Journal of the Indiana University Student Personnel Association

2008 Edition

Contents

INDIANA UNIVERSITY
STUDENT PERSONNEL ASSOCIATION

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

2008 Journal Editors

Eddie R. Cole & Lauren E. Morrill-Ragusea

Review Board

Todd Chamberlain, Danielle De Sawal, Leigh Featherstone,
Yoel Joa, Rachel Lawmaster, Jessica Koons,
Heather Matthews, John Moore

Journal Editors

1967: Ann Paloney & Michael J. Wiener
1968: Marily Liechty
1969: Dallas Bauman
1971: George C. Dehne
1972: Jane A. Lundahl
1973: Helen Mamarchev & Winnifred Weeks
1974: Elizabeth Brannon, Robert Ciesliki, Barbara Moudy, David Stacy & Dann Lobsinger
1975: Dann Lobsinger & Deborah Ann Alter
1976: Dianne Burnside & Richard Scott
1977: Susan Hopp, Frank Araiolo & Vince Carunchia
1978: Elizabeth A. Zavodny, Marc Kaplan & Jim Scroth
1979: Jim Scroth
1980: L. E. Wegryn
1981: B. J. Bischoff & Brian Pisaro
1982: Rodney P. Kirsch & Janet J. Wright
1983: Nedra Hartzell & Daniel Salter
1984: Susan Buffington & Diane Ledger
1985: Margaret O'Brien & David Stewart
1986: Lora Burnett & James Vander Putten
1987: James J. Holmen & James J. Hurley
1988: David J. Strauss & J. J. Thorp
1989: J. J. Thorp & Patricia Harned
1990: Patricia Harned & Diane Robinson
1991: Diane Robinson & Anne E. Spitler
1992: Anne Spitler & Lisa K. Mitchell
1993: Lisa K. Mitchell & Allison Block
1994: Allison Block & Melody M. Snyder
1995: Melody M. Snyder, Lisa P. Lourden, Kelli Kputska Smith & John Bean
1996: John Bean & Kelli Kaputska Smith
1997: Suzanne J. Mendoza, Jennifer Forbes & Alan Rose
1998: Jennifer Forbes & Ryan A. Forsythe
1999: Nariah S. Broadus & Christopher R. Turner
2000: Brent Ericson & Jason Pontius
2001: Valerie A. Sarma & Kelly A. Kish
2002: Drew Griffin & Victoria S. Pasternak
2003: Victoria S. Pasternak & Tara L. Sherwin
2004: Matthew D. Nelson & Tara L. Sherwin
2005: Matthew D. Nelson & Ryan D. Padgett
2006: Laura J. Barnes & Ryan D. Padgett
2007: Laura J. Barnes & Lauren E. Morrill
2008: Eddie R. Cole & Lauren E. Morrill-Ragusea

2008 Awards and Honors

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

Shane Windmeyer	Elizabeth A. Greenleaf Distinguished Alumni
Teresa Hall	Robert H. Shaffer Distinguished Alumni Award
Ebelia Hernandez	August and Ann Eberle Fellowship Award
John V. Moore III	
Philemon Yebei	
Genevieve Shaker	Holmstedt Fellowship
Roland Bullard, Jr.	
Andrea Robledo	Robert H. Wade II Fellowship
Amanad Suniti Niskodé	Virginia G. Piper Charitable Trust Fellowship
Carla Morelon Quainoo	Joseph P. Cangemi Leadership and Organizational Behavior Dissertation Award

Call for Nominations

Nominations of individuals for the 2009 Elizabeth A. Greenleaf and Robert H. Shaffer Distinguished Alumni Awards are now being accepted. The Greenleaf Award is presented annually to the graduate of the master's degree program in Higher Education and Student Affairs who exemplifies "the sincere commitment, professional leadership, and personal warmth" of Betty Greenleaf, for whom the award is named. Previous Greenleaf Award recipients include Louis Stamatakos, Phyllis Mable, James Lyons, Paula Rooney, Joanne Trow, Carol Cummins-Collier, Thomas Miller, Frank Ardaiolo, Deborah Hunter, Vernon Wall, William Bryan, Terry Williams, Marilyn McEwen, Gregory Blimling, Lawrence Miltenberger, and Jamie Washington.

The Robert H. Shaffer Award is presented to the graduate of the Indiana University Higher Education doctoral program who exemplifies outstanding service to the student affairs profession. Previous Shaffer Award recipients include L. "Sandy" McLean, Thomas Hennessy, Jimmy Lewis Ross, Robert Ackerman, Don G. Creamer, Nell Bailey, Alice Manicur, Rodger Summers, Caryl Smith, Donald Mikesell, and Michael Coomes.

Nominations for both awards close February 1, 2009. The awards will be presented at the 2009 ACPA and NASPA Annual Meetings. Please direct your nominations and supporting materials (e.g., vita) to Don Hossler, W.W. Wright Education Building, Room 4228, 201 N. Rose Avenue, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN 47405. Thank you.

Editors' Comments
Eddie R. Cole & Lauren E. Morrill-Ragusea

Welcome to the 41st edition of the Journal of the Indiana University Student Personnel Association! To all faculty, alumni, and students, it is our great pleasure to present the 2008 edition of the Journal. We hope you enjoy the interesting collection of topics covered in the articles.

"Assessing Latina/o Cultural Nourishment" takes a look at the La Casa Cultural Center and its impact on the development of students that utilize its services. "Busting The Myths of Faculty Governance" provides a historical perspective at faculty influence on administrative decisions made at Indiana University Bloomington. In "Predicting Collegiate Philanthropy" young alumni giving is compared to student engagement. Also, we have the historical piece "The Founding of Student Health Services at Indiana University,"which takes a look at the first 100 years of health services provided at IUB. The final two articles, "Student Emotional Adjustment" and "Meaning-Making Processes," serve as a representation of the first year master's cohort and the work they are doing in their first semester.

