did. But my thought is I don't think it makes any difference if you're a man or woman if there are political ways to do things. If you don't play by the rules, there are repercussions. I wouldn't expect any different treatment from the [superiors] because I'm a woman. You just play by the rules. Period. And I'm very comfortable with that...even if the rules aren't written down. You can't be in a situation long enough and not realize what those rules are. And if you can't pick them up, you shouldn't have gotten the job. You shouldn't have been selected for the job if you can't learn the rules real quickly. And chances are you won't survive in the job very long. (G)

This woman administrator learned by example that determining the "rules of the game" impacted leadership effectiveness. If administrators don't learn the rules quickly, their chances of retaining the leadership position diminish.

Equity pay.

The women administrators in this study revealed many stories about their personal values such as fairness, honesty, fair treatment of others, equitable treatment and pay, and diversity of opinions. One woman told a story about a time early in her career when she had been given a raise $200 less than a male faculty member hired at the same time. When reviewing her performance with her boss, she discovered it was not because her annual evaluation was inferior. In fact, the reverse was true. It was because her husband had a job that offered financial security in their home, and her boss perceived she did not need the money. The woman administrator recounted the results of this story.

> The bridges were totally destroyed in that meeting [when I discovered the truth]. I left that university. I will not work for someone who makes that kind of decision. ...It's important to me that I'm dealt with in an equitable manner. I will not stand for anything that's not equitable. Recently, I told my boss [president of the institution] "I will never give you a hard time as long as you deal with me in an equitable manner. If you don't deal equitably, I'll turn the whole campus loose on you." And he knew that I meant it. (G)

Fair and equitable treatment was a strong value held by the women leaders in this study. It impacted their perception of their superiors, respect for peers, and job performance. The same was true if advocating on behalf of another, whether it was a student requesting assistance or someone under his or her supervision.

Discussion on Women in Leadership

It is interesting to read these women administrators' stories and perceive the number of instances where gender was a subplot of the described event, although gender was not a theme of the study or the stories. It is just a fact that women administrators in higher education institutions work primarily with men, and therefore men are involved in the unfolding of their stories.

Collectively, these women administrators felt the style of leadership that worked best in today's organizations was one of inclusiveness – a "relational" style, rather than one of "competition" – a direct achievement style (Lipman-Blumen, 1992). Their philosophy of accomplishing common goals was one of a more web or spider-like structure that is interwoven rather than a hierarchy (Helgesen, 1990).

The stories revealed a number of leadership qualities that also emerged from Gardner's (1995) work. One was the need to assume leadership techniques appropriate to the situation. Numerous women in this study discussed their decision-making process as situational. One woman indicated that her style would be difficult to predict in a situation because every event necessitates different evaluation and techniques. Similar to a study of theoretical leadership (Irby & Brown, 1995), the women's stories revealed the following strong leadership characteristics: 1) seeking input; 2) encouraging others to be involved in decision-making; 3) sharing power and credit; 4) empowering others to improve skills and 5) maintaining open communication.

As more administrators retire, it becomes increasingly necessary to train competent individuals to assume educational leadership positions. A decade ago, studies began documenting that, contrary to popular belief, women administrators can be as effective as men (Porat, 1991). Yet, their opportunities for leadership have not happened easily. The female pioneers in educational administration were encouraged to "act more like men" in their administrative duties, only to find that the model was rarely compatible with their innate style (McGrew-Zouli, 1993). In addition, the literature suggests that too often university leadership programs perpetuated the exclusion of women administrators in top-ranking positions by relying on curricula based primarily on models of authoritative leadership styles (Glazer, 1990).

For about a decade, educational administrative leadership programs for women have been offered around the nation (Feldman, Risley, & Eisenberg, 1996; Gettys, et. al., 1994; Schmitt, 1994). Now, the second generation of women leaders has networks in place, which is in contrast to earlier women leaders who experienced isolation and its subsequent stress since there were few female peers with whom to share experiences (Hersi, 1993). Today's leaders are drawing upon skills and stories that they have developed from shared experiences as women – ones they have created on their own.

References

Austin, H. & Leland, C. (1991). *Women of influence women of vision.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

Bass, B. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectation.* New York: Free Press.

Belenky, M., Clinchy, B., Goldberger, N., & Mattuck, J. (1986). *Women's ways of knowing: The development of self, voice, and mind.* New York: Basic Books, Inc., Publishers.

Bennis, W., & Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders: The strategies for taking charge.* New York: Harper & Row.

Bliss, T., & Mazur, J. (1998). *Secondary and middle school teachers in the midst of reform: Common thread cases:* Merrill Publishing Company.

Chaffee, E., & Tierney, W. (1988). *Collegiate culture and leadership strategies.* New York: American Council on Education/Macmillan.

Chamberlain, M. K. (Ed.). (1988). *Women in academe: Progress and prospects.* New York: Russell, Sage Foundation.

Clemons, S., & Gloeckner, G. (1999). How women administrators in public higher education institutions choose their "battles." *Colorado State University Journal of Student Affairs,* VIII, 17-34.

Clemons, S. (1998). Status of women in higher education administration. *Colorado State University Journal of Student Affairs,* VII, 74-84.

Cole, H. P. (1997). Stories to live by: A narrative approach to health-behavior research and injury prevention. In D. S. Gochman (Ed.), *Handbook of health behavior research methods,* 325-348. New York: Plenum.

Cook, J., Fonow, M., & Neilsen, J. (1990). Knowledge and women's interests: Issues of epistemology and methodology in feminist sociological research. In J. Neilsen (Ed.), *Feminist research methods: Exemplary readings in the social sciences* (pp. 69-93). San Francisco, CA: Westview Press.

Danko, S. (2000). Beneath the surface: A story of leadership, recruitment, and the hidden dimensions of strategic workplace design. *Journal of Interior Design, 26*(2), 1-24.

Elkins, J. (1996). The quest for meaning: Narrative accounts of legal education. *Narratives Legal Discourse: A Reader in Storytelling and the Law, 46*, 10-29.

Feldman, C. S., Risley, R. A., & Eisenerg, D. U. (1996). *Phi Theta Kappa leadership development program: A comprehensive approach to teaching and learning leadership at community colleges*. Jackson, MS: Phi Theta Kappa International Honor Society.

Fennell, H. A. (1994). Women principals as leaders: A case study. *Journal of School Leadership, 4*, 672-707.

Gardner, H. (1995). *Leading minds: Anatomy of leadership*. New York: BasicBooks – A Division of HarperCollins Publishers, Inc.

Gettys, C. M., et al. (1994, November). *21st century administrator development program*. Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association, Nashville, TN.

Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Glazer, J. S. (1990). *Feminism and professionalism: The case of education and business*. Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction No. ED 326 120).

Golde, C. (1987, December). "Repeat after me…be assertive…take risks…speak up…" don't women need more than a game of "Simon Says"?: A critical examination of leadership training for women. *Campus Activities Programming, 20*(6), 43-47.

Gupton, S. L. & Slick, G. A. (1994). The missing pieces in emerging female leadership in the profession: Support systems, mentoring, and networking. *Mississippi Educational Leadership, 1*(1), 13-18.

Helgesen, S. (1990). *The female advantage: Women's ways of leadership*. New York: Doubleday.

Hersi, D. (1993). Factors contributing to job satisfaction for women in higher education administration. *CUPA Journal, 44*(2), 29-35.

Irby, B. J. & Brown, G. (1995, April). Constructing a feminist-inclusive theory of leadership. Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Association, San Francisco.

Kaplan, S., & Tinsley, A. (1989, January-February). The unfinished agenda: Women in higher education administration. *Academe, 75*(1), 18-22.

Klenke, K. (1996). *Women and leadership*. New York: Springer Publishing Company.

Lester, R., Piore, M., & Malek, K. (1998, March/April). Interpretive management: What general managers can learn from design. *Harvard Business Review*, 86-96.

Lieblich, A., Tuval-Mashiach, R., & Zilber, T. (1998). *Narrative research: Reading, analysis and interpretation, 47*. London: Sage Publications.

Lipman-Blumen, J. (1992). Connective leadership: Female leadership styles in the 21st century workplace. *Sociological Perspectives, 35*(1), 182-208.

McGrew-Zouli, R. (1993). Women's leadership style. In G. Brown & B. Irby (Eds.), *Women as school executives: A powerful paradigm,* 43-45. Huntsville, TX: Sam Houston Press and Texas Council for Women School Executives.

Neumann, A., & Bensimon, E. (1990). Constructing the presidency: College presidents' images of their leadership roles – A comparative study. *Journal of Higher Education, 61*(6), 678-701.

Noddings, N. (1984). *Caring: A feminine approach to ethics and moral education.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Offermann, L. R., & Beil, C. (1992). Achievement styles of women leaders and their peers. *Psychology of Women Quarterly,* (16), 37-56.

Ortiz, F., & Marshall, C. (1988). Women in educational administration. Handbook of Research on Educational Administration. N. Boyan (ed.), New York: Longman Press, 123-143.

Pearson, C. S., Shavlik, D. L., & Touchton, J. G. (Eds.) (1989). *Educating the majority: Women challenge tradition in higher education.* New York: American Council on Education.

Porat, K. L. (1991). Women in administration: The difference is positive. *The Clearing House, 64*(6), 412-414.

Remen, R. (1996). *Kitchen table wisdom.* New York: Riverhead Books.

Ryder, M. (1994, May-June). Women in educational administration: Breaking the statistical norm. *Thrust for Educational Leadership,* 23(7), 28-34.

Schmitt, D. M. (1994, February). *Integrating new theory and practice to prepare women for roles in educational administration.* Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Chicago.

Schon, D. (1984). Leadership as reflection-in-action. In T. J. Sergiovanni & J.E. Corbally (Eds.) *Leadership and organizational culture: New perspectives in administrative theory and practice,* 36-63. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Schon, D. (1985). *The reflective turn: Case studies in and on educational practice.* Columbia University, New York: Teachers College Press.

Slauenwhite, E., & Skok, R. (1991, June). Women in school administration: Where are they? *The Canadian School Executive,* 17-21.

Stodgill, R. (1974). *Stodgill's handbook of leadership: A survey of theory.* New York: Free Press.

Stokes, J. M. (1984). *Organizational barriers and their impact on women in higher education. National Association for Women Deans, Administrators and Counselors.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 264 747).

VanMaanen, J., Manning, P., & Miller, M. (1998). Series editors' introduction. In J. VanMaanen, P. Manning, & M. Miller (Eds.), *A narrative approach to organization studies,* v. London: Sage.

Wahl, T. A., & Vocate, D. R. (1993, August-October). Differences between women administrators and faculty. *Journal of the Association for Communication Administration,* 3-4, 56-66.

Watson, C. D. (1984, August). *Women in leadership positions: A comparison of considerate vs. dominant behavioral styles.* Proceedings of the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, Toronto, Ontario, Canada, 24-28.

Stephanie A. Clemons currently works at Colorado State University as an Associate Professor in the Department of Design and Merchandising.

Portraits of Individuality:
A Qualitative Study of Multiracial College Students

Heather Shea Gasser

Multiracial college students face many unique challenges on college and university campuses. Their experiences, while similar to those of other students of color, vary greatly from those with only one racial heritage. Common reoccurring themes in the multiracial experience include the need to define one's racial identity, the need to fit into peer groups, and the pressure to choose one racial identity, in addition to dealing with others' ambiguity about their appearance. Given this, college administrators and student affairs professionals should raise their awareness of these issues and seek to understand how their campuses' multiracial students' experiences differ from the experiences of monoracial students. This article explores facets of the multiracial college experience and makes recommendations based on the experiences of six college students.

While many realize that the population of students who enroll, study, and graduate from institutions of higher education is distinctively different from only a decade ago, few professionals in higher education grasp the effects that increasing populations of multiracial students will have on campuses in the United States. As a majority of students of mixed-race backgrounds (versus a majority of monoracial students) assert their multiracial status on campus, administrators, faculty, staff, and other professionals will discover that they should change the way they serve these students. Continuing many of the traditional programs, standard curricula, and typical student services may not meet the needs of the multiracial student population.

Those who study college students have, for decades, sought to discover the emerging needs of the next generation of students. While the experiences of students of color as a group have received increased attention in the literature, discussion of the unique experiences of biracial/multiracial students is largely absent from these texts. Soon the growth of the multiracial college student population will demand more direct attention. A 1997 article in *Time* estimated that by 2050, the "white" race would no longer make up the majority of the population (White, 1997). While blacks, Asians, Latinos, Pacific Islanders, and other people of color will see their populations proliferate, "An explosion of interracial, interethnic, and inter-religious marriages will swell the ranks of children whose mere existence makes a mockery of age-old racial categories and

attitudes" (White, 1997, p. 149). Students who defy the very categories with which colleges attempt to define campus demographics will force a reconceptualization of student services.

Moreover, as theorists and researchers investigate and analyze student development, higher education practitioners will continue to cultivate a campus community where all students succeed. As the academic and practical research comes together in reports, dissertations, theses, monographs, journal articles, and books, higher education and student personnel administrators consequently will need to increase their understanding of the growing multiracial population.

It is the researcher's hope that this qualitative study of multiracial college students adds to that base of knowledge; readers will gain insight into the unique needs of six multiracial students, and then will be better able to consider the implications of this study for the multiracial student population on their campuses.

College and Multiracial Identity Formation

Many multiracial individuals are challenged in college, perhaps for the first time in their lives, to define the parameters of their racial backgrounds. These challenges can take a variety of forms including: filling out admissions forms that require students to "check one box"; social, dating, and other student life considerations; representation or lack of representation of their ethnic heritages in the curriculum; and encounters with counseling centers, student support services, academic affairs, and other campus offices. These challenges, together with the disappearance of familiar childhood friendships in which one's racial legitimacy probably never was questioned, may catch the student in what Root (1992) describes as the "squeeze effect." When entering a social scene, "multiracial people experience a 'squeeze' of oppression as people of color and by people of color" (p. 5). For the student to be accepted by either white students or students of color, the person may have to choose to identify as one of her/his racial heritages and deny the others. The attempt to assert a truly multiracial identity, in which each of a person's races, ethnicities, and cultures are equally valued, may raise questions of loyalty from the monoracial groups. At a time when peer relationships are important, the multiracial student is left feeling marginalized.

Like most first-year college students, multiracial students are simply looking for a place to "fit in." Establishing connections with peer groups and creating a place for themselves in a new environment are part of the challenges students face. Forming relationships with faculty and staff and determining academic pursuits are additional factors students must consider in the traditional collegiate

experience. An inability to form connections on campus with both peers and mentors may ultimately lead to their withdrawal from the college environment. Multiracial students may face a greater challenge than other students of color in identifying mentors among upper-class students, faculty, or staff members.

Student Affairs and Diversity On Campus

The role of a student affairs administrator is to support the institution's academic mission, while facilitating the involvement, leadership opportunities, personal growth, and development of ALL students at his or her institution. Studies have shown that students' first impressions, ability to acclimate, and resultant retention are shaped through new-student orientation processes, residence hall programs, campus activities, and other leadership opportunities, as well as the students' connections with their peers, faculty, staff, and mentors (Astin, 1984; Sanford, 1966). New students quickly will discern if they can establish connections with the other students, or whether they belong at a specific institution at all. Alone and far from home for perhaps the first time in their lives, many students seek peer groups with similar backgrounds, ethnicities, and experiences in order to feel like they belong.

Based on the projected growth of the multiracial student population, the next generation of professionals entering the field of student affairs will be unprepared to adequately provide services, programs, and leadership opportunities to all students unless they establish a basis of understanding of the unique needs of multiracial students. Just as administrators consider the experiences of students of color on their campuses, they also should address the needs and common concerns of multiracial students.

Becoming a Multiracial Society

Since the 1960s, U.S. Supreme Court decisions, changes in legislation, as well as an increase in society's general acceptance of multiracial individuals have significantly changed the status of this previously unrecognized and grossly marginalized group. There has been hopeful discussion of "mixed-race people as the 'children of the future' – the natural 'bridges' between the artificial boundaries that divide the humans of the world" (Nakashima, 1992, p. 173).

However, according to both Root (1996) and Zack (1993), there continues to be a lack of common identity or solidarity among multiracial individuals in the United States. The largely understudied and unreported history of multiracial people in the United States has resulted in commonly practiced assumptions, stereotypes, and misconceptions of multiracial Americans. Like other oppressed

groups who are stereotyped, multiracial people have a socially constructed and stereotypic identity that plays out in American prejudices. Some of the stereotypes that have been over-emphasized in American popular culture include the image of the *tragic mulatto*, which was used by abolitionists as an example of the immorality of slave owners and the institution of slavery; the *marginal man* who is never a member of either group, destined to a life of uncertainty; the *exotic, beautiful*, and often *sexually promiscuous woman;* and the *Other*, a vulnerable person of ambiguous appearance with a lack of racial identity (Bradshaw, 1992).

A multiracial person's appearance and mismatched physical features (for example, an Asian eye shape with kinky black hair) will often cause confusion for people in a society where specific physical attributes are categorized to certain races. Consequently, many multiracial people are very sensitive and attuned to their appearances. "The racially ambiguous look of many, though not all, multiracial individuals has political, social, interpersonal, and intrapersonal implications" (Bradshaw, 1992, p. 88). Applications, formal government documents, and other forms ask individuals to designate their race by checking one box. For many multiracial individuals, society chooses that box for them based on the "eyeball test." "Physical appearance, as a variable, seems to play an important role in the ethnic identity development of racially mixed people" (Hall, 1980; Spickard, 1989). It is clear that depending on how others view them, multiracial individuals are perceived, defined, and treated quite differently.

Given the lack of solidarity among the multiracial population, the stereotypes and assumptions prevalent in American culture, and questions regarding physical appearance and racial identity, it is clear that to be of mixed racial heritage in the United States at the beginning of the millennium is to be largely misunderstood, stereotyped, and unrecognized.

Current Literature

At the beginning of the 21st century, the history and context of race, mixed race, and racial identity continue to influence public policy, government and private documents, legal decisions, and most importantly, the lives of every U.S. citizen. With this in mind, it is clear that for many, attending a college or university drastically impacts one's perception of his or her race, as well as her or his relationships with others of like or different racial heritages. There exist numerous studies and papers on the history and construct of race, the history of multiracialism, the concepts of privilege and passing, the role of programs and services for students of color in higher education, as well as the current research

on the multiracial college experience, specifically with regard to biracial and multiracial identity development.

In order to determine a need for conducting a study such as this, the author conducted a review of research findings relevant to this study, an analysis of methodologies and traditions used by previous researchers, as well as an evaluation to locate the gaps in what is already known about multiracial college students.

Research Problem

The dual purposes of this qualitative, phenomenological study were to describe the unique experiences of six multiracial college students at Colorado State University, a large, public institution in the Rocky Mountain West region, and to uncover any central underlying meanings or common themes within their experiences.

It was the researcher's hypothesis that just as the traditional theoretical racial identity models have not sufficiently dealt with the complexities of multiracial identity development, so have the traditional campus program models and student support services been unprepared to adequately meet the needs of biracial and multiracial students on college and university campuses. The researcher examined programs and services, which are based on more traditional theoretical perspectives, and related their effectiveness to multiracial students' needs as they attended college.

Methodology

The qualitative study is a rigorous and complex method of analysis and inquiry. The researcher's role in a qualitative study is as an active learner rather than as a passive analyst. This allows the researcher to gain a more complete understanding of the participants' points of view. Unlike quantitative research, qualitative methodology allows the researcher to "purposefully select" the participants for the study. Random or arbitrary means of selecting participants is not useful when the researcher is only interested in studying a specific group with certain characteristics. Therefore, the participants in this study were carefully chosen because of their different perspectives, their ages/years in school, and their involvement or lack of involvement with support services. In addition, the participants' specific racial background and gender were carefully controlled to provide an even distribution of various racial combinations and gender related perspectives. Aliases (both first and last names) were assigned to

preserve anonymity of the participants. Table 1 below outlines the demographics of the participants in the study.

Table 1

Participant Demographics (in order of interview)

Participant # and Assigned Alias (to preserve anonymity)	Racial Background	Gender	Age	Year in College	College (area of study)	Geographic Origin	On or Off Campus
1 – Gena Steinberg	Asian & Caucasian (Jewish)	Female	22	Junior	Liberal Arts	Out of State	Off-Campus
2 – Jeff Daniels	African American & Asian (also part Caucasian)	Male	20	Junior	Liberal Arts	In-State	Off- Campus
3 – Angela Daniels	African American & Asian (also part Caucasian)	Female	20	Freshman	Liberal Arts	In-State	On-Campus
4 – Lisa Perry	African American & Caucasian	Female	22	Senior	Liberal Arts	In-State	Off-Campus
5 – Lee Clayton	Asian & Caucasian	Male	23	Senior	Applied Human Sciences	In-State	Off-Campus
6 – Brian Matthews	African American & Caucasian (also part Native American)	Male	19	Sophomore	Natural Sciences	In-State	On-Campus

Qualified participants were identified through several means: by the Directors and Associate Directors of both Black Student Services (BSS) and Asian, Pacific American Student Services (APASS), through the assistance of a faculty member in the Center for Applied Studies in American Ethnicity (CASAE), and also by residence hall staff and other student services offices at Colorado State University. Replication of the sampling technique utilized for this study would

be somewhat simple, however, replication of the results obtained would be practically impossible given that any other six individuals could have completely different perspectives.

Data Analysis

The data (transcriptions of the 90 minute interviews) was analyzed with an approach known as the *grounded theory* method of coding (Creswell, 1998). This method consists of three phases: open coding, the process of developing categories of information; axial coding, the process of interconnecting the categories; and selective coding, the process of building a "story" that connects the categories together. After checking the transcripts for accuracy and building narrative portraits of the individuals, the transcripts were analyzed with the computer program HyperRESEARCH (version 1.65). First-level coding, or open coding, provided a list of over 200 codes. In the second-level coding process, the researcher examined the frequencies and redundancy of the quotations and grouped the codes into smaller subsets or categories. The final stage involved composing a discussion of the data in larger categories. This process resulted in a description of the phenomenon of multiracialism for the six participants. This phenomenon is outlined through the following *Emergent Themes.*

Conclusions and Recommendations

The Research Questions and Emergent Themes

Given the gaps evident in the review of current literature and research, this study addressed the specific research questions listed below. During the data analysis, specific themes evolved that responded directly to these questions.

Question one: Is there a "multiracial experience" common to all individuals of mixed race?

While certainly no two persons' experiences will be the same, the data collected for this study as well as the current research and literature suggests that there are similar experiences unique to multiracial individuals. Variations in self-definition, awareness of the pressure to choose one racial identity in order to fit in, and the importance of appearances, as well as others' confusion about their ambiguous appearance, are among the repeating themes of this study related to a common multiracial experience. As one of the participants stated of her peers, "They are like – 'so are you black or white or what?' But I'm both. So there are

some people around me who don't understand, who need me to pick something" (Angela).

Given this, it is safe to say that there cannot be a singular multiracial experience, just as there is not a "white experience" or an "African American experience." The human race is simply more heterogeneous than homogeneous. As one of the participants in this study summarizes, "[you can] do a lot of research to figure out what that multiracial experience is like, but it's different for everybody" (Angela).

Question two: Are there common needs of multiracial students on college campuses, and if so, what are these needs?

For many multiracial individuals, the process of leaving familiar childhood relationships and family ties challenges students to develop their identity and to form their own racial self-concept. The attempt to assert a truly multiracial identity, in which all of a person's races, ethnicities, and cultures are equally valued, may raise questions of loyalty from monoracial groups. One participant described this feeling, "My friends on my floor...I did what every freshman did, we partied, we had fun and it was really cool. I had all these friends, everything was just working great, and then everybody started separating into their own groups, which is going to happen. And I didn't get into any of them" (Angela).

For multiracial college students, the most prevalent need on campus is to have a social connection or peer group allegiance. Unlike most monoracial college students, the multiracial person's background, relationships, high school peer groups, and racial group preference complicate the process of joining a peer group and gaining a true-to-self identity. Gena describes her experience, "For the first week and a half I was going to frat parties and it was really hard for me because I felt I couldn't be myself around these people. Before...I just felt like I wasn't being me and these weren't the things I liked to do and I didn't fit in around here."

Oftentimes, in college, part of the identity process for multiracial students includes immersion in the culture or race to which they were denied previous exposure. Lee comments, "When I came to college, I actually looked to get involved with APASS because I really wanted to know what it was like to grow up being Asian and not what it was like to grow up being Caucasian." The participants of this study commented on the effects of a lack of diversity on campus and the necessity to move beyond a monoracial paradigm.

Question three: Are the current theoretical perspectives and identity models in place meeting multiracial students' needs?

Traditional racial identity models may fail to fully address the complexity of the multiracial person's identity development process. Since commonly used racial identity models do not accurately meet the multiracial student's needs, those who base their teaching, counseling, and support programs and services on a monoracial paradigm probably do not have a complete understanding of the issues multiracial students face. As the campus student population becomes increasingly multiracial, as opposed to monoracial, it is critical that colleges and universities refrain from fitting these students into the traditional offices, services, and theories. The change towards multiracial sensitivity represents a fundamental paradigm shift in the way colleges and universities operate. One student suggested integrating multiracial students' perspectives into the current "success classes" facilitated by the campus' advocacy offices: "I guess that in the success classes, they could have sections for multiracial students or have other classes where they pull aside the multiracial students and just see what they think...Or hold a panel...Bring the older multiracial students in to have panels with them and talk to them...focus on multiracial students" (Jeff). Additional recommendations for practitioners operating from this paradigm are discussed below.

Question four: Do current campus programs and student services offices adequately meet the needs of multiracial students? If not, what additional or different services could be provided for this growing population on campus?

For multiracial students who feel an allegiance to one racial group over the others, the campus programs and advocacy office structure at the University is meeting their needs. These students primarily identify with one race and have peers of primarily one race. Jeff stated, "I see [Black Student Services] more as a freshman support system; I see it more as a social place for people to have connected with Black students on campus. I see it more as helping with retention than anything else. And those that have [connected with the advocacy office], they're usually students that you'll see graduate from here...It's like the one place that you can be assured of that there's going to be Black students." Since oftentimes the focus of the advocacy offices is less on counseling and more on social, leadership, and involvement opportunities, multiracial students do not feel singled out or different from the other students who visit the offices. In addition, within Black Student Services, the diversity among the students is beneficial; if a multiracial student is attached to a diverse peer group, her or his feelings of isolation and dissimilarity subside. For multiracial students desiring information or understanding of a culture with which they were not raised, the

advocacy offices provide the means for these students to explore their racial heritages.

For multiracial students who do not choose to identify solely with one race, loyalty to one advocacy office makes them feel as though they are ignoring part of themselves or dishonoring one of their parents. In addition, for students concerned with appearances, their racially complicated features could make them self-conscious in a primarily monoracial environment. One participant related, "I don't know, [going to the advocacy office] is kind of weird for me yet, it's not yet comfortable for me. I don't know why. Everybody in there is like...dark, and I'm like light" (Angela). Geographic origin (Midwest, East Coast, Rocky Mountain Region) and by whom they were raised (interracial parents, single mother, adoptive parents) also impacts multiracial students' ability to feel at home at the advocacy office.

Recommendations for Higher Education

For the last 30 years or more, issues of diversity within the campus community have been at the forefront of student affairs administrators' minds as they work with students on college and university campuses. Administrators have studied the effects of marginal environments, enacted policies to protect students from racial violence, as well as worked to change the racial climate on their campuses so as to attract more students of color. Programs designed to increase recruitment and retention of African American, Latino/a, and Native American students have proliferated on many campuses, resulting in an increase in graduation rates of these previously underrepresented groups.

As higher education walks further into the 21st century, a new challenge awaits. Once again administrators are called to educate themselves about race, but this time from a multiracial perspective. It is likely that a paradigm shift in higher education is eminent. As is demonstrated in this study, multiracial college students' needs are vastly different from those students with a monoracial background. When student affairs practitioners refer to an "appreciation of differences" on campus, the multiracial student population adds a new dimension to the collegial environment. Systems of faculty and staff training, implementation of support services, as well as one's everyday assumptions must now include the relevancy for multiracial students. With imminent, drastic increases in the multiracial population, administrators should adjust their perspectives to incorporate the unique needs of the multiracial population. It is this researcher's recommendation that student affairs practitioners and academicians undergo multiracial awareness training and begin to look at the campus as primarily multiracial as opposed to monoracial. While helping multiracial individuals develop a healthy sense of identity may be the role of

parents and K-12 educators, this process should be continued as students move into higher education. On campuses where monoracialism is valued (as evident in programs, services, and curriculum), it might be difficult for the multiracial individual to continue to actualize her or his multiracial identity.

As the reader has learned in this study, the six student participants, like most college students, are simply looking for places to fit in. An inability to establish connections with peers, faculty, and staff, in conjunction with academic frustrations can ultimately lead to withdrawal from the university. For this reason, administrators need to educate themselves as to the complexities associated with the multiracial experience. Meanwhile, administrators should keep in mind the unlikelihood of identical solutions for every multiracial student. This study suggests that multiracial student development models are irrelevant as these students do not all go through the same identity processes and develop identical racial self-concepts. Instead, the multiracial experience is highly variable and is based on many social, familial, environmental, and personal factors.

It is clear that faculty, staff, and peers play tremendous roles in college students' lives. Certain individuals can drastically impact a student's field of study, subsequent occupation, productivity, and motivation. With essential training, student affairs administrators, already well versed in student development theory, can lead the campus in adopting, promoting, and positively impacting their campus' multiracial student population. If indeed the driving concern of most multiracial students is their ability or inability to fit in (as it was for the students in this study), practitioners need to develop planned interventions, facilitate increased understanding, and combat marginality on campus. This could be accomplished through the creation and support of multiracial student organizations, the seamless integration of cultural centers (so students are not faced with choosing one advocacy office over another), and the general advocacy for and understanding of multiracial students' unique needs and experiences.

Final Thoughts

Multiracial college students face many unique challenges on college and university campuses. Their experiences, while similar to those of other students of color, vary greatly from those of students with only one racial heritage. However, within a group of multiracial students there are few generalizable commonalties. Concerns considered common may only apply to a portion of the multiracial individuals one encounters. Issues regarding racial self-identity, peer groups, the need to fit in, and the need to choose one race, in addition to others' ambiguity about their appearance often reoccur as one examines the multiracial

experience. Given this, those who work in college administration and student affairs should seek to understand what makes one multiracial student's experience fundamentally different from that of a monoracial student. The answer lies in the process of interpersonal human contact, counseling, and caring for this segment of our college population. The researcher urges the reader to investigate these issues and evaluate the efficacy of policies and services on one's own campus for its multiracial students.

References

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

Bradshaw, C. (1992). Beauty and the beast: On racial ambiguity. In M.P.P. Root (Ed.), *Racially mixed people in America*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Creswell, J. W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among the five traditions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hall, C. C. I. (1980). *The ethnic identity of racial mixed people: A study of Black-Japanese*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.

Nakashima, C. (1992). An invisible monster: The creation and denial of mixed-race people in America. In M.P.P Root (Ed.), *Racially mixed people in America* (pp. 162-178). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Root, M. P. P. (Ed.) (1992) *Racially mixed people in America*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Root; M. P. P. (Ed.) (1996). *The multiracial experience: Racial borders as the new frontier* (pp. 3014). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Sanford, N. (1966). *Self and society*. New York: Atherton Press.

Spickard, P. R. (1989). *Mixed blood: Intermarriage and ethnic identity in twentieth –century America*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

White, J.E. (1997, May 5). I'm just who I am: White, Black, Asian, other race is no longer as simple as black and white. So, what does this mean for America? *Time*, 149.

Zack, N. (1993). *Race and mixed race*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Heather Shea Gasser ('00) currently works at the University of Arizona as the Coordinator for Commuter Student Affairs in the Center for Student Involvement and Leadership.