We would like to thank our advisor, Danielle DeSawal, for her guidance throughout the editorial process. Her help is integral to the success of the Journal. We truly appreciate her support.

On behalf of all IUSPA members, we would also like to thank the alumni who support the journal with their financial contributions. The unique opportunity to write for publication early in our careers allows HESA students to further expand their education and professional development. It would not exist their generosity.

Finally, we would like to thank the eight members of our Review Board. This publication would not be possible without your dedication to reading, editing, and providing constructive criticism throughout the submission process. With our most sincere hearts, we thank you.

It has been an honor and rewarding of experience to serve as editors of the Journal. We are proud to present the 2008 IUSPA Journal!

Eddie R. Cole is a first-year master's student in the Higher Education and Student Affairs at Indiana University Bloomington. He received his B.S. in Speech Communications journalism emphasis from Tennessee State University in 2007. Currently, he is a graduate supervisor in Briscoe Quad and serves as a practicum intern in the Indiana Memorial Union under Dr. Bruce Jacobs.

Lauren E. Morrill-Ragusea graduated with a Master's in Higher Education and Student Affairs from Indiana University Bloomington in 2008. She received her B.A. in History from Indiana University Bloomington in 2005. While at IUB she served graduate supervisor for Residential Programs and Services in Wright Quadrangle and a practicum intern for the Bloomington Faculty Council.

State of the Program
Danielle M. De Sawal
Master's Program Coordinator

The Higher Education and Student Affairs (HESA) program at Indiana University has flourished this past year, and I would like to take a moment to share with you some of the highlights.

IUSPA has a strong executive board this year and continues be involved in both service and academic pursuits. Leigh Featherstone, Heather Matthews, and Tricia Davis took 5th place in the 2008 Student Affairs.com virtual case study competition. Second-year HESA student, Alana Hamlett was elected to serve as an at-Large Member on the ACUI Board of Trustees.

Our alumni and faculty members remain at the top of the profession through teaching, research and service. HESA faculty member George Kuh received the Outstanding Contribution to Higher Education award from NASPA and alumna Paula Rooney received the NASPA President's Award. Barbara C. Jones, alumna, was recognized as one of NASPA's Pillars of the Profession and alumna Susan Johnson received the Hardee Dissertation of the Year award. HESA faculty member Vasti Torres concluded her term as ACPA President providing strong leadership and direction for the association over this past year. Alumna Jill Carnaghi received the Esther Lloyd Jones Award from ACPA and alumnus Shane Windmeyer received the ACPA Voice of Inclusion Medallion. Lou Stamatakos, alumnus, received the ACPA Lifetime Achievement Award during the 2007 Joint Meeting in Orlando.

In other news, we are excited to welcome Dr. Alex McCormick, who joined the faculty in January serves as Director of the National Study for Student Engagement. Alex served as a senior scholar at The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and directed the first major revision of the Foundation's widely-used classification of colleges and universities. Faculty member Nancy Chism was recognized as a Fulbright Scholar and conducted research on teaching and learning in Thailand this past spring.

The HESA program remains a well respected graduate preparation program. This year we hosted 110 students on campus during our two HESA Outreach Weekends. The Fall 2008 cohort looks extremely promising and we are excited about the next academic year.

The IUSPA journal is a product of the commitment to academic excellence and scholarly research that our students engage in during their graduate experience. Our student editors and editorial team have an incredible opportunity to improve their skills in reviewing, critiquing, and editing their peer's publications. These opportunities only continue due to your financial support. Please designate your donations to go towards the IUSPA Journal so that we can continue to provide this opportunity to our students.

Faculty Advisors

Assessing Latina/o Cultural Nourishment:
The Role of University Cultural Centers

Nathan E. Cheesman, Isaac B. Kinsey,

Israel Laguer, and Mahauganee D. Shaw

This study connects existing research on university cultural centers and ethnic student identity construction. Through observation, we examined the extent to which programs provided by La Casa, Indiana University Bloomington's Latina/o cultural center, serve as a source of cultural nourishment. González's (2000, 2002) investigation of the experiences of self-identified Chicano college students framed this work. We will discuss the themes that emerged, as well as recommendations for practice and avenues for future research.

Regardless of the strength of a student's cultural identity, students of any ethnic minority search for a place to commune on campus (Watson, Terrell, Wright, Bonner II, Cuyjet, Gold, Rudy, & Person, 2002). Latina/o[1] student identity development theory strongly suggests a link between ethnic identity construction and acculturation in Latina/o college students (Alcoff, 2005; DeStephano, 2002; Evans, Forney, & Guido-Dibrito, 1998; Torres, Howard-Hamilton, & Cooper, 2003). These students often struggle with openly embracing and displaying aspects of their culture in a campus atmosphere where they feel isolated. In efforts to assist ethnic minority students in overcoming these feelings of marginalization and alienation (González, 2000), many campuses have established cultural centers aimed at serving their various ethnic student populations.

Cultural centers provide students with a social network of staff and faculty members, fellow students and members of the outside community who are attuned to their everyday needs and may serve as mentors, peers, resources, and allies. González (2000, 2002) considered these centers outlets for "cultural nourishment" (2000, p. 82) that may assist ethnic minority students in identifying with their campuses. Culturally nourishing aspects of a campus environment cultivate students' ethnic identity development and provide them with a sense of belonging. Cultural centers "exist to support ethnic students in pursuing their educational goals" (Jones, Castellanos, & Cole, 2002, p. 21), fostering their persistence through to graduation. They also teach students and the campus community at-large about a group's "cultures, traditions, practices, beliefs, and ancestry" (p. 22). In this way,

---

1 In this study we have used "Latina/o" to refer to all Americans with heritage and descent from Central or South America. Throughout this document you will also see other terms such as "Chicano" which refer to a specific cultural distinction within the Latina/o population. We use these terms interchangeably due to their inclusion in the documents or programs that we have referenced. Even though these terms refer to specific distinctions, we propose that the instances in which they are included here may be extended to all Latina/os.

cultural centers cultivate opportunities for knowledge sharing and provide an additional campus learning environment.

In 1973, Indiana University Bloomington (IUB) established La Casa, the Latina/o cultural center, "focusing on uplifting Latino culture" (Hernandez, 2007, p.11). From its inception, La Casa's purpose and mission has been "to achieve through educational and social programs, a greater historical, political and cultural awareness regarding Latina/os" (Casillas, 2007). La Casa achieves this by providing events and programs to all students and members of the Bloomington community (L. Casillas, personal communication, October 1, 2007).

This study examines the extent to which La Casa's programs foster the nourishment of Latina/o culture. By utilizing González's framework (2000) as a foundation we focus and expand the idea of the "epistemological world" (González, p. 75). In its original form, the epistemological world examines the elements of campus culture that either encourage or impede cultural nourishment. Using this framework, we study the exchange of knowledge and information about Latina/o culture through La Casa's programming efforts.

Through an analysis of existing literature we provide an overview of our foundational framework and highlight research that discusses the dissemination and reception of knowledge among ethnic minorities on college campuses. We also present the methods by which information was collected, analyzed, and processed, and an explanation of our findings, including the themes and outcomes that resulted. Finally, we offer recommendations and implications for practical application. The purpose of this study is to provide insight for student affairs practitioners and community organizers who aim to gauge the effectiveness of programs and centers like La Casa.

Literature Review

Research into ethnic identity construction demonstrates that Latina/o students develop and embrace their ethnic identity at varying levels depending on four factors: (a) Their generational status, (b) parental influence, (c) self-perception of their ethnic identity, and (d) their social environment (Torres, Howard-Hamilton, & Cooper, 2003). Keefe and Padilla (1987) found that Latina/os who are second-generation through fourth-generation students in the American educational system arrived on college campuses less aware of their cultural heritage than their first-generation counterparts. Yet these students, despite their greater assimilation into American culture, still maintained as strong a sense of cultural identity and pride as that held by their first-generation peers.

Ethnic minority students on predominantly White campuses have a deep desire for a campus domain where they may leave the minority portion

of their label at the door. Hefner (2002) emphasized that cultural centers are a beacon of hope which help retain students of color. For Latina/o students at IUB, La Casa is this place. Unlike White students, many of whom seldom contemplate their racial identity, students who belong to an ethnic minority group regularly struggle with the task of intermingling and blending their ethnic identity with the campus culture (Frankenberg, 1993). This task can interfere with these students' already daunting responsibility of adjusting to the academic demands of college life (Jones et al., 2002; Smedley, Myers, & Harrell, 1993). Therefore, ethnic minority students are placed at a further disadvantage from their White peers, impinging upon their ability to persist (González, 2000; Nora & Cabrera, 1996).

Campus cultural centers are critical to enhancing cross-cultural and racial interactions on predominantly white campuses (Hurtado, Milem, Clayton-Pedersen, & Allen, 1998). Many of these centers play a key role in helping students affirm a sense of identity and encourage them to become involved in all aspects of campus life (Hurtado, et al.). In a 2002 study of a predominantly White campus with no Latina/o cultural center, González's interviews of Chicano students revealed that they desired information on the history of their culture. This was seen through their description of their dorm room and the office of a Chicano professor as a place of solace from the general campus culture, even specifically referring to their dorm room as "the Chicano cultural center of the university" (p. 212). By offering an atmosphere that is both inviting and inclusive of individuals with whom these students identify, cultural centers create an environment conducive to learning and aids in fostering a strong sense of cultural awareness.

Framework

González (2000, 2002) found three elements within the campus environment that made Latina/o students feel both marginalized and alienated. He then classified these as the physical, social and epistemological worlds. When Latina/o culture is neglected within these aspects, the Latina/o students feel the effects of marginalization and alienation. However, when these aspects of the campus environment are inclusive of Latina/o culture, they intensify to the cultural nourishment of these students. We believe these elements can also be used to explain the differing sources of cultural nourishment. González (2000) asserted that these worlds exhibited "asymmetrical representations" (p. 75) of Latina/o culture, implying that one might be more important than another, thus encroaching on the Latina/o student's ability to feel welcome on campus. Working to create an understanding of the relationship between these worlds, we have depicted them as interlocking spheres of influence, rather than three loosely connected worlds.

The first element of asymmetrical representations experienced by Latina/o students in González's study is the physical world. This sphere is characterized by the layout of the campus, architecture of buildings, artwork, and symbols found on campus postings. González (2000, 2002) noted that the Latina/o students felt marginalized by the lack of relatable cultural representation in their physical world on campus.

The social world, the next sphere, is constructed of interactions with others—students, faculty, and staff members—in the campus community. This element represents daily interactions with persons of various ethnicities and cultures, the political power held by these groups on campus, and different languages spoken around campus (González, 2000, 2002). González found that the students were not accustomed to seeing other Latina/o persons on campus, did not feel as if the population of Latina/os found on campus had a significant influence on campus policies or initiatives, and felt alienated by other members of the community when speaking in their native tongue, Spanish. Since the efforts of González's study specifically focused on one campus entity, and not the entire university, we chose not to prioritize the physical and social elements of campus culture.