Indigenous Names and Mascots as Symbols of School Spirit

Lea R. Hanson

There are over 60 colleges and universities today that use the names and symbols of Indigenous Peoples as a school athletic team name, nickname, or mascot (Connelly, 2000). According to the majority of the schools who are currently using such nicknames and mascots, the use is intended to be an honorable portrayal of the Native American culture and represent a strong tradition of school spirit. According to many people who are of Native American descent, such mascots are both culturally and historically inaccurate portrayals of American Indians (Muir, 1999). The debate regarding schools' continuing use of such nicknames and mascots is currently under close examination: this article addresses both sides of the issue, as well as some historical background and context.

The debate of whether or not it is ethical to use Indigenous nicknames and mascots is both historical and controversial. Over 60 colleges and universities use such mascots today; according to Connelly (2000), the selection and development of these institutions' nicknames and symbols can be attributed to two social trends. The first being "the objectification of Native Americans as 'good Indians'. The term 'good Indians' perpetuates the cartoon-like illustration of Native Americans. This term illustrates Native Americans as having maroon skin, painted faces, and wearing leather and feathers. The second social trend is the rise of the collegiate 'booster culture' (2000). Booster culture is best described as a type of groupthink where athletic team supporters favor a nickname and/or mascot because of the intense sense of belonging that comes with being a part of a booster or pep club. Such trends are often difficult to eliminate, especially when numerous people (students, faculty, staff, alumni, and community supporters of athletics) practice such behaviors and actions.

The debate regarding schools' continuing use of such nicknames and mascots is currently under close examination by several educational institutions. It is important that this topic be explored and researched as it can be labeled as an issue of racism. Pewewardy (1999) stated:

> ...most states make a commitment to provide the best public education for every student. The issue of equity is an important component of that commitment to educational excellence, ensuring access, treatment, opportunity, and outcomes for all students, based

on objective assessment of each individual students' needs and
abilities. (p. 9)

Every institution of higher education has a duty to serve the needs of its
students. Because of the commitment to the equal education of all students, the
college or university that uses such mascots has the responsibility to answer this
question: Is using Indigenous mascots and nicknames an honorable portrayal, or
a false depiction, of Indigenous Peoples? When considering this issue, two
concerns often arise. The first, and most common, is whether such uses are
honoring or offending Indigenous Peoples. The second, which is equally
important, is how these actions affect all individuals in today's society, not only
those with Native American heritage. These topics of concern have been
heatedly debated and both sides have produced convincing arguments.

Historical Background

While there are a large number of colleges and universities currently debating
this issue, some of the more visible controversies have come from two state
universities. The University of North Dakota's (UND) athletic teams use the
name, the "Fighting Sioux," and the University of Illinois (U of I) uses the
"Fighting Illini". Both these campuses have similar stories: the Native
population would prefer that the names be changed, while the students, alumni,
and athletic boosters would like them to remain the same.

The colorful mascots and logos used by UND and U of I inaccurately portrays
the Native population today; however, many people are ignorant about that
concept. In fact, many people today do not realize that Native Americans still
exist. According to Berswick (1990), it is the school's responsibility to
reeducate people with this misconception or who have been raised in a racist
community or household. Almeida (1996) suggested that in response to a lack of
knowledge, classroom teachers at all educational levels, including college, often
use one of two approaches when teaching Native American culture. The first is
the "dead-and-buried approach," which leads students to assume that Native
Americans no longer exist. The alternative approach is the "tourist approach," in
which students visit reservations where they are led to believe that Indigenous
Peoples do exist, but not in their communities (Almeida, 1996, p. 2). Inaccurate
education can lead to stereotyping, rather than understanding. Once these
stereotypes are instilled in individuals, whether intentionally or not, they are
difficult to reverse.

Many efforts are being made toward the elimination of the use of Native
American nicknames and symbols as athletic team names and mascots on
today's campuses. For example, on April 13, 2001, the United States
Commission on Civil Rights released a statement regarding the use of Native

American images and nicknames as a sporting or athletic team's symbol. The statement "calls for an end to the use of Native American images and team names by non-Native schools" (p. 1). The statement determined that such mascots and team names were found to be "disrespectful and offensive to American Indians and others" (p. 1). Although this statement was written with the best of intentions, because the Commission utilized terminology such as "non-Native schools", institutions that are classified as a Native school because of their prominent Native American population.

Opposing Views

Pewewardy (1999) stated, "Indigenous Peoples would have never associated the sacred practices of becoming a warrior with the hoopla of a pep rally, half-time entertainment, or being a side-kick to cheerleaders" (p. 6). Muir (1999) agreed that such mascots are both culturally and historically inaccurate portrayals of American Indians. Muir further stated, "using 'Indians' as mascots for sports teams is opposed by most Native Americans" (p. 56).

Since it has been repeatedly noted that such nicknames and mascots are offensive to Native Americans, why do intelligent and empathetic fans continue to use and support them? Dennis (1981) contended that people engage in racist behavior because they are reasonably sure there is support for it within their society. People often act in ways they would otherwise disagree with when they are in a context where such behavior is not only acceptable, but is the norm. By not stopping such behavior from occurring, the institution may be indirectly supporting it. The United States Commission on Civil Rights (2001) stated, "the stereotyping of any racial, ethnic, religious or other groups when promoted by our public educational institutions, teach all students that stereotyping of minority groups is acceptable, [which is] a dangerous lesson in a diverse society" (p. 1). Therefore, it could be argued that some of our nation's educational institutions are promoting racism. This is a very serious accusation, and yet it is supported by their actions or lack thereof.

In the opposing view, athletic fans and supporters at both UND and U of I have argued that their choice of athletic nickname has been "instrumental in shaping the image of the entire college or university" (Connolly, 2000, p. 515). Many supporters at these universities are strongly opposed to changing their names. In an interview with *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, Kim Srock, a student at UND said, "It's like, get a life, this is a game -- it's not about Indians. They're like a bunch of crybabies. Get over it" (Brownstein, 2001, p. A46). Similar reactions toward those looking for change can be found at U of I. In an interview with *Thought & Action*, Charlene Teeters noted from her personal experience at the U of I, "[Native Americans] were feeling very sad and vulnerable. And once

again we were basically told, 'Keep your mouths shut, get your degree, and then just get out'" (Johns, 2000, p. 124). It should be noted that these two examples of attitudes are in addition to and contrast with many statements of sincere intentions to use the nickname in a manner that can be considered honorable by the Native American population.

Connolly (2000) stated, "Oftentimes, boosters not only claimed that Native American cultures were being remembered and sustained with authenticized symbols, but they also suggested that doing away with these symbols would encourage forgetting Native Americans' history as well as overlooking their current political interests" (p. 536). Additionally, Connolly also noted that we can generalize the reasons such institutions use to justify keeping their nicknames into three themes:

1. Using such nicknames and symbols is a way of respecting and remembering Native Americans,
2. Native Americans are no different from other groups used for nicknames and symbols, and
3. Only a militant minority of Native Americans has a problem, the rest of them do not take offense. (p. 534)

While it is important to consider such arguments, we also must ensure that our interpretations of Native Americans' opinions come from Native Americans themselves.

Commitment to Multicultural Education

Many would say that the responsibility lies with the educators and the administration of these universities to resolve the conflicts surrounding Indigenous mascots and nicknames because they have made a commitment not only to make equal education accessible, but also to promote education that is multicultural. According to Berswick (1990), multicultural education must distinguish between culture and ethnicity if it is to preserve ethnic identity while promoting social interaction. Multicultural education is an excellent way to diminish prejudice and stimulate new appreciation for ethnic and racial differences. Today's educators have the responsibility to teach without bias, "teaching from an antibias perspective means going beyond conventional multicultural education and introducing students to a working concept of diversity that challenges social stereotypes and discrimination" (Almeida, 1996, p. 1). Most schools, elementary through graduate programs, make a verbal commitment to multiculturalism, but many of these schools have much further to go regarding the consistency between what they say they support and what they actually teach in their classrooms.

In order to effectively teach multiculturalism, specifically in relation to Native Americans, their culture, and their history, educators must closely examine their

own biases and/or underlying beliefs about Native Americans by questioning the images they see in the media and their surrounding campus environments. Images such as Walt Disney's Pocahontas, cartoon-like Eskimos, the Cherokee princess myth and image, the UND Fighting Sioux, and the U of I Fighting Illini. Almeida (1996) recognized the inaccuracy of these mythical characters perpetuate stereotypes, and suggested:

> Materials that make sweeping generalizations about Native Americans, materials that present only the colonizers' perspectives, books and videos that exploit Native American cultural and spiritual traditions for profit, and lack of respect for Native American intellectual property rights and Indigenous knowledge are four materials to avoid using in any educational institution. (p. 6)

It is difficult for some educators to detect the flaws noted above when reviewing information for classroom use, therefore Almeida suggested using Native American-controlled publishers and media distributors when choosing such educational resources (1996). Such resources can be located through a community's or a university's cultural center or library.

Suggestions for Change

When it comes to examining how an educational institution might change their current Native American nicknames and mascots, there are a number of possibilities. One way is to implement or improve multicultural education in the curricula of higher education, which is consistent with the mission and values of many educational institutions. Another route would be to make nickname and mascot changes. Institutions also have the option to refuse athletic play with teams who use Indigenous nicknames; however, this is an extreme example that few have ventured to practice, and many would consider a last option.

In order to expect change from universities that still use Indigenous nicknames and mascots, it is important that they understand the history and reasoning behind the concerns of Native Americans and their allies. Native American activism regarding this issue began to increase in the 1960s. It was in this decade when many universities, as well as professional sports teams, began to change their names. Stanford University and Dartmouth College, which had used the name "Indians," both made changes. The teams from the University of Massachusetts were formerly known as the Redmen. These institutions have made an attempt to set the example that change is possible. Another method that can be used to counteract the stereotypes of Native Americans is to follow the examples of other colleges and universities who have changed their names and/or mascots. For instance, in 1996, Miami University in Ohio changed its team name from the Redskins to the Redhawks. The change was the result of the

Miami tribe of American Indians voting unanimously to withdraw its endorsement of the nickname. Another university, Eastern Michigan University, changed its nickname from the Hurons to the Eagles in 1991 (Muir, 1999).

Example of institutions refusing to play teams with Indigenous nicknames include both the University of Minnesota (U of M) and the University of Wisconsin (UW), which enacted policies in 1993 that forbade their football teams to compete against teams that have Native American nicknames (Muir, 1999). Although this only applies to teams and institutions outside of the University's normal conference opponents, it still sends a strong message to many colleges and universities that these institutions have no tolerance for the use of Indigenous nicknames as mascots. As for those schools in the U of Ms' or UWs' conference who bear such nicknames, no team or players with the logo on his or her jersey or any other team paraphernalia is allowed on the field, court, or ice during an athletic competition (Muir, 1999). Later that year, the University of Iowa forbade images of Native Americans, including Chief Illiniwek, onto its campus because the local Native American population was offended. The state of Michigan also took a stance: in 1988, the Michigan Civil Rights Commission recommended that all state educational institutions (including the four state-supported colleges and universities) discontinue their use of Native American names and logos. The 1988 Commission Statement called such nicknames and logos "stereotypic, racist, and discriminatory" (p. 1).

Conclusion

The issue of using Native American names and symbols as athletic team names and mascots is a serious and prominent issue in the field of higher education today. Research and public opinion has demonstrated that both sides of the argument are passionate and persistent when defending their opinions on the topic. When examining this controversy, it is found that there are two major themes, including the underlying racism in the use of Indigenous nicknames, and the way these actions affect all humans who are exposed to this racism.

As in any debate, it is necessary that both arguments be heard. On one side, we have the opposition to change. This population is most often composed of people who are not members of the Native American culture and/or ethnicity. On the other side, we have those who support change, often including the general Native American population, and those people who support an inclusive and multicultural community. Although the research has noted that most Native Americans are in favor of eliminating the use of their cultural names as mascots, not all Native Americans would agree that these institutions' nicknames and symbols are inappropriate.

There is always room for more research to be done on this issue, especially because it deals with themes that can be considered to be racist. This issue is important and ongoing; while the concerns were first voiced almost four decades ago, higher education is still in a state of constant struggle and debate.

References

Almeida, D. A. (1996). *Countering prejudice against American Indians and Alaska Natives through antibias curriculum and instruction.* (Report No. EDO-RC-96-4). U.S.: West Virginia; 1996-10-00. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED400146)

Berswick, R. (1990). *Racism in America's schools.* (Report No. EA 49). U.S.; Oregon: 1990-00-00. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED320196)

Brownstein, A. (2001, February 23). A battle over a name in the land of the Sioux. *The Chronicle of Higher Education,* p. A46.

Connolly, M. R. (2000). What's in a name? *Journal of Higher Education, 71,* 515-547.

Dennis, R. M. (1981). *Socialization and racism: The white experience.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Johns, R. (2000). Interview: Charlene Teeters on Native American symbols as mascots. *Thought & Action, 16,* 121-130.

Muir, S. (1999). Native Americans as sports mascots. *Social Education, 63,* 56-57.

Pewewardy, C. D. (1999). From La Belle Sauvage to the Noble Savage: The deculturalization of Indian mascots in American culture. *Multicultural Education, 6,* 6-11.

United States Commission on Civil Rights (2001). Commission statement on the use of Native American images and nicknames as sports symbols. Issued: April 13, 2001. Retrieved September 8, 2001, from http://www.aics.org/mascot/civilrights.html

---

Lea Hanson ('03) currently works at Colorado State University as a Greek Life Advisor in the Lory Student Center and is a graduate student in the Student Affairs in Higher Education program.

Civility in Higher Education

Rebecca Newman-Gonchar

Although the attention to incivility among college students and professors appears to be recent, accounts of uncivil behavior have been addressed for many years. From the time universities opened their doors, professors have complained about the behavior and attitudes of their students, while students have protested the unfair treatment professors have shown them. According to Cowley and Williams (as cited in Holton, 1999), students during the Great Rebellion of 1823 at Harvard University were discovered "drowning out tutors' voices in the classroom, drenching people with buckets of ink and water and more" (p. 59). Fulton and Thompson, (as cited in Holton, 1999) state that at Yale University in the 1840s, students were "wont to express their displeasure with their tutors by stoning their windows and attacking them with clubs if they chanced out after" (p. 59).

Renewed conversation about civility claims that it has decreased more rapidly in recent years. Students, faculty, staff, and researchers agree with the notion that civility is more of an issue today than it was ten years ago. This article will try to answer the following questions: What is civility? What has contributed to the increase in uncivil discourse? How can student affairs professionals help alleviate the problem?

"A student is angry over a failing grade and storms out of the classroom shouting at the professor. An instructor, frustrated because students did not read the material, browbeats them for an hour" (Kuhlenschmidt, 1999, p. 13). Classes are being hijacked by classroom terrorists with behavior including: arriving late and leaving early, napping in the back of the classroom, physical confrontations, emotional outbursts, carrying on running conversations during class, and even bringing newspapers or TVs to class (Schneider, 1998). From where does this behavior stem? Should students be expected to react calmly to unexpected grades? Are instructors allowed to act with such fury?

U.S. News and World Report (Marks, 1996) documented that "9 out of 10 Americans think incivility [in society] is a serious problem, and nearly one half think it's extremely serious" (p. 67). Respondents to the study agree that "incivility [is] evidence of a profound social breakdown" (p. 67). Most Americans appear to understand the negative impacts incivility has on society and believe that incivility has worsened considerably. If the university is a

microcosm of the greater society, it is no wonder that incivility has increased on campus as well.

Research indicates that incivility in classrooms has increased and is threatening the secure nature of the university climate. In their book When Hope and Fear Collide, Levine and Cureton (1998a) state that "classroom disruption increased at a startling 44 percent of colleges..." (p. 96). Incivility on campus occurs readily in classroom environments, where professors become upset with students or students treat professors inappropriately. Levine and Cureton (1998b) state that "a majority of deans at four-year colleges say... civility has declined on the college campus (57 percent)..." (p. 6). This indicates that university administrators are aware of the increasing incidences of uncivil behavior and attitudes on their campuses.