The final element is the epistemological world. This element is defined by the "knowledge that exists and is exchanged within various social spaces on campus" (González, 2002, p. 207). Sources of cultural nourishment within the epistemological world observed by González included campus settings where knowledge of Latina/o culture was shared and studied, as well as interactions with other Latina/os, both on and off campus. Our study focused on the knowledge of Latina/o culture within IUB, as disseminated through La Casa.

Using the epistemological world as our theoretical framework yielded a natural connection to our study location. The subjects in González's study (2000) "were more concerned…not [with] teaching non-Chicanos about Chicanos, but [with] creating an epistemological space on campus where Chicanos could share and discuss ideas about the Chicano community with each other" (p. 80). Though La Casa is not reserved specifically for Latina/o students, it serves the IUB community as an epistemological space where members of the campus community may learn, share and discuss ideas about Latina/o culture (González). This is further supported by La Casa's purpose: "to achieve through educational and social programs, a greater historical, political and cultural awareness regarding Latina/os" (Casillas, 2007). With this understanding we observed the programs and events sponsored by the Center, analyzed documents distributed during programs, and evaluated La Casa's epistemological promotion of cultural nourishment.

Methods

Information was obtained by attending a variety of La Casa's programs in order to get a first-hand view of the knowledge exchanged. Seven publicized La Casa programs were randomly selected and observed over the course of a two-month period. Five of these programs were analyzed for the purpose of determining the aspects of cultural nourishment visible in the programs. Table 1 shows information about the program topics and presenters and an overview of the programs. The other two were omitted because neither La Casa, nor its representatives or affiliates, were directly involved in their coordination or presentation.

Research Procedures

To help understand the epistemological world, we initiated data collection under our central concept: there is a broader scheme by which knowledge is disseminated, processed, and exchanged. Fundamentally, we gathered information to determine how the program presenters enlightened program attendees and to what extent these attendees contributed. These contributions were seen through the ways audience members communicated their personal knowledge of, and experiences with, the program topic.

Our team of researchers consisted of one African-American female, one African-American male, one European-American male and one Puerto Rican male. The diversity of ethnicity, cultural perspectives, and life experiences in our group strengthened our processes and analysis. Throughout the observational process, we attended the programs in alternating pairs to not only aid in analysis and reduce personal bias, but also to allow each person to focus on different aspects of the knowledge sharing process. While the extent of our past experiences with cultural centers directed our choice of topic, it did not figure into the selection of our research location or determine our research questions.

During the observations, the pairs manually recorded field notes to track the knowledge that was shared and how it was shared. For example, when an attendee asked a question, we recorded the question and if it was based directly on the knowledge shared in the program or if it was supported by the attendee's own knowledge. We noted the reactions of presenters and audience members, such as whether they verbally supported or opposed statements or if the conversation progressed without recognition of the previous comment. Following each program, the pair recapitulated in efforts to record all information possible and ensure accuracy.

Analysis

To further define our central concept, we categorized aspects of our observations under the following headings: (a) Presenters' interaction with

program attendees and learning outcomes, (b) the extent to which presenters made cultural distinctions, and (c) how actively attendees contributed to the knowledge sharing process. We referred to these three areas of observation as data indicators, which helped evaluate the effectiveness of the knowledge sharing process by revealing themes within La Casa's programming.

The first data indicator was the presenters' interaction with program attendees and the learning outcomes of each program. With this focus, we outlined the perceived assumptions presenters made about the audiences' general knowledge of their respective topics. This provided information regarding how presenters disseminated knowledge and whether articulated the information in ways relevant to the campus community. The observed learning outcomes helped determine how much the program aimed to expand the general knowledge base of the audience.

Our second indicator was the extent to which presenters made cultural distinctions within the context of their program. This information is significant for two reasons. First, this indicator was used to verify if the presenter was versatile and able to apply their topic area across the many backgrounds within the Latina/o culture. Secondly, it demonstrated how much of an effort the presenters made to engage audience members of different cultural backgrounds. Placing the information in a context relevant to the audience encouraged them to interact, participate, and extract the message of the program.

How attendees contributed to the knowledge sharing process was our third data indicator. This information assisted in conceptualizing how much attendees learned or how much of their knowledge was pre-existing. If responses were grounded in past experiences or previously attained knowledge we assessed that the audience was attempting to connect what they understood about the topic with the presenter's suggestions. Moreover, if the audience's comments were based primarily upon the information presented at the program, the audience member was exhibiting expansion of knowledge.

Results

Our three data indicators served as a guide for the conceptualization of four themes. These themes, which describe the commonalities that we identified in all of the programs, emerged during further analysis of the data collected from our observations. The four themes were: (a) Programs' functions were manifold, (b) program organization and presenter pedagogy influenced the climate, (c) programs encouraged active participation, and (d) audience knowledge was actively integrated into the program. It is important to note, that while the themes were supported by our data indicators, they were not confined by this framework. However, we specifically focused on how these themes fit into our data indicators.

Programs' Functions were Manifold

While we ascertained that the initial purpose of all programs was to share information and knowledge with the attendees, we determined that each program also served multiple purposes. These purposes were to disseminate new knowledge, to actively collaborate, and to highlight the interconnection between various cultures and backgrounds.

We believe these multiple functions were enhanced by hosting the programs at different campus locations; featuring presenters from various cultural and educational backgrounds, with or without affiliation to the University; and emphasizing cultural similarities and differences. Referencing González's framework, hosting programs at various locations exemplified the importance of the physical world, while it showcased presenters of various backgrounds highlighting the social world. The fact that the programs placed an emphasis on intercultural distinctions illustrated aspects of the epistemological world. The interplay of these three facets reinforced González's idea of how the physical, social, and epistemological worlds intersect to create an optimal opportunity for cultural nourishment. The overlapping of these theoretical worlds resurfaces throughout our results.

The programs, both implicitly and explicitly, highlighted the interconnections between various cultures and backgrounds. There were several instances where either the presenters or the attendees made references to similarities and connections between their culture and other cultures. For example, during the program on undocumented students, major discussion surrounded the hidden culture of fear inherent in these individual's lives that hinders them from seeking educational opportunities. The attendees, mostly Asian and Latina/o students, equally expressed their sentiments in validating an understanding of fear and how it has continually perpetuated within the individuals who migrate to this country every day. By providing the forum to exchange ideas, the presenters created an optimal environment for learning and the knowledge sharing process.

Program Organization and Presenter Pedagogy Influenced the Climate

Program organization and pedagogy was a theme that interlinked the attended programs. They collectively illustrated the methods of knowledge dissemination on a spectrum ranging from social to intellectual.

Presenters assumed that the audience members had an abundance of preexisting knowledge on the subject matter. These assumptions were expressed through usage of advanced language and references to concepts not included on handouts. In a program concentrated on Native American

culture, the presenter used the terms "Indian" and Navajo" interchangeably. For an attendee without previous knowledge of Native American culture, this could have been confusing. Thus, the presenter's perceptions that attendees would have preexisting knowledge on their subject areas may have influenced their chosen pedagogy. This may explain why various teaching methods overlapped across the majority of the programs.

Culturally specific language and media usage were also recurrent concepts among the presenters. Spanish terms and phrases such as "Día de la Raza," "Quinceañera" and "Chicano" were used at various programs. Distinctions were made of how these terms have slight differences in meaning among Latina/os from a variety of Spanish-speaking countries. Films, documentaries and web-based references were commonly used across the majority of the programs to emphasize the significance of the topic.

Programs Encouraged Active Participation

Each program topic was presented in a manner that held the attention of the attendees. Additionally, all programs followed a format that allowed participants4to immerse themselves in the topic and engage in meaningful discussion. We discerned that each of the programs attended encouraged the engagement of all participants, attributable to how the presenter influenced the organizational structure and tone of the program.

All programs were properly suited, both in topic and content, for a college-aged audience. This helped ensure that the heavily student-populated audience could relate to the presentation. During each program, the presenters shared knowledge with the audience members, often using familiar examples with which a wide array of people could identify, to ensure that the information was clearly understood. To add to the depth of the information and the reality of the topic, presenters strayed from imparting strictly intellectual knowledge by also sharing personal information. For example, in describing the dual identity experienced by Chicano people living near the Mexico-United States border, one presenter gave the personal example of craving pizza with jalapeños. Presenters also dealt with commonly held stereotypes of Latina/o people. Some made an active effort to refute these stereotypes—one program began with the presenter jokingly stating, "We're doing this on real time, not Latino time," to indicate that the program would run in a timely manner as opposed to having a late start. The timely beginning refuted the stereotype, while simultaneously acknowledging the stereotype's existence and assumed notoriety.

Program presenters were successful in engaging the audience members. Though not all programs evoked passionate discussion from the audience, there were multiple occasions where the audience members were visibly shocked by the information being presented. Audience members'

wide-eyed responses to a presenter's comment about a Catholic priest rejecting the Quinceañera ceremony due to the questionable integrity of the honoree's virginity, suggested that the audience was captivated. Though emotion was not always verbally expressed, occurrences such as this illustrated the attention level of audience members and the receipt of new knowledge. Regardless of the level of responsiveness from the audience during the program, most concluded with a well-informed dialogue that reflected the program topic. In addition to displaying preexisting knowledge of the topics, audience members took an active interest in the program. At the end of one program, an audience member asked the following series of questions: "Why did you choose to do this program? Was it your [personal] idea? Why? Where are you from? What is the significance [of this topic] to you?" The probing nature of these questions is indicative of high levels of engagement experienced by this program attendee.

Ending with a question and answer period, a standard portion of most programs, seemed an especially effective method of allowing the audience to make connections to the presentation and to share peer knowledge. As noted by Watson et al. (2002) identifying a connection to the campus community is important to student success. Through the dialogue that occurred during this portion of the program, a variety of viewpoints were disclosed, and participants' experience with the program topics was evidenced in references made to their personal lives and their preexisting knowledge base. Attendees prefaced their questions and comments, beginning with statements such as "That's similar to how I grew up," or referencing books and videos in their personal repertoires. The question and answer period became a knowledge sharing forum where participants bounced ideas and opinions off the commentary of others.

Audience Knowledge Was Actively Integrated Into the Program

Another major theme that arose in our study dealt directly with the program attendees. At each of the programs, the attendees' knowledge was actively integrated into the program.

Anytime attendees made a comment or asked a question based on their past experiences or preexisting knowledge, the presenter expounded upon this information for the benefit of other participants. By integrating this information into the program the presenters not only acknowledged the ability of attendees' input to strengthen the experiences of other participants, but also emphasized the idea that knowledge is present in all aspects of the campus community. This integration of knowledge was apparent when the presenters consciously broadened the epistemological environment. Both during and after programs, the presenters made an active effort to refrain from implying that their personal convictions were the absolute truth. They

did so by providing resources that attendees could use to formulate their own opinions. The provision of additional resources not only acted as a disclaimer, it also encouraged audience members to engage in personal research.

Summary

Cultural centers serve as learning environments. La Casa's programs served as demonstrations of this by offering participants what Kuh (2000) has outlined as the three synchronous practices of well-organized learning environments—opportunities, support, and rewards. Through programming, La Casa provides the campus community with opportunities to interact and discuss aspects of Latina/o culture in a knowledgeable environment. Often, the programs that we observed encouraged participants to engage in further research on a topic by providing program participants with handouts that detailed suggested readings and other information sources.