Uncivil behavior on college campuses is not limited to students. Faculty report that the "reality of verbal attacks in academic journals and physical brawls in faculty meetings" demonstrates the same problem among faculty members (Leatherman, 1996, p. II 3). Students report that their professors disrespect them, yell at them, or even throw things across the room in anger. In order to address problems of incivility, one must examine this fragile relationship between students and faculty members and develop programs and practices to create more civility on campus.

"Uncivil behavior represents a threat to the fundamental nature of the university" (Blake, 1982, p. 51). University officials specifically charged with the mission of establishing social connections among students and faculty must be ready to address the changing campus dynamics. This article will provide insight into the areas influencing civility in society and on campus, and provide student affairs professionals with recommendations for addressing incivility.

Defining "Civility"

The American Heritage Dictionary (1996) defines civility as "courteous behavior, politeness" (p. 349). Boggs (1992) expands the dictionary definition of civility and suggests that it is "an obligation or duty to be fair to others, to show kindness and tact, and... to behave morally toward others as a response to their basic dignity and worth" (p. 3). Contrary to civility, "the most basic component of incivility is simply a lack of respect for another human being" (Heinemann, 1996, p. 2). Extreme incivility, according to Heinemann (1996), is violence, which also is increasing on college campuses across the country. In civil societies, people are expected to treat each other with dignity and respect and to stop people who act in the contrary. Patrick (1997) expands on the notion of civility to include more than politeness. Tolerance, compassion, and integrity

add a component of responsibility to the concept of civility. Students or professors who merely treat others politely are not civil members of society; they also must be accepting, honest, and caring.

The Decline in Civility

Researchers across the nation have studied the decline in societal civility. They have identified a wide range of explanations for the increase in incivility amongst members of society. To date, no definitive cause has been identified that would allow social leaders to remedy the deplorable behavior and attitudes at their source. Why do people treat each other with little respect and care? What happened to the Golden Rule, where by people pledged to treat others the way they wanted to be treated? What influenced the breakdown of these basic social skills?

Stark and Associates (1977) suggests that educational administrators cannot "ignore the political and social climate in which the consumer movement in education is enmeshed" (p. xi). Consumerism has been targeted as one of the reasons incivility in society has increased. In 1998, Schneider wrote that "students live in a Wal-Mart society where it's convenience that counts" (p. A12). "...The moral code of the market has replaced that of civil society resulting in pessimistic, self-serving, antisocial behavior" (Heinemann, 1996, p. 2). Learning for learning's sake has been replaced by the notion that students pay the university to educate them and thus have little responsibility in contributing to their own education. The "I pay your salary" attitude has led many faculty and staff to attribute the displeasure, tension, and disrespect in students to increased consumerism in society. Students emphasize the financial relationship between faculty and students and do not see the importance of the human connection they have with their faculty. Students' behavior, as a result of these beliefs and values, lacks the respect and compassion for fellow human beings necessary for a connection between faculty and other students.

Problems with consumerism are evident when coupled with the fact that students are dissatisfied with their education. Levinson (2000) attributes incivility to the increase in academic disengagement or boredom. His study suggests that 40% of freshmen frequently were bored in their classrooms, and this boredom is a reflection of a society that favors individualism, materialism, and competition. Students are not interested in the tedium of lectures and books. They want to collect material possessions, compete with their classmates, and concentrate on their individual lives. Consumerism has taught them to seek entertainment when not seeking individual goals, and classroom lectures do not compete with outside influences for their attention. One reason for the lack of

entertainment is attributed to the lack of training for professors in classroom management.

Along the route to becoming a faculty member, a Ph.D. candidate is taught specialized information about a specific academic field. Once hired to teach college students, they walk into large classrooms with little more than their common sense to manage the class. Combined with the lack of teacher training for Ph.D. candidates and the anonymity students feel in today's large classes, professors often find it difficult to grab and maintain students' attention and involvement in the material. Poor teaching and classroom management by untrained professors can lead to frustration and dissatisfaction with the college experience for both the students who are learning and the faculty who are teaching. Students lose respect for their "boring" instructors and, therefore, do not believe it is rude to abandon or interrupt the inadequate service that is being provided.

"Today and certainly within the past ten years, more than at any time in the history of higher education, students represent a microcosm of American society and, accordingly, bring to the campus the diversity of society and its tensions and conflicts" (Freedman, 1981, p. 52). Students represent the diversity found in society, which has "often been a source of violence and hostility – the ultimate manifestation of incivility" (Blake, 1982, p. 50). Has diversity in society increased incivility on campus? With an increasingly diverse, heterogeneous student community and a stable, tenured, homogeneous faculty with little common background in perspective from students, miscommunications and uncomfortable interactions are inevitable. The social, economic, and political issues that contribute to tension and conflict between different classes, races, religions, and social groups in society are not abandoned at the university door.

Along with the cultural attitudes and disagreements students bring to campus, "students are coming to college overwhelmed and more damaged than in the past" (Levine & Cureton, 1998a, p. 15). As latchkey children, the majority of current college students spent more time alone in front of the television or in daycare than any other generation in history (Losyk, 1997). These children were more influenced by television role models who demonstrated violence as an appropriate means of conflict resolution. With working parents, students received less attention from their families, which denied them a number of important opportunities to learn how to maintain healthy relationships through interactions with adult role models. When problems arise, these students, with limited experience with conflict resolution, feel hopeless and react emotionally. Often these emotions are in the form of frustration and anger, which easily can lead to uncivil behavior.

Technology has added another dimension to individuals' decreased ability to manage their emotions and to react productively to unexpected situations. Time in front of the computer often means time spent alone. "There is some concern that this time spent alone may encourage lower verbal and interpersonal communication skills" (Sanders & Bauer, 1998, p. 10) and less time to practice relational problem solving. Students say they can "identify when they were confronted with a problem and lacked the know-how for resolution" (Newton, 2000, p. 9) and, therefore, felt helpless in resolving the conflicts. Feeling helpless can lead to feeling desperate and to a tendency to act irrationally in rectifying the situation. Students and professors have not acquired adequate skills to manage their emotions effectively, which has led to increased incidences of disrespectful and hostile behavior.

Another way to look at students' ability to resolve conflicts without uncivil reactions is to examine where they are in their moral development. Students who act uncivilly or in opposition to the student code of conduct have been found to score "significantly lower [on the Defining Issues Test] than the norm population," meaning that their moral development has not reached the same level of the norm for that age group (Chassey, 1999, p. 4). The Defining Issues Test is a pencil and paper assessment of ethical judgment based on Kohlberg's cognitive-developmental theory of moral development (Evans, Forney, & Guido-DiBrito, 1998). Conclusions then can be drawn regarding the reasons why students continue to act uncivilly. Students who do not act appropriately may not have the ability to do so because they have not developed morally. Students' moral development is directly related to how they interact with others on the college campus. Moral reasoning contributes to the ways in which people value and treat each other. If students have not developed the skills to reason morally, then they may act less civilly towards others because they see no value in others or maintaining relationships with them.

Promoting Civility on Campus

On college campuses, civil behavior should be demonstrated in the way faculty and students interact with one another. As a place of social interaction and a working model of how one should interact in one's community, college campuses should not be riddled with unproductive behavior and attitudes. Uncivil discourse should not permeate the daily lives of individuals who work and study on our campuses. Institutions of higher education play a vital role in shaping the societal members of tomorrow. The goal then is to create a more civil society of people who understand the importance of respect, collaboration, and community. Colleges and universities must influence the course of society by focusing on character, values, and high standards of behavior.

Yates (1999) states that "it really doesn't matter how our students were expected to behave before they came to this campus. Once we admit them, we have an obligation to set limits and to enforce standards that will prepare them to be the people we expect them to be when they graduate" (p. 8). He continues to say that colleges and universities have "an important and meaningful impact throughout [students'] lives" (p. 8). The way students and faculty interact in the campus community can impact the state of future working and community environments. It is vital that universities guide behavior and attitudes through the reinforcement of civil discourse, in order to create living and working environments conducive to civil interaction. Without deliberate reinforcement, working and living environments of tomorrow will suffer. "We abdicated responsibility for teaching our students to behave and function in ways that will assure their social success – too often failing even to hold ourselves accountable as role models and teachers of such behavior" (Yates, 1999, p. 8).

"Helping students develop the integrity and strength of character that will prepare them for leadership may be one of the most challenging and important goals of higher education" (King, 1997, p. 87). Many researchers, including King (1997), equate character, moral judgment, and civil behavior. King suggests that there is a moral component to citizenship, which determines how individuals interact with others in their community. Morality should be examined as the key to respectful interaction and taught to students to ensure their social success. "Institution-wide approaches to communicating institutional values, expectations, and activities make the moral dimension of university life more visible to students and set the stage for them to apply their understandings in broader contexts" (p. 88).

Tiberius and Flak (1999) believe that incivility can be viewed as a warning of deeper problems. Incivility on campus communicates a problem with the relationship between students, faculty, and staff. Behavior and attitudes portrayed by faculty and students are not random or arbitrary. They happen in reaction to a larger problem, misunderstanding, or disappointment. These sources should not be overlooked. The breakdown of the faculty-student relationship requires quick effective action to resolve the issue at its source.

In order to "reach a mutual commitment to fairness, understanding, respect and caring... we need a willingness to change... to improve the relationship" (Tiberius & Flak, 1999, p. 9-10). Acknowledging that there is a problem in the relationship is only the beginning. Loeb (1999) suggests that "we need to understand our cultural diseases – callousness, shortsightedness, denial – and learn what it will take to heal our society and our souls" (p. 46). Being willing to change has to follow the acknowledgement. To combat the decrease in civil behavior, change is necessary in several parts of the university community. Faculty and student perceptions, curricular and co-curricular goals, and

university values may need alteration in a way that would recognize the intentional aspects of community.

Institutional Responsibility to Change

No singular unit of the university should be responsible for "[solving] a multifaceted systemic, community-wide problem" (Dual & Pardo, 1995, p. 36). Yet, a "normative culture" created by student affairs administrators could remodel what students and faculty believe is normal into a civil microcosm of society (Varlotta, 1997, p. 131). "Because student development is one of the most important goals of a university, the true measure of university excellence depends upon its ability to affect favorably the lives of its members" (p. 125). When student affairs administrators assist in fostering a better relationship between faculty and students, they promote the development of the student and the excellence of the university.

 "Colleges and universities have a special role in educating a diverse body of students who will possess the moral fiber and social skills necessary to provide future leadership" within the community (Gaudiani, 1997, p. 30). The students that colleges and universities educate today will be community leaders in the years to come. The effect their development has on their ability to act and react civilly has a profound community impact in future years. "The very fabric of our national community depends on the degree to which we care about and treat each other with respect to community" (Berman, 1998, p. 27). The lack of civility is evident in many parts of society. To educate the leaders of the future to act civilly could alter the way community members treat each other in the future.

Curriculum changes could lead to the type of character development that initiates civil behavior and attitudes. Berman (1998) suggests a curriculum that focuses on the themes of empathy, ethics, and service. With this model, students learn perspective taking, conflict resolution, assertiveness, trustworthiness, respect, responsibility, justice, fairness, caring, and citizenship. Students also get an opportunity to explore their roles in society. Service-learning, the integration of community service into curricula, can provide students with a greater understanding of their impact on communities.

Trevakis and Jenkins (1997) believe service learning gives students the real life practice they need to develop healthy self-esteems and productive relationships with others. "To promote civility, nurture character, and develop civic commitments in young people requires that we reconnect them with their community, help them understand and appreciate others and show them that they can make a difference" (Berman, 1998, p. 28). The larger connection to

community gained by interacting in service learning and volunteer opportunities can greatly impact the nature of civil interaction among students and between students and faculty. "Pro-social behavior is stimulated not so much by the traditional constructs of efficacy and locus of control but by much deeper sources—one's sense of self and one's morality, one's sense of connectedness to others and to a sense of meaning that comes from contributing to something larger than oneself" (Berman, 1998, p. 28). The deep understanding of community, responsibility, and justice can heal the disappointment and resentment that lead students to uncivil behavior.

On the university campus, "a sense of community and being appreciated and valued by the faculty and staff" (Sanders & Bauer, 1998, p. 15) can greatly impact a student's behavior, therefore, potentially decreasing the likelihood that they will act in ways contrary to the community's values. Student affairs administrators should seek ways to foster a sense of community in the university and to encourage faculty and staff to appreciate the students with whom they work. Student affairs professionals should work to develop more personal relationships between students and faculty. By including faculty in students' lives outside the classroom, student affairs professionals can contribute to students' understanding of the human worth of faculty and the faculty's understanding of the worth of the students.

Mentor relationships also can be influential in impacting the students' development and the civility on college campuses. Most undergraduate institutions provide multiple opportunities for their students' academic and intellectual development. "Undergraduate education in America could be improved if more attention were given to the emotional and social development of students" (Willimon, 1997, p. 7). Well-rounded students, or those students who have the opportunity to develop more than just their intellectual abilities, will have a better grasp of their role in society and how their morals influence them. Skills formed through the development of their emotional and social lives enable students to behave civilly in their community. However, professors may require help in learning the skills necessary for aiding the social and emotional development of students. Student affairs administrators should not only aid students through this part of their development, but should also train faculty in the potential and importance of their roles.

Another area that could influence the degree of civility on campus may simply occur in the classroom, in a setting where faculty and students have the opportunity to express themselves and to be heard by one another. Student affairs professionals possess the facilitation skills that may assist professors in maintaining civil discourse in their classrooms. An opportunity should be awarded to the faculty to learn these skills. Provided such an opportunity, student affairs professionals and faculty could not only share useful facilitation

techniques, but also find allies in their mission to create the leaders of tomorrow. Academic and student affairs leaders should provide opportunities for the employees in their divisions to share ideas that work and to establish consistent expectations of each other, their peers, and their students.

Sanctioning aberrant behavior may be another way to deter uncivil behavior. "Although we might not use uncivil language ourselves, we nevertheless reinforce it when we tolerate it by our silent consent" (Heinemann, 1996, p. 26). To address this issue, Myers (2001) suggests weighing classroom decorum as part of the students' grades. "Conduct such as arriving on time and waiting for formal dismissal, not leaving class unless there is a substantial health problem, keeping electronic devices disabled, and making thoughtful, not pejorative, comments are all included in my definition of proper classroom decorum" (p. 11). If students were penalized for their behavior by professors, they may begin to understand the importance and consequences of their actions. Professors should maintain honest communication about their expectations. Clarifying appropriate classroom decorum and faculty-student relationships on the first day of class could help set an influential tone for future interactions.

Besides faculty involvement in encouraging appropriate behavior, the institution can incorporate civic virtues into other areas of the university community. One way may be to create an environment that helps students clarify their personal values, including respect of the dignity of every human. "Valuing in decision making" is a competency that should be measured in all graduates (King, 1997, p. 92). King believes that "when all is said and done, the college should encourage each student to develop the capacity to judge wisely in matters of life and conduct" (p. 92). Value clarification activities can help students identify what they believe is appropriate for interactions between individuals.

The factors influencing the faculty-student relationship are complex and multifaceted. Regardless of how instrumental one factor may seem in solving the problem of incivility on college campuses, the reality is that each factor contributes to the larger campus climate. The consumer age may mean that students are more demanding when their expectations are not met, but their emotional management skills fail to suppress any inappropriate behavior. The diversity on college campuses may contribute to the tension between students and faculty, but the professor's lack of training in teaching, crises management, and communication skills promotes an environment of disrespectful behavior and misunderstanding. The influences mentioned in this article make up only a small portion of the factors that have molded the campus community. However, each is important to examine and to address. "The goal is not to indoctrinate students, but to set them free in the world of ideas and provide a climate in which ethical and moral choices can be thoughtfully examined and convictions formed" (King, 1997, p. 92). Universities play a vital role in the development of

the citizens of our communities. To encourage uncivil behavior through silent consent only will lead to communities and businesses filled with mistrust and a disregard for the individual. Colleges and universities are a place to change the direction in which societies are working and to create a more civil future.