Our findings reflect existing literature in which cultural centers are proven to provide a safe social haven as well as a source for cultural nourishment. La Casa's programs provide Latina/o students with the opportunity to be in an environment that is centrally focused on their culture and features topics with which they readily identify. The programs also allow these students to see individuals who resemble them as scholars and leaders. As Hurtado and Carter (1997) noted, students who interact with faculty outside of the classroom express a greater sense of belonging and drive to excel. Personal interactions such as this often manifest as informal opportunities to participate in the knowledge sharing process. Other scholars have noted that social support serves to increase both students' self-esteem (Dubois, Nevhille, Parra & Pugh-Lilly, 2002) and the likelihood of their persistence at that institution (Stovall, 2000).

Program participants were rewarded with the acquisition of new knowledge, often having integrated their classroom knowledge with outside experiences. As González (2002) noted, exposure to new knowledge is a catalyst for students to seek further information on a topic and begin the process of becoming knowledge sharers themselves. The shift to knowledge sharer is encouraged through La Casa's multifunctional programming which acknowledges and accepts cultural distinctions and integrates program attendees' knowledge into the discussion.

Recommendations and Implications for Practice

We found that program presenters appeared to have prior experience in presenting to, and facilitating epistemological discussion among, collegiate level students; however, they did not appear to invest the same amount of effort in preparing for their presentations. Some presenters came with a sufficient amount of material ready to discuss, while others seemed to rely heavily on their visual aids and other props. While we understand that it might be difficult to determine if all presenters are comparably credentialed, there should be some minimum level of expectancy for presentation and facilitation skills. Also, it is important to note that prior experience alone does not equate to adequate presentation skills for collegiate programs.

More undergraduate students should be incorporated as presenters. Multiple undergraduate groups either supported or co-sponsored the programs we observed. Students from these groups usually offered opening remarks and introduced the presenters; they were seldom presenters themselves. González (2002) notes that knowledge learned and internalized on campus often allows students to share that knowledge with others. This process of assuming the role of knowledge sharer contributes to the students' "sense of purpose [and drive] to persist at the university" (p. 213). La Casa and other cultural centers are strongly encouraged to feature undergraduate presenters, thus increasing knowledge sharing on the peer level and building students' confidence as knowledge sharers.

Other services offered by La Casa may create nets of support for students, but this subsystem was not evident in the programming efforts we studied. It seems logical that reference should be made to the services offered by the Center as it is possible that program attendees may have never had previous contact with La Casa. An extension of González's (2002) work suggests that providing this information may assist university students by providing "an impetus for discovering other… forms of cultural nourishment" (p. 213). Through this research we can move past noting the view of cultural centers as simply fostering support for students of various ethnic or cultural backgrounds, to studying how this support structure actually functions.

Limitations and Avenues for Future Research

Though this report focused strictly on the epistemological aspect of campus cultural centers, it is important to remember that the social and physical worlds are interconnected with the knowledge that exists and is exchanged on campus. The location of La Casa on IUB's campus, with respect to the central aspects of campus life, may influence the way that campus constituents interpret the institution's perception and value of Latina/o culture. This represents the physical layout of the campus, and the social construction of the campus climate. Though no direct observations were made regarding audience demographics, it is possible that La Casa's programs served as a social outlet for students of various ethnic and educational backgrounds. Future research in this area could aid the body of knowledge

on campus cultural centers and campus programming, helping to situate these areas within Gonzalez's three worlds.

By constructing our study around current literature, we were able to remove our personal biases from the framework. Our study was, however, limited by the fact that we had no frame of reference regarding presenter or topic selection, and that the constraints of our study only afforded enough time to attend a select number of events. Future researchers would do well to consider these issues and to construct methods that eliminate these restrictions. While we understand the limitations presented here, we do not believe that they significantly detract from our findings, subsequent recommendations, or their practical applications.

Identifying and creating campus sources of cultural nourishment are important to current practices in higher education. Working in a field focused on the holistic development of each student, practitioners should be concerned with how well individual students are able to integrate into the campus. Students who frequent events at a campus cultural center are likely to also identify with underrepresented populations. By focusing on La Casa, this study was designed to capture the experiences of these students. As members of an underrepresented population, these students may find it difficult to make meaningful connections to the campus, thus impeding their ability to persist. Ensuring that the campus provides a culturally nourishing environment may be the best way to assist these students in their pursuit of higher education.

References

Alcoff, L. M. (2005). Latino oppression. Journal of Social Philosophy, 36(4), 536-545.

Casillas, L. (2007). A note from the director. Retrieved September 18, 2007, from Indiana University Bloomington, La Casa/Latino Cultural Center Web site: http://www.indiana.edu/~lacasa

DeStephano, M. T. (2002). Is there a truly Latino canon? Language, literature, and the search for Latino identity and power. Journal of Hispanic Higher Education, 1(2), 99-110.

Dubois, D. L., Nevhille, H. A., Parra, G. R., and Pugh-Lilly, A.O. (2002). Testing a new model of mentoring. New Directions of Youth Development, 93, 21-57.

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

Frankenberg. R. (1993). White women, race matters: The social construction of whiteness. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

González, K. P. (2000). Toward a theory of minority student participation in predominantly white colleges and universities. Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory and Practice, 2(1), 69-91.

González, K. P. (2002). Campus culture and the experiences of Chicano students in a predominantly white university. Urban Education, 37(2), 193-218.

Hefner, D. (2002). Black cultural centers: Standing on shaky ground? Black Issues in Higher Education, 18(26), 22.

Hernandez, E. (2007). Demanding social change at Indiana University: Latino student activism in the mid-1970s. Journal of the Indiana University Student Personnel Association, 9-21.

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

Hurtado, S., Milem, J.F., Clayton-Pedersen, A.R., & Allen, W. R. (1998). Enhancing campus climates for racial/ethnic diversity: Educational policy and practice. The Review of Higher Education, 21(3), 279-302.

Jones, L., Castellanos, J., &, Cole, D. (2002). Examining the ethnic minority student experience at predominantly white institutions: A case study. Journal of Hispanic Higher Education, 1(1), 19-39.

Keefe, S. E., & Padilla, A. M. (1987). Chicano ethnicity. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

Kuh, G. D. (2000). Understanding campus environments. In M. J. Barr, M. K. Desler, & Associates (Eds.), The handbook of student affairs administration (2nd ed., pp. 50-72). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Nora, A. & Cabrera A. F. (1996). The role of perceptions of prejudice and discrimination on the adjustment of minority students to college. The Journal of Higher Education, 67(2), 119-148.

Smedley, B. D., Myers, H. F., & Harrell, S. P. (1993). Minority-status stresses and the college adjustment of ethnic minority freshman. The Journal of Higher Education, 64(4), 434-452.

Stovall, M. (2000). Increasing retention and success through mentoring. In S.R. Aragon (Ed.), Beyond access: Methods and models for increasing retention and learning among minority students (pp. 55-62). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Torres, V., Howard-Hamilton, M. F., & Cooper, D. L. (2003). Identity development of diverse populations: Implications for teaching and administration in higher education. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, 29(6), 1-125.

Watson, L. W., Terrell, M. C., Wright, D. J., Bonner II, F. A., Cuyjet, M. J., Gold, J. A., Rudy, D. E., & Person, D. R. (2002). How minority students experience college: Implications for planning and policy. Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Nathan Cheesman graduated from the Higher Education and Student Affairs program in 2008. He received a B.S in Integrated Mathematics Education and a B.A. in Mathematics & Statistics from Miami University in 2006. At IUB, Nathan served as Graduate Live-In Advisor for Lambda Chi Alpha Fraternity and was an intern for the Student Development and Compliance Office in the Intercollegiate Athletics Department.

Isaac Kinsey graduated from the Higher Education and Student Affairs master's program in 2008. He received a B.S. in Kinesiology from Indiana University in 2005. While at IUB, Isaac worked as a Graduate Assistant/Assistant Instructor of the R100 Leadership Development Series at the Center for Student Leadership Development and also as the Graduate Live-In Advisor for the Sigma Alpha Mu Fraternity.

Israel Laguer is a 2007 graduate of Indiana University's Higher Education and Student Affairs Master's program. As a graduate of The Rowan University, Israel earned his B.A. in Sociology with a Concentration in Leadership Studies. At IUB, he worked with Residential Programs and Services and taught courses focused on the leadership development of students and the analysis of historically Black Greek Lettered Organizations.

Mahauganee Dawn Shaw is a doctoral student in the Higher Education and Student Affairs program. She earned a M.A. in Educational Administration and a B.A. in Liberal Arts both from the University of Missouri-Kansas City. At IUB, Mahauganee currently serves as a Project Associate at the Center for Postsecondary Research.

Faculty Governance: Challenging the Myths

Kelly A. Kish, Lauren E. Morrill-Ragusea,

and Robin L. Murphey

This study examined the role of faculty in university governance using archival records of the Bloomington Faculty Council at Indiana University Bloomington. The study employed archival analysis techniques to challenge one myth about faculty governance. As faculty members continually seek to carve out their roles in institutional decision making it is increasingly important to ground their arguments in historical evidence.

Overview

The study of institutional governance has gained increased momentum in recent years due in part to heightened external pressures influencing American colleges and universities (Tierney, 2004). As Burgan (2004) outlined, these outside pressures include declining support from state budgets, increased activism on the part of boards and alumni, new demands by non-traditional students, increased foci on the role of institutions in the economic development of surrounding regions, and competition from for-profit higher education—all of which have challenged the structure and participants in university governance and decision making (Burgan). These discussions raised an underlying, and unanswered, question about the role of faculty in university governance in the 21st century. This study examined the role of faculty in university governance by examining myths about faculty governance that are referenced in higher education scholarship and commonly heard in administrative offices and trustees' meetings around the country. Using the lens of one faculty senate organization we challenged the myth that faculty senates are given menial tasks by the administration and have no influence over significant decisions.

Faculty in Institutional Governance

Over recent decades, competing and conflicting definitions have emerged over the appropriate role for faculty in governance. In an era of higher education shifting toward market models of organization and governing boards applying bureaucratic decision making models to areas that used to be within the domain of the faculty, the 1966 Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities issued by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) has lost its meaning in (AAUP, 1966; Helms and Price, 2005). The Statement afforded faculty "primary responsibility for such fundamental areas as curriculum, subject matter and methods of

instruction, research, faculty status, and those aspects of student life which relate to the educational process" (np). Faculties across the country have tried various methods to work through contentious times. Burgan (2004) encouraged balancing between unionization and shared governance (Burgan, 2004), while Tierney and Minor (2003) called for communication, increased trust, and delineating responsibilities and meanings of shared governance. Each of these approaches work best when the role of the faculty in institutional governance is agreed upon by other governing groups.