References

The American Heritage Dictionary (3rd ed.). (1996). Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Berman, S. M. (1998, May). The bridge to civility: Empathy, ethics, service. *The School Administrator, 55*(5), 27-32.

Blake, J. H. (1982). Beyond civility: Human relations and the academy. Integrated Education. *Center for Equal Education, 20*(3-5), 50-56.

Boggs, D. L. (1992). *Adult civic education* (Report No. EDO-CE-92-129). Columbus, Ohio: Office of Educational Research and Improvement (Ed.), (ERIC Digest No. 129)

Chassey, R. A. (1999). A comparison of moral development of college student behavioral offenders and non-offenders. *Research Reports,* 1-14.

Dual, D. A., & Pardo, I. F. (1995). Universities and community health: A national dialogue for improving the quality of life. *The Educational Record, 73*(1), 36-43.

Evans, N. J., Forney, D. S., & Guido-DiBrito, F. (1998). Chapter ten: Kohlberg's theory of moral development. *Student Development in College* (pp. 171-185). San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass Publishing.

Freedman, T. (1981, Summer). Is civility on campus threatened? *The Educational Record,62*(3), 51-53.

Gaudiani, C. L. (1997). Catalyzing community: The college as a model of civil society. *The Educational Record, 78*(3-4), 80-86.

Heinemann, R. L. (1996, November). *Addressing campus-wide communication incivility in the basic course: A case study.* Paper presented at the meeting of the SCA Annual Convention, San Diego, CA.

Holton, S. A. (1999). After the eruption: Managing conflict in the classroom. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 77*, 59-68.

King, P. M. (1997, Summer). Character and civic education: What it takes. *Educational Research, 78*(3-4), 87-93.

Kuhlenschmidt, S. L. (1999). Promoting internal civility: Understanding our beliefs about teaching and students. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 77*, 13-22.

Leatherman, C. (1996, March 8). Whatever happened to civility in academe? [Electronic version]. *The Chronicle of Higher Education.*

Levine, A., & Cureton, J. (1998a). *When hope and fear collide.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishing.

Levine, A., & Cureton, J. (1998b, March-April). What we know about today's college student. *About Campus*, 4-9.

Levinson, A. (2000, January 24). High school seniors bored, worry about loans. *AP National Writer*. Retrieved January 9, 2002, from http://www.schooladministrator.net/previous-news-jan26-00.html.

Loeb, P. R. (1999, July-August). Soul of citizen. *UTNE Reader*, pp. 46-48, 52-53.

Losyk, B. (1997, May 1). *Generation X, what are they like*. Retrieved December 8, 2000, from http://www.elibrary.com.

Marks, J. (1996, April 22). The American uncivil wars. *U.S. News and World Report*, 66-72.

Myers, F. J. (2001, January). The dialogue. *National Education Association Newsletter*, 11.

Newton, F. B. (2000, November-December). The new student. *About Campus*, 8-15.

Patrick, J. J. (1997, June). *Global trends in civic education for democracy* (Report No. EDO-SO-97-1). Columbus, Ohio: Office of Educational Research and Improvement (Ed.), (ERIC Digest No. ED410176).

Sanders, L. E., & Bauer, K. W. (1998). Undergraduate students today: Who are they? *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 98, 7-16.

Schneider, A. (1998). Insubordination and intimidation signal the end of classroom decorum in many classrooms. *The Chronicle of Higher Education, 44*(29), pp. A12, 1-6.

Stark, J. S. & Associates. (1977). *The many faces of educational consumerism*. Lexington, KY: Lexington Books, D.C. Health and Company.

Tiberius, R. G., & Flak, E. (1999). Incivility in dyadic teaching and learning. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 77*, 3-12.

Trevakis, D. K., & Jenkins, M. (1997, Spring). Civitas and the professional school: A look at the civic responsibility of higher education. *Expanding Boundaries, 2*, 70-73.

Varlotta, L. E. (1997, Winter). Invoking a university's mission statement to promote diversity, civility, and free speech. *NASPA Journal, 34*(2), 123-133.

Willimon, W. H. (1997, September-October). Has higher education abandoned its students? *About Campus*, 4-9.

Yates, A. (1999). *Fall Address*, September 14, 1999. Retrieved December 9, 2000, from http://www.pres.colostate.edu/speeches/fallad99.html

---

Rebecca Newman-Gonchar ('01) currently works at Colorado College as the Assistant to the Dean of Students and Apartment Manager.

Academic Integrity and the Student Affairs Professional

Zane S. Reif

Academic integrity has become a controversial topic in higher education as academic administrators, faculty, student affairs professionals, and students try to determine the difference between honesty and dishonesty in academia. Policies regarding academic dishonesty are unclear at most institutions, leaving students uninformed about what constitutes cheating. Rapidly changing technology and examples of unethical behavior in society make it difficult for faculty to keep abreast of imperfections in the classroom. At some universities, the responsibility of teaching moral and ethical behavior has been turned over to student affairs professionals; thus, academic integrity can be reviewed as a reflection of the teachings and developmental techniques used by these practitioners. The author will discuss relationships between academic and student affairs and outline student attitudes about academic dishonesty.

"Cheating, plagiarism, the falsification of credentials, and other forms of misrepresentation by students, faculty members, and administrators at all levels of education have reached epidemic proportion" (Desruisseaux, 1999, p. A45). According to a 1998 study conducted by the Josephson Institute of Ethics, nearly 70% of middle and high school students admitted to cheating on an exam during the course of an academic year (McCabe, 1999). These influxes of students are the current leaders of colleges and universities around the country; therefore, it is imperative that students are taught to be ethical decision-makers and are given knowledge about what constitutes academic misconduct. Cheating, according to Risacher and Slonaker (1996), includes the following items:

1. Submitting material that is not yours as part of your course performance, such as copying from another student's exam, or allowing a student to copy from your exam.
2. Using information or devices that are not allowed by the faculty; such as using formulas or data from a computer program, or using unauthorized materials for a take-home exam.
3. Obtaining and using unauthorized material, such as a copy of an examination before it is given.
4. Fabricating information, such as data for a lab report.

5. Violating procedures prescribed to protect the integrity of an assignment, test, or other evaluation.
6. Collaborating with others on assignments without the faculty's consent.
7. Cooperating with or helping another student to cheat.
8. Other forms of dishonest behavior, such as having another person take an examination in your place; or, altering exam answers and requesting the exam be regraded; or, communicating with any person during an exam, other than the exam proctor or faculty. (p. 119)

Furthermore, according to Risacher and Slonaker (1996), plagiarism, a common type of cheating, can be categorized into one of three criteria:

1. Directly quoting the words of others without using quotation marks or indented format to identify them.
2. Using sources of information (published or unpublished) without identifying them.
3. Paraphrasing materials or ideas of others without identifying resources. (p. 120)

There is a growing concern for postsecondary institutions to develop academic integrity and a moral conscience in today's students. Faculty do not believe developing an individual's character is part of their job description, and academic administrators do not have the time or resources to cultivate programs aimed at moral enhancement (Schwartz, 2000); therefore, the burden has fallen into the hands of the student affairs professional.

According to McCabe and Drinan (1999), students are confronted with both academic and social pressures to succeed. A student may justify cheating in order to maintain a minimum grade point average for financial aid, to gain acceptance into graduate school, or to land the perfect job after graduation. More than ever before, parents view college as simply providing "the facts, tools, and skills needed to ensure their child's future occupational success" (Schwartz, 2000, p. A68). Parents do not believe faculty or administrators are at institutions of higher education to foster character, rather they believe universities exist to produce a diploma so that their children may move on with their lives and find gainful employment.

The author will present the argument for joint collaboration between academic and student affairs, define the roles student affairs professionals play in the enigma, and offer possible solutions for both sides of higher education. By reviewing these findings, one can begin to understand academic integrity and develop solutions on college campuses around the country.

Description

Developing academic integrity can only be accomplished after understanding the cause of its demise in higher education. According to McCabe and Drinan (1999), there are several issues institutions must address to curtail academic dishonesty, including:

1. Inadequate administrative support for academic policies and procedures.
2. Inequitable systems to adjudicate suspected violations of policy.
3. Few programs that promote academic integrity among all segments of the campus community.
4. Lack of awareness of new educational trends affecting academic integrity on campuses.
5. Little guidance about how advancing technology raises new questions about cheating.
6. No regular assessment of the effectiveness of policies and procedures to encourage academic integrity. (p. B7)

According to Schneider (1999), administrative support for academic policies and procedures has been minimal. Judicial processes are considered time-consuming and punishments are often nominal when compared with the "crime." Receiving negative publicity and excessive bureaucracy are justifications for faculty to shun reporting cases of academic dishonesty (McCabe & Drinan, 1999). In addition, judicial boards have undermined "professorial confidence" by overturning guilty verdicts of cheating because the case had not been "proved beyond a reasonable doubt" (Schneider, 1999, p. A9). Additionally, threats of physical violence and implied legal prosecution by students have hampered the willingness of some professors to report misconduct to the administration as they would "prefer to deal with cheaters in the privacy of their own offices" through means such as suspension, make-up projects, and withdrawals (p. A9).

Few university judicial systems have procedures designed to act against academic dishonesty on a consistent basis. Judicial panels adjudicate students on a case-by-case basis, thus relying on individual testimony and factual information collected in the classroom. "Often, different procedures are followed by different divisions or schools at the same institution—and sometimes even within the same division or school" (McCabe & Drinan, 1999, p. B7). Most students are unaware of what constitutes academic dishonesty because they have not been educated about it. Faculty are unaware of how to advise students about specific forms of cheating and plagiarism, and administrators are unclear on how to deal with university judicial cases of dishonesty when they occur (Moon, 1999).

Academic organizations promoting honesty and character development are relatively nonexistent on college campuses, which means faculty and academic administrators rely on student affairs professionals to coordinate this area. Often, faculty and academic administrators do not have the time or knowledge to develop honor codes or present workshops focusing on academic policies, which often means that programs designed to foster civility and cultural relativism come from student affairs professionals with little input from other academic areas on campus (McCabe & Drinan, 1999). "The challenge for higher education is to establish character development as a high institutional priority. Sustained leadership is needed to articulate the expectations of personal and civil responsibility in all dimensions of learning and living on a college campus" (Schwartz, 2000, p. A68). Ultimately, consistency and education are the key ingredients in deterring academic misconduct amongst students.

Universities focus on defining what behavior is inappropriate, rather than promoting the values of honesty, trust, fairness, respect, and responsibility (Wilson, 1999). The Center for Academic Integrity has incorporated these five values into their fundamental principles, thus revolutionizing attitudes toward academic dishonesty. Faculty are realizing the need to become proactive in fighting academic dishonesty, rather than reacting to the occurrences on a case-by-case basis (Drinan, 1999). Renard (1999) agrees; she focuses on developing student pride in higher-level thinking and adjusting traditional assignments to be more "cheat-resistant" and creative. By adjusting teaching techniques, faculty can deter dishonest practices and define the values, which higher education institutions desire to promote.

Educational trends, like enhanced computer assignments and group projects, encourage academic dishonesty and present students with opportunities to cheat or collaborate in unethical ways. Technology is changing the way students cheat as the Internet makes it almost impossible for professors to detect plagiarism. Administrators have been tentative in prosecuting Internet plagiarism because most academic policies are outdated and most professors are ill equipped to understand the ramifications of this new technology (McCabe & Drinan, 1999). "The most popular sites are equipped with a search engine so that students can find a paper on any topic in any content area with ease. Many include a free e-mail news-update service to alert students when new topics are available" (Renard, 1999, p. 40). Advanced technology and the emphasis on collaborative learning have called upon educational practitioners to reform academic integrity systems nationwide (Drinan, 1999).

The final issue concerning academic integrity concerns the inadequacy of assessment tools once procedures and policies have been incorporated. Honor codes have been a traditional way of dealing with academic dishonesty; however, they are "rooted in a campus tradition of mutual trust and respect

among students and between faculty members and students" (McCabe & Drinan, 1999, p. B7). Students policing each other takes a commitment from the entire student population, and many times they are reluctant to take ownership of a system requiring them to confront peers about academic dishonesty (Drinan, 1999).

Plagiarism and cheating are often difficult to detect, and the severity of the crime varies case-by-case. A solution for one case of plagiarism does not necessarily mean it will transfer successfully to the next one. The Center for Academic Integrity is in the process of designing and testing guidelines that will assess the effectiveness of higher education institutions at combating academic dishonesty (Drinan, 1999). These guidelines have been broken down into three distinct areas:

1. Elaborate on the intellectual and moral components that define academic integrity.
2. Suggest institutional approaches to reinforcing academic integrity at any institution of higher education.
3. Advance assessment of academic integrity as a "best practice" during accreditation of self-studies. (p. 32)

Academic integrity is a gray area that professors, administrators, and students are unwilling to discuss, much less regulate or pass judgment upon. According to Drinan (1999), "Academic integrity concerns will be at a takeoff point in American higher education when faculty begin to see integrity as a complement to academic freedom, not as a challenge to it" (p. 33). The National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA) agrees with Drinan and points out that student affairs professionals should be involved in the judicial process as advisors, not decision makers (Risacher & Slonaker, 1996). The role of the student affairs officer is often unclear in instances of academic misconduct; therefore, caution must be taken to make faculty and academic administrators more aware of techniques that gauge a student's moral development and foster cooperation amongst the various campus departments in encouraging academic honesty. Student affairs professionals have a responsibility to share their knowledge with faculty in order to gain an understanding of a student's academic and societal expectations. By encouraging moral development and preventing academic dishonesty from occurring, student affairs professionals may create a culture of honesty, trust, fairness, respect, and responsibility (Dwyer & Hecht, 1996).

Recommendations

The author agrees with Dwyer and Hecht (1996) in recognizing that prevention of academic dishonesty is a better solution than reacting through discipline.

Identifying situations that are vulnerable to student collaboration and discussing boundaries for plagiarism will discourage the amount of cheating and dishonesty that occurs (Moon, 1999). Renard (1999) believes students must be held accountable for academic dishonesty; however, having students take pride in their creative work and assigning topics that are interesting and unique will curtail dishonest situations. She further presents key elements essential for faculty in designing "cheat-resistant" papers:

> Be aware of how and why students may plagiarize, avoid using the same topics year after year, make topics specific rather than generic, choose topics of high interest to students, tie topics to the students' experiences, require higher-level thinking skills, require creative responses, provide a range of topic choices that fit the objective, engage students in all phases of the writing process, and teach and practice source documentation. (p. 41)

In addition, student affairs professionals must create a consistent judicial process for reporting and judging verdicts on cases of academic dishonesty. This responsibility embraces procedural communication of student and faculty rights, and justification of rulings and sanctions. Drinan (1999), has developed four hypothetical stages to foster communication:

1. An inchoate, primitive stage where there is an ill-formed institutional academic integrity policy.
2. The institutional "radar screen" stage where administrators and faculty interest in developing common standards arises out of concern about legal problems, or, more typically, embarrassingly inconsistent application of rules by faculty and administration.
3. Institutionalized systems requiring regular organizational attention.
4. An honor code system where students are empowered to enforce the code and socialize the student body to it. (p. 33)

Administrators must create an environment where both faculty and students are comfortable discussing the prevention of academic misconduct and where judicial processes are both timely and consistent. Once accomplished, "professorial confidence" will increase while student ethical violations will decrease (Schneider, 1999).

Student affairs professionals must be knowledgeable about their roles with respect to academic integrity, as this will foster input related to moral development and ways to create judicial fairness. Academic discipline develops character in future leaders and strengthens the integrity of the higher education institution by having students be more responsible and aware of personal decisions (Risacher & Slonaker, 1996). One philosophy in student affairs is that students are good; therefore, students may exhibit behavior not necessarily

indicative of their character when going through the maturation process. "The 'developmental' view, however, suggests that it is foolhardy to think that only students who cheated in high school will be academically dishonest in college" (Schwartz, 2000, p. A68). Debates rage on whether academic misconduct is a problem associated with faculty and curriculum, or if it is a problem associated with behavioral problems learned at home (Risacher & Slonaker, 1996). According to most academic and student affairs professionals, misconduct cases are handled improperly due to policy inadequacy and limited time commitment by faculty.

Kohlberg's Theory of Moral Development may shed light on other aspects of a student's personal growth as the theory can detail the developmental stage of those who attempt academic misconduct. These students are likely found at the preconventional level of development, which contains two stages: heteronymous morality and individualistic, instrumental morality. In heteronymous morality, "individuals justify actions based on avoidance of punishment and the superior power of authorities" (Evans, Forney and Guido-DiBrito, 1998, p. 174). Students do not see themselves as doing anything wrong because they are not punished or they are not aware that their behavior is dishonorable. Generally, students in this stage do not know they are doing anything wrong because they have never been taught academic honesty. Individualistic, instrumental morality implies that "individuals...follow rules if it is in their best interest to do so" (Evans, Forney, and Guido-DiBrito, 1998, p. 174). Students in this stage are focused on self-needs without regard to the negative impact their actions will have on other students as well as the integrity of the institution. Students know that what they are doing is wrong and how to avoid it, but choose not to because their ambitions are self-centered.

With this theory in mind, understanding the challenges faced by faculty, administrators, and student affairs professionals allows one to make equitable judgments about the development and prevention of academic dishonesty. The procedures must be discussed and universities must understand the environment in which students are maturing. Technological advances have made campuses more complex and have decreased student accountability, while value systems have changed to reflect this deficiency (McCabe & Drinan, 1999). Doing what is right is not as important as doing what is necessary to get by in the academic world, whether it involves deliberate acts of dishonesty or not.

Conclusion

One cannot more vigorously stress the point that academic dishonesty must be prevented rather than prosecuted through judicial sanction. The learning process must start at the beginning of each class, and development must occur under

both the academic and social umbrellas. Faculty, academic administrators, and student affairs professionals must share the responsibility of educating students about morality and character. "One does not have to be a critic of higher education to realize that the current national preoccupation with questions of morality and character may provide a catalyst to strengthening both academic integrity and the related virtue of academic freedom" (Drinan, 1999, p. 33).

There are more tangible solutions to the problem of academic misconduct, yet they too are products of a collaborative effort between academic and student affairs. Hollinger and Lanza-Kaduce (1996) provide several examples, suggested by students, which could be helpful in curtailing scholastic dishonesty (see table 1).

Table 1

Perceived Effectiveness of Countermeasures

Rank	Total Sample (N=1,672)	Cheaters (n=1,139)	Non-cheaters (n=533)
1. Scramble tests	81.6	80.3	84.6b
2. Small classes	69.8	69.8	71.5
3. Several proctors	68.4	67.4	70.5
4. Unique makeup's	68.4	67.1	71.1
5. 2+ forms of exams	66.6	65.5	69.0
6. Use study sheets	54.8	56.6a	50.9
7. More essays	54.8	55.2	53.3
8. Pass out old exams	52.4	54.8a	47.8
9. Check Ids	46.9	45.8	49.7
10. Give different assignments	42.8	42.1	44.3
11. Specific paper topics	30.2	28.6	33.5
12. Marked answer book	29.5	28.8	31.1
13. Names on test books	26.9	28.0	29.3
14. Assign seats	26.9	25.3	30.3b
15. Check footnotes	26.4	27.4	24.3
16. >Exams, <take homes	23.7	22.8	25.6
17. Pencil only exams	22.7	21.4	25.8
18. No leaving exam	22.1	22.0	22.1
19. <Exams, >take homes	17.5	19.7a	12.7
20. "Hot line" to report	16.0	14.5	19.0b

Note 1. The values are in percent of those indicating countermeasures as either "effective" or "very effective."
a On these three items cheaters felt these countermeasures were more effective than did non-cheaters (p<.05).
b On these three items non-cheaters felt these countermeasures were more effective than did cheaters (p<.05).
Note 2. From "Academic Dishonesty and the Perceived Effectiveness of Countermeasures: An Empirical Survey of Cheating at a Major Public University," by R. C. Hollinger & L. Lanza-Kaduce, 1996, *NASPA Journal, 33.*

While students had many suggestions regarding the deterrence of cheating and plagiarism, it is through support of the instructor and development of the student that unethical values are deterred. To prevent academic dishonesty, faculty need the proper supplemental resources (technology) and staff (clerical and teaching assistants) that many institutions cannot afford (Hollinger & Lanza-Kaduce, 1996). Student affairs professionals must be proactive in talking to students about issues regarding dishonesty in the classroom by relating it to practical experiences within the culture of the campus and eventually, within the culture of the workplace.

> Enhancing a culture of academic integrity requires a strategic plan that accurately identifies the stage of academic integrity at an institution, mobilizes key facilitators, depreciates barriers between stages, provides for socialization of new students and new faculty into the academic integrity system, and embeds thinking about academic integrity into virtually all deliberations on a campus. (Hendershott, Drinan, & Cross, 2000, p. 596)

"Although strategies and approaches may differ, our common goal should be to encourage and inspire students to develop and rely on their own moral compass—despite enormous pressures to the contrary. That is the mark of character" (Schwartz, 2000, p. A68). The student affairs professional has a difficult task of limiting the amount of judicial involvement in academic misconduct so that faculty and academic administrators will become as or more responsible for student development and integrity.

References

Desruisseaux, P. (1999, April 30). Cheating is reaching epidemic proportions worldwide. *The Chronicle of Higher Education, 45*(34), A45.

Drinan, P. F. (1999). Loyalty, learning & academic integrity. *Liberal Education, 85*(1), 28-33.

Dwyer, D. J. & Hecht, J. B. (1996). Using statistics to catch cheaters: Methodological and legal issues for student personnel administrators. *NASPA Journal, 33*, 125-135.

Evans, N. J., Forney, D. S., & Guido-DiBrito, F. (1998). *Student development in college: Theory, research and practice.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Hendershott, A., Drinan, P. & Cross, M. (2000). Toward enhancing a culture of academic integrity. *NASPA Journal, 37*, 587-597.

Hollinger R. C. & Lanza-Kaduce, L. (1996). Academic dishonesty and the perceived effectiveness of countermeasures: An empirical survey of cheating at a major public university. *NASPA Journal, 33*, 292-306.

McCabe, D. L. (1999). Academic dishonesty among high school students. *Adolescence, 34*(136), 681-687.

McCabe, D. L., & Drinan, P. F. (1999, October 15). Toward a culture of academic integrity. *The Chronicle of Higher Education, 57*(4), B7.

Moon, J. (1999). How to stop students from cheating. *The Times Higher Education Supplement, 1400*, 28-29.

Renard, L. (1999). Cut and paste 101: Plagiarism and the net. *Educational Leadership, 57*(4), 38-42.

Risacher, J. & Slonaker, W. (1996). Academic misconduct: NASPA institutional members' views and a pragmatic model policy. *NASPA Journal, 33*, 105-124.

Schwartz, A. J. (2000, June 9). It's not too late to teach college students about values. *The Chronicle of Higher Education, 46*(40), A68.

Schneider, A. (1999, January 22). Why professors don't do more to stop students who cheat. *The Chronicle of Higher Education, 45*(20), A8-A10.

Wilson, R. (1999, October 15). Colleges urged to better define academic integrity and to stress its importance. *The Chronicle of Higher Education, 46*(8), A18.

Zane S. Reif ('02) currently works at Colorado State University as a Program Advisor in the Lory Student Center and is a graduate student in the Student Affairs in Higher Education program.

An Explanation of the Bennett Model of Intercultural Sensitivity

Wendy S. Stultz

M. J. Bennett's model of intercultural sensitivity examines the various stages a person developing cultural competence may experience, and in what ways. Intercultural sensitivity is not an end result, but rather a continuum of increasing awareness of differences and similarities. Encompassed in it are the unique viewpoints that result from interaction and increased knowledge about people outside of one's own cultural parameters. A person may relate to different cultures in different ways, and consequently may be in multiple stages simultaneously. This article explains the process of development through the stages, discusses the relevance of the model to today's students, and reflects on the possible strategies of a cultural trainer or "guide" to assist learners through their development.

Human beings are ethnocentric by nature, holding themselves apart from those who are different. The unknown is often feared or ignored. This internal and societal desire to separate from the unknown explains the development, learning, and internalization of unique and complex cultures by different peoples of the world, and the subsequent uneasiness with the cultural ways of other groups. Currently, technology in all its myriad forms and ready access to information encourages the understanding of others. It is established that "international awareness and knowledge are important in the total being of an individual living in our contemporary times" (Barnhart & Groth, 1987, p. 78). Anyone who has an interest in becoming aware of cultural differences will benefit from intercultural exposure. This article will trace the theoretical progression of an individual who is developing intercultural sensitivity, by suggesting activities and guided interactions that will assist the learner.

M. J. Bennett (1986) perceives the continuation of ethnocentrism not only as unprofitable, but also as destructive in today's globally oriented community. His developmental model encourages interaction and shared experience to facilitate one's progression from ethnocentrism, which assumes "that the worldview of one's own culture is central to all reality" (M. Bennett, 1986, p. 10), to ethnorelativism, which is the perspective that "cultures can only be understood relative to one another and that particular behavior can only be understood within a cultural context" (p. 26). Ethnorelativism views actions through the lens of one's own culture, and responds to these actions in a culturally appropriate

manner, while not judging cultural actions. This model, and the activities meant to assist individuals through their development of intercultural sensitivity, becomes especially relevant in higher education because students, upon graduation, must be prepared to live in a world where people and institutions are increasingly interdependent (Barrows, Clark & Klein, 1980). Recognizing the increasingly global society, higher education professionals should take on the role of guides, providing encouragement, activities, and support for those who wish to achieve intercultural sensitivity. Their responsibilities can include anything from adapting curriculum, providing international awareness programs, assisting in interpersonal conflicts, or modeling behavior among professionals. With the globalization of campuses and corporations, cultural understanding will allow the learners to live, study, and work in interculturally sensitive environments.

It is difficult to train a person to view culture objectively, especially when he or she has experience with only one culture. Since individuals react to situations differently, no perfect formula exists for "teaching" intercultural sensitivity. M. J. Bennett's (1986) model does not suggest a universal approach to engage individuals in the delicate balance of low- and high-risk experiences, or externally and internally focused experiences, for developing ethnorelativism. One strategy he suggests is to follow the model of Gudykunst and Hammer (1983). The model moves an individual on a continuum from non-threatening ideas through a series of interactions with other cultures and people, to more personal, contextually specific understanding of gestures, comments, and situations. Gudykunst and Hammer's (1983) model works well combined with the levels of depth required for a full understanding and emotionally mature response to the Bennett model since the challenge and personal understanding necessary for the latter stages increases as the learner progresses. One way to facilitate the individual's growth is through interaction with a guide, who has had experience with culture from an ethnorelative stance, but who, by definition of the Bennett Model, has not reached an end of his or her own culture learning. Continued exploration at progressively deeper levels of culture allows the learner to develop a more objective view of culture outside of any one context. Since Bennett's model addresses all levels of depth and emotion, using Gudykunst and Hammer's tool is appropriate when dealing with groups at different stages of sensitivity. Bennett's model can also provide a beneficial encounter to each learner, regardless of prior regardless of where he or she may be on the continuum.

Assumptions of the Bennett Model

The first basic assumption of the Bennett (1986) model is that a person wants to learn about another culture. This idea recognizes that no one can be forced to

understand another person without some internal or external motivation. The second assumption is that each stage requires personal reflection and understanding in order for the learner to progress. If one does not draw conclusions that will require further testing, there is no continued motivation for greater understanding or even interaction with others. The reasons behind the desire for greater understanding may be varied, but almost always lead a person to further questioning, and may cause him or her to examine the construction of his or her own identity. (M. Bennett, 1986) Questions about identity often become another motivating factor for learning a wider scope of views. As exploration continues, it is important for a guide to understand that negative personal experiences may cause the learner to retreat from his or her exploration of culture; these temporary retreats or feelings of superiority and inferiority are not only natural, but may be necessary stages of understanding.

Ethnocentric Stages

Ethnocentrism, on one side of Bennett's model, is characterized by three major stages: 1) a *denial* of differences, including cultural or personal isolation, 2) a *defense* of cultural norms, including denigration of other groups or feelings of cultural superiority, and 3) a *minimization* of difference, either of physical traits or transcendental beliefs (Peace Corps Information Collection and Exchange, 1997). These stages may appear to overlap as all elicit some of the same actions; however, each stage has a unique focus and intent.

Denial

Persons in denial might understand that the world includes many cultures and languages, but believe that these different cultures do not affect them in their home country (M. Bennett, 1986). Many Americans are at this stage because they either refuse to or are unable to fully communicate in another language, thereby constructing barriers to communication. This stage is innocent: reactions form from ignorance rather than an aversion to difference. For example, children start at this stage, often believing that people everywhere speak, or at least think in, whatever language they themselves speak.

Creating physical isolation has become less of a reality as societies have expanded, although the emotional sense of isolation remains strong. Although technology reduces the unknown through increased internet access and widespread media coverage of events, issues of international affairs and diplomacy are generally unknown by the common American citizen. Regardless, a person can easily ignore world news, or may not see the potential impacts the events have on his or her life. Isolation and separation, substages of denial, are

similar in that they both lead to broad generalizations and sweeping cultural stereotypes. Ignorance is an acceptable part of growth and development, and should not deter the guide from assisting a person who wants to learn.

In this stage, a guide could effectively support a student by planning direct interaction with other cultures. This exhibits the world beyond the ethnocentric culture while avoiding discussions that are too deep or personal for this stage of development. This recommendation follows Gudykunst and Hammer's (1983) conception that early experiences should be non-threatening to the learner, or their identity, or worldview. Appropriate activities would include promoting basic awareness through festivals or exhibitions of films, art, music, or dance (M. Bennett & J. Bennett, 1997).

Defense

Being confronted with information different from one's personal assumptions about other cultures may cause defensive reactions. Again, the responses that emerge from this stage are not necessarily malicious, but are essential to the process of understanding other cultures. Defense is commonly the initial reaction to a perceived or internal question of identity. A person at this stage might wonder where he or she fits in the world, and how to adapt to a new conceptualization of culture. Additionally, he or she must determine personal identity in light of this new understanding, as well as examine how these differences were missed before (M. Bennett, 1986).

Denigration, portraying someone or something as inferior, is one level of defense. It is not an isolated dislike for a culture or a race (M. Bennett, 1986). Rather, individuals in this stage still see their own culture as being central, and therefore are quick to devalue other patterns of thought that threaten this reality. Cultural superiority, believing that one's own culture is better than others, may be a separate substage or may be fully mixed with denigration. Differentiating between denigration and cultural superiority is important because superiority is a "positive evaluation of one's own cultural status, not necessarily the denigration of other groups" (M. Bennett, 1986, p. 17). Even though moving to cultural superiority is preferred over a longer period of denigration, it too must be overcome; the more superior one perceives a specific culture to be, the more inferior all others seem.

Reversal is the adoption of another culture as the ideal or preferred situation. This is common when the learner is surrounded by another culture, perhaps having relocated to a different country. This reversal may seem more advanced than other aspects of defense because the learner is actively living within another culture. While less common than denigration or superiority, reversal can

happen to severe extremes, especially in expatriate situations. M. J. Bennett, a returned Peace Corps volunteer from Micronesia, uses Peace Corps volunteers (PCVs) as an example of reversal (M. Bennett, 1986). Since PCVs live in and constantly interact with the host culture, they are forced to conform to it. This adaptation elicits feelings similar to superiority, with the "different" culture reversed to be the native culture of the volunteer. This kind of reversal can cause the same identity problems and intercultural issues as denigration or superiority, but also adds the problem of the PCV negatively portraying his or her native culture to the host country nationals. By the PCV "going native" to feel more comfortable with his or her adopted culture, he or she may become a well informed, but negative, viewer of his or her own culture, which is now the "foreign" culture.

Having pride in one's own culture plays some role in each person's identity and intercultural understanding. Throughout the defense stage, this pride should be acknowledged by the guide, but not reinforced, as this promotes cultural superiority. Comparing general traits between specific cultures may be one activity to foster growth through the defense stage. Cultural traits could include celebrations of holidays, definitions of family, or religious observances. At this stage, it is inappropriate to expect the learner to make objective statements about personal experiences or to perceive other cultures with an open and accepting mind. Recognizing universals and the commonality among cultures and people are key concepts for moving from defense into minimization. In exhibiting universal concepts, the guide should represent the common aspects of culture, such as values or vulnerability. By focusing on the positive, the guide assists the learner in perceiving benefits to culture. "In other words, the antidote to defense is the discovery that everyone is, after all, just human" (M. Bennett, 1986, p. 21).

Minimization

To the untrained observer, minimization may seem like the final goal of ethnorelativism, but it is actually one's last effort to maintain an ethnocentric worldview (M. Bennett & Hammer, 1998). Difference is acknowledged and not viewed negatively; however, difference and uniqueness are trivialized. A person in minimization might see all cultures and people as being basically the same. Peace Corps and many other "world help organizations" have been founded on this kind of thinking, that "one world, one people" have the same needs and desires (Peace Corps Information Collection and Exchange, 1997). The ethnocentrism becomes more clear when the goals of these organizations, or of other people in minimization, are expressed more clearly; the common humanity they search for often means to help others be more like the helper, and less like the original culture.

Both levels of minimization, physical universalism and transcendent universalism, make the assumption that all people are fundamentally the same and prescribe to the same values. Physical universalism relies on the similarities of people, such as body features and human needs. Transcendent universalism implies a more spiritual meaning, focusing on the purposes of existence. Minimization ignores the traditions important in the development of culture and explanations for natural phenomena or other inexplicable entities (M. Bennett, 1986). This stage easily reverts to defense if expectations of communication are not met or equally valued by the other person in the interaction. Since the learner is still ethnocentric in view, he or she assumes commonalities to be present, and may become insistent in challenging other people's behavior when it does not fit these expectations (M. Bennett & Hammer, 1998).

Appropriate activities at this stage would include discussing what makes culture unique, listening to cultural speakers (M. Bennett & J. Bennett, 1997), or initiating contact with a more experienced culture learner. This person should most likely be from a similar cultural background as the learner, but have in depth knowledge and experience with the target culture.

Moving out of minimization produces a paradigm shift from ethnocentrism to ethnorelativism. This is possibly the most difficult movement in the model, as it requires an acknowledgement of a non-absolute reality (M. Bennett, 1986). Activities that can be used to make this shift easier include simulations and increased personal involvement in cross-cultural interactions. An appropriate simulation might include holiday traditions unique to a specific culture, or a simulation game where the learner is encouraged to see fundamental and lasting differences between cultures. The guide should validate the confusion commonly experienced when moving to relativity in order to prevent a retreat to ethnocentrism.

Ethnorelative Stages

Acceptance

Cultural difference is acknowledged openly at this stage. This new relativity and understanding is revealed in two main forms: respect for behavioral differences and respect for value differences (M. Bennett, 1986). Acceptance will often elicit a "honeymoon" phase in cultural sensitivity development because the learner now can find the unique aspects more enjoyable and can gain a deeper understanding through personal reflection and observation.

Both superficial and deeper behavioral differences are now recognized and used to analyze culture (M. Bennett and J. Bennett, 1997). One obvious difference is language. Linguistic theorists such as Whorf (1956) have linked language and culture as essential pieces that need each other to function while being also shaped by one another. In recognizing this interdependence, the person becomes aware that his or her native tongue is foreign to others, yet, with work, both parties can communicate ideas over this barrier. Nonverbal communication, such as gestures and body language also help alleviate problems in language communication (M. Bennett, 1986). As the learner relies more on these cues to decipher messages, he or she notices the differences in norms for these more subtle communications. By realizing the importance of cross-cultural communication, the learner strengthens his or her acceptance of cultural differences and can progress to adaptation through questions, interactions, and cultural reflection.

The Peace Corps explains that society expresses what qualities should be valued and passes them to children who adopt versions of these values, later promoting them as adults (Peace Corps Information Collection and Exchange, 1997). Personal or societal values are relative and based on the history and traditions of the country. To respect these differences is to accept them as valid, even if they seem personally offensive. At this stage, a guide should encourage personal interaction between the learner and someone of another cultural group. Raising personal questions about differing viewpoints may be necessary for continued reflection. The learner should now express respect for others' values and beliefs, and should have some tolerance for ambiguity within cultural situations (M. Bennett & J. Bennett, 1997), which differs sharply from the ethnocentric stages of development.

The learner needs to progress through acceptance with challenge and support. Continual challenges to grow in intercultural sensitivity not only keep the learner involved, but also prevent acceptance from becoming the new basis for ethnocentric behaviors. Adaptation is achieved through the practical application of the new knowledge and the respect gained from interactions. At this level, listening, observing, questioning, and reflecting on philosophical and abstract concepts become effective learning techniques.

Adaptation

Once the framework for appreciating cultural differences is established through an understanding of relativity, skills for communicating with others can be enhanced. Activities to assist the learner would include increased personalized contact with the culture, and real-life opportunities to use the new understanding of values in real situations. These could include visiting another country,

participating in religious observances, or interacting with a host family. These activities allow the learner to "look at the world 'through different eyes' and may intentionally change their behavior" (M. Bennett & Hammer, 1998). It is important to remember with these activities that the learner may be in several stages of intercultural sensitivity as he or she relates to specific cultures. For instance, if the learner's experience were centered on one particular culture, such as Japanese culture, visiting a country that has a completely different culture, such as India, would not be as effective for that learner.

Adaptation is not assimilation. At this stage, the learner no longer fears losing his or her identity, and can explore the differences for what they are, without judging which are better. Learning becomes an additive process, where the learner is blending skills to deal with situations or to improve communication (M. Bennett, 1986). Empathy and pluralism are the abilities to shift worldviews. Empathy is understanding differences and is intentional, incomplete, and temporary. A learner must consciously think about the implications of culture to understand the differing worldview. Pluralism may also be incomplete in cultural knowledge, but is a permanent ability to look at the world through a different lens. Once a learner moves to pluralism, the cultural understanding often is done on a more subconscious level, and becomes an automatic response to intercultural situations.

Empathy is not an emotional response; rather, the learner is actively trying to imagine the situation from the other person's perspective. The learner must study the background, history, and traditions of the culture he or she is attempting to understand in order to be successful (M. Bennett and J. Bennett, 1997). When the available cultural information is incomplete, the learner will still revert to his or her original understanding of the world, but will do so in order to learn the cross-cultural perspective. For example, Bennett (1986) describes an empathetic American student's explanation to an Arab student about the purpose of airplanes, saying "maybe airplanes are like modern camels-conveyances you use to fulfill obligations to friends across some ocean-desert" (p. 33). The interaction demonstrates a respect for the Arab student's geography and possible level of comfort with flying, while using ideas the Arab student will relate to and understand.

Pluralism, to unintentionally shift to a different worldview, is achieved through interaction. The learner needs to have a broad understanding of that cultural frame (M. Bennett, 1986). The learner internalizes the new cultural contexts, and the respect for difference that was exhibited in acceptance becomes a respect for self, thereby understanding him or herself as a part of difference.

It is essential during adaptation that the learner continues his or her interactions with other cultures without judging or evaluating. The guide might increase the

effectiveness of these interactions by introducing new cultures, and might encourage a more personal discussion of situations by the learner. Once a learner knows more than one culture to compare, reflection can be used to see the learner's original culture in a more objective way. Issues of personal or group identity may again come into question as the learner adds viewpoints and feels more comfortable operating within different cultural frames. He or she also may realize the internal shock of being a metaphorical cultural chameleon, not being confined to any specific worldview, but able to adapt to his or her surroundings. If the guide is aware of the potential struggle and handles it in a productive and caring way, the new cultural chameleon will grow to desire a "holistic, coherent sense of self that somehow integrates multiple frames of reference" and will move forward into integration (M. Bennett, 1986, p. 39).

Integration

Integration goes beyond adaptation because the learner is no longer content to view himself or herself as existing within a particular worldview, but wishes to incorporate the new cultural ideas into a "third culture perspective," not solely the native or the learned culture. This new perspective blends the feelings, worldviews, and beliefs of multiple cultures into something that is not claimable by any one cultural group (Pollock & Van Reken, 1987). Each individual is unique in his or her ability to interact with and feel a part of both the home and non-native cultures. The learner must begin to contextually evaluate the values and beliefs of any culture studied in order to incorporate these values into their growing worldview.

Contextual evaluation is necessary to prevent "a multiplistic quagmire where all possible choices and alternative perspectives seem equally good" (M. Bennett, 1986, p. 40). Essentially, the learner has to choose his or her own moral and cultural beliefs, and then look to the external cultural norms within the situation for support or challenge. Not holding convicted beliefs removes the ability of the learner to make moral decisions. One can consciously choose to act in ways that are appropriate to a given culture without giving up personal values, as long as one understands the need and reason to do so.

This ability to place cultural values within context and interpret actions in a culturally sensitive manner sets the learner apart. There are many benefits and challenges to reaching this stage, most of which relate back to the individual's place within culture. If the learner feels marginalized for his or her increased cultural awareness, he or she may feel at a disadvantage within any one cultural group. Constructive marginality, the positive aspect of this ability to view culture objectively, is arguably an advantage to the person who can now live anywhere and adapt or communicate effectively across cultures. A strong sense

of personal identity replaces the need for cultural group identity in many cases (M. Bennett, 1986). As cultural mediators, diplomats, or other international affairs professionals, these ethnorelative people can construct a worldview on demand. It should be stressed that arriving at this stage is not a completion of cultural sensitivity, but rather a further challenge to continue expanding personal worldviews, and to share this intercultural knowledge with others.

Conclusion

The Bennett Model of Intercultural Sensitivity plots the progression of an individual from the most ethnocentric stage of denial through the paradigm shift into ethnorelativism, and finally to integration. As a theoretical model, it covers reactions to difference and changing thought patterns. A guide can provide constant assistance and keep the learner from settling in a stage or reverting to earlier patterns. Many cultural ideals are too different for a learner to readily accept, and so must be introduced as the learner progresses. Reflection and interaction within appropriate activities will aid this progression.

"One does not have culture; one engages in it" (M. Bennett, 1986, p. 32). With so many cultures on the planet, one can spend years or even a lifetime exploring differences and similarities. Coming to understand one's native culture can be difficult, but can be done through comparisons of cultures, values, or beliefs. Growing to understand a culture other than one's own is noble, and gives the learner more insight into the world and its people. Ideally, learners in Bennett's model will have cultural informants or guides to help bring about positive development and ask the deeper questions that explore the underlying aspects of culture. Once the learner understands the process, additional cultures become a personal challenge and a way of life.

References

Barnhart, R. S., & Groth, L. (1987). The assessment of college student growth resulting from an international course and study experience. *College Student Journal, 21.* 78-85.

Barrows, T., Clark, J., & Klein, S. (1980). What students know about their world. *Change, 12,* 10-17.

Bennett, M. (1986). Towards ethnorelativism: A developmental model of intercultural sensitivity. In R. M. Paige (Ed.), *Education for the Intercultural Experience.* Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.

Bennett, M., & Bennett, J. (1997). A developmental model of intercultural sensitivity. In R. M. Paige (Ed.), *Education for the Intercultural Experience.* Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.

Bennett, M., & Hammer, M. (1998). *The developmental model of intercultural sensitivity.* Portland, OR: Intercultural Communication Institute.

Gudykunst, W. B., & Hammer, M.R. (1983). Basic training design approaches to intercultural training. In D. Landis & R. Brislin (Eds.), *Handbook of Intercultural Training, 1.* Elmsford, NY: Pergamon.

Peace Corps Information Collection and Exchange. (1997). *Culture matters: The Peace Corps cross-cultural workbook.* Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Pollock, D., & Van Reken, R. (1987). *Third culture kids.* Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.

Whorf, B. (1956). Science and linguistics. In Milton Bennett (Ed.), *Basic concepts of intercultural communication* (pp. 215-223). Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.

Wendy S. Stultz ('02) currently works at Colorado State University as the International Programs Coordinator for Apartment and Residence Life and Is a graduate student in the Student Affairs in Higher Education program.

Students of Color in Study Abroad Programs

Jill Zambito

Studying abroad is oftentimes considered a life-changing experience for young men and women, one that adds depth and quality to their lives and future careers. This article will discuss a case study examining the positive impact study abroad has on student participants, as well as explore the under-representation of students of color in study abroad programs. To help change perceptions, which discourage students of color from study, abroad, higher education professionals should concentrate their efforts on marketing study abroad opportunities toward this student population.

Studying abroad is a common choice for American college students. Over 71,000 students take advantage of the opportunity each year (Herman, 1996). Young adults often enroll in school and find themselves seeking more than the American classroom experience, extracurricular activities, and part-time employment. These adventurous scholars often travel abroad to experience opportunities that cannot be taught by universities in the United States. Studying abroad allows students to reflect upon their own culture while living in and learning to appreciate another culture. International experiences often result in greater development of interpersonal skills, cultural sensitivity, and global exposure. Although these life lessons can be taught in the United States college classroom, the study abroad immersion experience forces a deeper understanding of the world and its cultures.

Unfortunately, students of color are missing out on the benefits that thousands of Caucasian students enjoy each year (Carroll, 1996). Many students of color desire to study abroad, but most do not make the venture, primarily due to financial concerns. Lack of marketing and outreach to students of color might also be obstacles in recruiting more students of color to study abroad. A lack of opportunity to travel abroad can be detrimental to the satisfaction of students of color during their college years. Ultimately, a lack of international experience and understanding could hinder the success of students of color in the global marketplace they will enter upon graduation (Herman, 1996).

The Benefits of Study Abroad Programs

Study abroad falls under the broad category of experiential learning, a popular concept in higher education. Experiential learning involves increasing one's

overall knowledge by applying what has been learned in the classroom to real life interactions. Some examples of experiential learning include field experiences, internships, living and learning communities, and study abroad (Sachdev, 1997). Experiential learning is not a new concept, as increasing numbers of institutions are encouraging students to participate by providing more of these opportunities. Many programs exist; however, few are directed toward students of color (Sachdev, 1997).

Of the variations of experiential learning available, study abroad is one of the most popular. Much research has been conducted to illustrate the positive impact study abroad has on students. According to Opper, Teichler, and Carlson (1990), study abroad can increase students' academic achievement, foreign language proficiency, cultural awareness, as well as foster changes in students' competence, attitudes and views. Unfortunately, while thousands of college students take advantage of these opportunities, students of color are not often among them.

Study abroad experiences give students new ways to challenge themselves academically, providing intellectual stimulation and opportunities to become more assertive. In many cases, students who participate in study abroad are forced to cope with "noticeable disjunctions in the course of study begun at home" (Opper, Teichler, & Carlson, 1990, p. 80). Identifying differences between their host and home institutions is in itself a learning experience. Study abroad also helps students form strong viewpoints and creates a newfound appreciation for, or sometimes disapproval of, the way practices are conducted at their home institutions. Often, study abroad encourages students to learn to articulate some of the silent opinions they once held. Opper et al. (1990) have found that after a study abroad experience, students became more imaginative, increased their ability to develop a personal point of view and are more able to communicate an opinion. In addition, these researchers found that "the obvious strengthening of students' skills in comparative analysis, and the increase in their familiarity with research internationally in their field, point to the singular influence of study abroad" (p. 81). American students tend to change most in their views about the importance of "becoming familiar with different schools of thought; examining relationships between observations, hypotheses, facts, and concepts; obtaining knowledge from different disciplines; developing one's own point of view; and comparative/international perspectives" (Opper, et al., 1990, p. 81). All too often, students of color are entering the professional world without these vital international skills.

In addition to the various life lessons learned through experiential international education, studying in a country whose dominant language is not English encourages students to develop their foreign language skills, which is "among the most highly prized of students' reasons for going abroad" (Opper, et al.,

1990, p. 82). They hope to further foreign language proficiency, including speaking, listening comprehension, and reading skills. Students often return to the United States more confident about using their language skills and more enthusiastic about using their second language in the future. Once again, many students of color are at a disadvantage because of their limited international immersion.

The Impact of Study Abroad: A Case Study

In 1997, Sachdev, a professor in the School of Social Work at Memorial University in Newfoundland, Canada, conducted a study involving the impact of the study abroad experiences on social work students. He illustrated the need for experiential learning at the collegiate level as a way to increase knowledge and understanding of multiculturalism. Racial and ethic groups in Canada, as opposed to those in the U.S., have been able to maintain their distinct cultures because of the absence of a melting pot approach to multiculturalism. Due to this pluralism, it is necessary that social workers gain skills and attitudes to enable them to interact effectively with people from various cultures and ethnic backgrounds. The Canadian Association of Schools of Social Work deemed necessary a curriculum that would ensure that students pursuing undergraduate and graduate degrees would have an appreciation of cultural diversity. Sachdev (1997) reported that classroom teaching simply could not substitute for experiential learning.

Sachdev's (1997) case study involved four undergraduate students from an Eastern Canadian university who spent eight weeks in New Delhi, India and participated in integrated community development programs. Before the trip, the students underwent an intense orientation program. After arriving in New Delhi, they worked in agencies and participated in activities to remove international barriers. These students also had the opportunity to visit the homes of their New Delhi professors and peers. Professors tested the students before and after their experience abroad. The test results illustrated that the majority of these students showed a favorable change in their attitude toward the people and culture of New Delhi (1997). The positive experiences these students had with study abroad, potentially increased their overall appreciation for cultural diversity, thereby assisting them to become more sensitive social workers.

Excluding Students of Color: The Message Universities Send

While Sachdev's (1997) study demonstrated successful study abroad experience, it did not account for restrictions on access. Financial limitations appear to be one of the most influential factors that discourage students of color from

participating. In the book, *Integrating Study Abroad into the Undergraduate Liberal Arts Curriculum,* Shapiro (as cited in Burn, 1991) indicated that the low number of students of color involved in study abroad programs is related to economic, cultural, and academic factors. Loss of income while abroad and the expenses of living abroad act as deterrents (as cited in Burn, 1991). Carroll (1996), explained that this response was not at all surprising since over 70% of those surveyed received some form of financial assistance.

When examining possible reasons to explain the lack of participation by students of color in study abroad programs, Carroll (1996) looked to the National Association of Foreign Students Advisors (NAFSA) for an answer. She concluded:

> Although real obstacles do exist, especially curricular and economic ones, part of the problem is the perpetuation of individual and institutional assumptions. Such assumptions clearly limit what does and does not happen. One important barrier to study abroad is the widespread misconception of families, students, and their institutions that study abroad is not an achievable goal. Making such an experience for such students 'an achievable goal' therefore remains your primary challenge. How you address these 'misconceptions,' however, depends not only on available resources and precedents but also on your imagination, energy and priorities. (pp. 14-15)

Many prominent international educators concurred, finding that "in addition to financial concerns, family concerns, the lack of foreign language knowledge, and lower grade point averages, often prevent underrepresented students from even considering study abroad" (Carroll, 1996, p. 16). While others disagreed, claiming:

> The reasons that others give as to why minorities do not study abroad are way off the mark. Minorities do not travel abroad because they have not been told that Stafford loans, and other scholarships and grants can be used for study abroad. They are often not aware that there are programs to Africa and the Caribbean. (Carroll, 1996, p. 29)

Although funding seems to be one of the primary obstacles for students of color who consider studying abroad, research indicates that there are multiple resources available.

Other factors hindering students of color from participating in study abroad include: the limited availability of opportunities to study in a country which reflects one's ethnic heritage, the inability to graduate when planned, and the loneliness experienced from missing one's family (Carroll, 1996). Goodwin and Nacht (1988) found:

> One of the insidious features of discrimination in study abroad, as
> in other parts of society, is that it feeds on itself. So long as
> programs are perceived to be designed and reserved for the
> unusually talented, wealthy, young, and white, these are the
> participants that will tend to apply. Moreover, because those with
> some international experience already are most likely to undertake
> study abroad, lack of this experience, like the cycle of poverty,
> becomes self-reinforcing. (pp. 77-78)

A perceived barrier is just as significant a problem as a real barrier. To obtain
her research, Carroll (1996) interviewed students from African American/Black,
Asian/Pacific Islander American, Mexican American/Hispanic, Native
American/Indian and Caucasian/White descent. After compiling the results of
the questionnaires, Carroll (1996) discovered that African American/Black
students demonstrated the greatest concern with potential problems related to
nationality and ethnicity. The majority of the African American/Black student
group and Mexican American/Hispanic students desired to study abroad in a
location that reflected their heritage.

Upper-middle class Caucasian Americans created study abroad programs.
Today, established programs regularly send students to Western Europe and
other predominantly Caucasian nations. To students of color, these opportunities
are not attractive because they lack connection to their ancestors. According to
Goodwin and Nacht (1988):

> Neither the style nor the content is likely to appeal to persons of
> different socio-economic backgrounds and geographic origin.
> Those with Asian, African, Middle-Eastern and Latin American
> ancestors, and especially those from working-class backgrounds,
> may not be charmed by a rented apartment on Oxford High Street
> or a villa overlooking Florence. (pp. 76-77)

Financial difficulties, misconceptions, and overall inappropriate locations of
study combine to discourage students of color from studying abroad.

Recommendations

Although there is no simple solution to obstacles of access, it is essential that
higher education professionals take action to equip all graduates for global
communities. Most importantly, students need to become aware of the abundant
financial resources available for study abroad. For example, the *Financial Aid
for Study and Training Abroad* guide contains 14 scholarships and grants
specifically dedicated to students of color. There are numerous other
scholarship entries available for any student, regardless of race or ethnic
background (Schlachter & Weber, 1996). Also, most colleges and universities
provide the same financial aid and scholarship package to students when they

study abroad as they would for attending classes in the United States. This valuable policy needs to be better advertised and adopted by more institutions. While increased funding will solve some problems, higher education officials must also assess the interest and knowledge of students of color about study abroad program requirements and opportunities. From this assessment, more effective promotion and facilitation of study abroad opportunities for historically underrepresented students can be created.

In addition to marketing programs toward students of color, the creation of alternative and diverse locations for studying abroad is critical. In their research, Goodwin and Nacht (1988) explained that:

> Critics of the current study abroad landscape make the point that marvelous opportunities lie underdeveloped in the third world, offering special characteristics that some students might find especially attractive: the opportunity to combine study with services...open and welcoming cultures with which unsophisticated American students can quickly relate...and low cost. (p. 79)

While it may be difficult to create study abroad programs in developing nations, universities hoping to fulfill the needs of all their students must begin to form new partnerships abroad. It is necessary that study abroad officials visit potential schools to ensure the level of safety for American students.

Another tool for creating interest in study abroad is to appeal to the reality that students are outcome-based. Through the use of testimonials from successful alumni and prominent business leaders, more students will recognize the benefits of the study abroad experience. Hopefully, these efforts, used in combination, will increase the number of students of color participating in study abroad experiences. It is vital that higher education officials recognize the importance of encouraging students of color to learn abroad. These experiences better prepare students for the professional world, giving them the opportunity to be better contributors of this global society. The experience helps them break down the wall between the academic world and the "real world." Students who participate in study abroad not only learn from a professor's notes, but also expand their own knowledge, understanding, leadership potential, and success through their experiences. By acknowledging the absence of students of color in study abroad, and working to increase their recruitment, institutions will not only benefit the student, but also the institution and the future success of study abroad programs.

References

Burn, B. (1991). *Integrating study abroad into the undergraduate liberal arts curriculum.* Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Carroll, A. (1996). *The participation of historically underrepresented students in study abroad programs: An assessment of interest and perception of barriers.* Unpublished master's thesis, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colorado.

Goodwin, C. & Nacht, M. (1988). *Abroad and beyond: Patterns in American overseas education.* New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Herman, N. (1996). *The impact of study abroad experiences on the psychosocial development of college students.* Ann Arbor, MI: A Bell & Howell Information Company.

Opper, S., Teichler, U., & Carlson, J. (1990). *Impacts of study abroad programmes on students and graduates.* London, United Kingdom: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

Sachdev, P. (1997). *Cultural sensitivity training through experiential learning: A participatory demonstration field education project.* Newfoundland, Canada: Memorial University of Newfoundland.

Schlachter, G., & Weber, R. (1996). *Financial aid for study and training abroad.* San Carlos, CA: Reference Service Press.

Jill Zambito ('03) currently works at Colorado State University as a Program Advisor in the Lory Student Center and is a graduate student in the Student Affairs in Higher Education program.

Class of 2001

Each year, students of the graduating
SAHE class conduct original research in
the form of a thesis, or prepare a
professional paper in order to meet
graduation requirements. The Editorial
Board is pleased to share the research
topics from the Class of 2001.

The following is a list of the current
positions of the members of the Class of
2001, followed by the title of their
research. Please feel free to contact the
author if you would like more
information about his or her research. A
copy of each author's thesis or
professional paper is sometimes kept in
the SAHE Library, located in the
Palmer Center on the
Colorado State University campus.

Mercedes Benton
Advisor, Multicultural Student Organizations
Portland State University; Portland Oregon
Do African American Students Need Separate Support Services At Predominantly White Colleges and Universities?

Cindy Braly
Judicial Affairs
Ohio University; Athens, Ohio
Atheist Students: An Invisible Minority

Chris Bryner
Residence Life and Student Activities
Shelton Jackson College; Sitka, Alaska
Campus Ecology and Civility: The Relationship of Campus Artifacts to the University Compact

Lisa Campos
Judicial Affairs
University of Texas; El Paso, Texas
First Year Transitional Experiences of First Generation Rural Latino/a Students

Jessica Chavez
Graduate Student, Law
University of Colorado; Boulder, Colorado
Assessing the Needs of Latino Greek Letter Organizations

Craig Chesson
Assistant Director, Residence Life
Colorado State University; Fort Collins, Colorado
Black Issues Forum: A Cooperative Program to Recruit African American Students to Predominantly White Institutions

Scott Coenen
New Student Orientation
University of Minnesota; Minneapolis, Minnesota
Evaluating the Applicability of the Emotional Intelligence Construct to Graduate Preparation Programs in Student Affairs

Glenn DeGuzman
Assistant Director, Asian Pacific Student Services
Colorado State University; Fort Collins, Colorado
The Decline in Persistence of Men in Higher Education

Kerry Knowlton
Area Coordinator, Residence Life
University of Northern Colorado; Greeley, Colorado
*Distilling Theatrical Juices: A Phenomenological Study of Student
Development Through Theater Involvement*

Becky Newman-Gonchar
Assistant Dean of Students
Colorado College; Colorado Springs, Colorado
Civility in Higher Education

Jeremy Page
Area Coordinator
California Polytechnic; San Luis Obispo, California
Current Administrative Perceptions of Student Activism on Campus

Jose-Luis Riera
Campus Ministry
Drexel University; Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
*Hope for the World: Using Services to Revive Spiritual Development on
the College Campus*

Jacqui Sene
Coordinator of International Education
Colorado State University; Fort Collins, Colorado
*Third Culture Kids: College Student Development Theory Application
and Implementation*

Tara Stormoen
Assistant Director, Campus Programs
Macalester College; Saint Paul, Minnesota
*Institutional Initiatives and Distribution Methods as a Result of the 2000
ACUI/EBI Student Union/Student Center Survey*

Nick Sweeton
Residence Life Coordinator
Humboldt State University; Arcata, California
*At a Crossroads:The State of Affirmative Action Policies and Practices
in Higher Education*

Deb Timms
Hall Director, Residence Life
Colorado State University; Fort Collins, Colorado
*Common Ground: A Comparative Study of Faith and Moral
Development Theory to Facilitate Discourse on Faith and Spirituality
within Student Affairs*

Tory Volden
Residence Hall Coordinator
University of Alaska; Anchorage, Alaska
Residence Hall Design: Meeting Student and University Needs

Sarah Woodside
Coordinator for Residential Education
University of California; Santa Cruz, California
*A Qualitative Study of Female Student Perceptions of Gender Roles
While Studying Abroad in Latin American Countries*

Lance Wright
Student Union / Student Activities
University of Illinois; Urbana-Champagne, Illinois
*The Student Voice: An Examination of the Ingersoll Residential College
Using the College Experiences Questionnaire*

Colorado State University *Journal of Student Affairs*

Guidelines for Manuscript Preparation*

Purpose

Manuscripts should be written for the Student Affairs generalist who has broad responsibility for educational leadership, policy, staff development, and management. Articles with specialized topics, such as harassment, should be written to provide the generalist with an understanding of the importance of the program area to Student Affairs; such an article should not take the form of a program specialist writing to a program specialist.

The Editorial Board invites submissions of the following types of articles:

* Quantitative, Qualitative, or Emancipatory Research Articles
* Editorial Articles
* Historical Articles
* Opinion/Position Pieces
* Book Reviews

Research articles for the Journal should stress the underlying issues or problem that stimulated the research. Treat the methodology concisely; and most importantly, offer a full discussion of the results, implications, and conclusions.

Procedure

Manuscripts should not exceed 3,000 words (approximately 12 pages of double-spaced, typewritten copy, including references, tables, and figures) and should not be fewer than 1,000 words (approximately four pages). Exceptions should be discussed with the editors prior to submission.

Guidelines for Writing

* Prepare the manuscript, including title page and reference page, in *strict* accordance with the Manuscript and Production section of the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association, Fifth Edition (pages 284-305). For example, space once after the punctuation at the end of sentences (290).

- Include an article abstract and brief description of the author. The abstract should clearly state the purpose of the article and be concise and specific, limited to 120 words. Refer to page 12 of the Publication Manual for assistance.

- Double-space all portions of the manuscript, including references, tables, and figures.

- Avoid bias in language; refer to pages 62-76 of the Publication Manual for assistance.

- Do not use footnotes; incorporate the information into the text.

- Use the active voice as much as possible.

- Check subject/verb agreement, singular/plural.

- Use verb tense appropriately: past tense for the literature review and description of procedures, and present tense for the results and discussion.

- Proofread and double-check all references/citations before submitting your draft.

- Use Microsoft Word (PC version 6.0 or higher is preferred).

- Any article under consideration for publication in a nationally distributed journal may not be submitted to the Colorado State University *Journal of Student Affairs*.

- Please be aware that we will request more specific guidelines for your final revisions. More information will be mailed to you closer to the publication date.

*Adapted from the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators

PAST EDITORS

As we produce the eleventh edition of the Colorado State University *Journal of Student Affairs*, we want to acknowledge those who have laid the foundation for our success.

MANAGING EDITORS

2000-2001 Chris E. Bryner '01

1999-2000 Greg Kish '00

1998-1999 Kirsten Peterson '99

1997-1998 Beth Yohe '98

1996-1997 Ray Gasser '97 & Jocelyn Lowry '97

1995-1996 DeEtta Jones '96 & Michael Karpinski '96

1994-1995 Jeremy Eaves '95 & Alicia Vik '95

1993-1994 Mary Frank '94 & Keith Robinder '94

1992-1993 Jodi Berman '93 & Brad Lau '93

1991-1992 Marie E. Oamek '92

FACULTY ADVISORS

1996-2000 Martha Fosdick ('95), former Assistant to the Vice President for Student Affairs, Colorado State University

1991-1998 Keith Miser, former Vice President for Student Affairs, Colorado State University

COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY
STUDENT AFFAIRS IN HIGHER EDUCATION GRADUATE PROGRAM
PALMER CENTER
1005 WEST LAUREL STREET
FORT COLLINS, CO 80521