Kadish (1972) claimed that this definitional predicament is caused, in part, by the inherent conflict in faculty's dual role—as employee and as educator—because they conceive, plan, govern, perform research, and deliver education, in addition to being employees. The lack of clarity and shared belief about the role of faculty in institutional governance imperils the premise of shared governance and faculty authority, encourages polarization over issues, and exaggerates the adversarial concerns over common interests (Eckel, 2000; Helms and Price, 2005; Hollinger, 2001; Leatherman, 1998; Kezar and Eckel, 2004; Minor, 2004; Scott, 1996; Tierney and Minor, 2003; Williams, Gore, Broches, and Lostoski, 1987). Against this backdrop, scholars have recently begun developing an arsenal of empirical evidence about the characteristics, strengths, and advantages of faculty governance and the faculty's involvement in shared governance (Kezar and Eckel; Minor; Tierney and Minor). This study attempted to add to this arsenal by focusing on an archival content analysis of one faculty governance body's activities over the last half-century.

History and Myths of Faculty Governance

Rosser (2003) traced the origins of faculty governance to fundamental questions over "who shall teach and what shall be taught" (pg. 5). Drawing on the experiences of the great European colleges, the colonial colleges in the fledgling United States mirrored their structure with three exceptions:

> (1) the influence of church and the mission of the college were intertwined (private denominational sponsorship); (2) the autonomy of the faculty was not immediately established, because the American colleges started with a president, and the president initially taught; and (3) the establishment of a layboard [sic] or governing board that was not part of the institution, or did not include part of the faculty (or president), but an external overseeing body that did not exist in the European model (p. 6-7).

Lucas (1994) commented that by the late-1800s a "compromised" approach to governance had been reached at a number of institutions; the faculty were allowed to make decisions about student admissions, academic standards, curriculum, while other matters were left to the board and president.

The growth of the American research universities between 1890 and 1920 provided the setting for a renaissance for faculty governance in the United States. But, the 20th century was a contentious one for faculty governance and professional representation around the country. On the one hand, the AAUP encouraged the recognition of faculty authority over traditional matters of educational importance through traditional faculty senates. On the other hand, the AAUP participated in intense debates over the right to collective bargaining which resulted in over 830 institutions in the United States covered by faculty collective bargaining agreements in 1984 and grew to 1,115 campuses in 1995 (Douglas, 1988; Rhoades, 1998).

Myths and anecdotes that undermine the effectiveness of shared governance developed during the 20th century. The myths discussed in this paper can be found in higher education literature and general opinion magazines and newspapers and can be overheard in person by faculty members themselves in addition to administrators and trustees. As Leatherman (1998) joked, "If you want to draw a crowd to a faculty senate meeting, talk about pay, parking, or ousting the president. Anything else plays to an empty house" (A8). Hollinger (2001) added that "Shared governance" can be a joke when administrators do the governing and chuckle privately at faculty senate leaders who can be kept earnestly busy worrying about parking policies. Many faculty governance organizations do very little governing, except in a crisis" (p. 30). The idea that faculty senates lose interest when taking on serious issues with the management of the institution was also raised by Association of Governing Boards President Tom Ingram, when he said that he believes most faculty senates are "dysfunctional" because they are slow to act, reluctant to make hard decisions, and eschewed by the top scholars on the campus (Leatherman). Tierney and Minor (2003) introduced the notion that faculty governance in general and faculty senates in particular inhibit responsive decision-making and critics "bemoan the lethargic pace of decision-making when faculty are involved and expect to reach consensus" (pg. 1). Engstrand (2005) from the University of Minnesota, wrote about the effectiveness of the Minnesota senate, and juxtaposed their reputation to "the reputation of these bodies at other institutions as debating societies that accomplish (and affect) little" (p. 25). Further, Scott (1996) suggested that while faculty members assume

> their departmental, college and university committees are providing meaningful 'input' on university policies, in fact senior administrators pursue other avenues of consultation, including hand-picked committees which can provide a more 'authentic' faculty voice…in this changed context, faculty governance through traditional, elected councils takes second place to a parallel track of 'task forces' and 'ad-hoc committees' as values

are shifted from academic freedom and shared governance to cultivating academic 'consumers' and cost savings (p. 724).

This study examined one myth about faculty governance through the activities and evidence of the Bloomington Faculty Council (BFC) at Indiana University Bloomington (IUB). Specifically, this study asked: Is the faculty senate given menial or symbolic items to discuss by the administration so that faculty members have minimal influence over significant decisions?

The Bloomington Faculty Council

The Bloomington Faculty Council is a useful case study of how one institution's faculty has formed a governance system that has served them well through most of the institution's history. Archival records show that the Indiana University faculty, then numbering only five, began to meet and record meetings of faculty business in 1835 (Collection C236, Faculty Council, IU Archives). The roots of modern faculty governance activities are grounded in these sessions of the faculty where: misconduct decisions and punishments determined, examination day recitation orders developed, the schedule of classes and distribution of faculty effort agreed upon, and decisions about educational policy affirmed (Faculty Council Minutes July 22, 1841 and May 8, 1846). In 1929, the general faculty approved the formation of a "University Council" to consider questions of academic policy affecting the university as a whole. This original Council was given investigative, deliberative, and recommendatory powers only (Mares, 2004). The Council investigated questions presented to it by the administration, the faculty as a whole, or individual members of the faculty. In the 1930s, for example, the Council discussed the introduction of a new curriculum that provided for a broad introductory set of coursework in the first two years followed by elective coursework in the third and fourth years. The new curricular approach was emphasized further by the introduction of "majors" and new professional-oriented degrees. Later that decade, the group considered substantive issues about the university library—budgets for acquisitions, the process for book orders, the location of rare books on the campus, and other administrative matters pertaining to the library (See Collection C233, University Council, IU Archives). This group existed from 1929 to 1969 (Mares).

The current structure of the BFC has its roots in 1969. The university underwent significant administrative reorganization in 1969, initiated by IU President Elvis J. Stahr, resulting in an independent faculty governance body in Bloomington (separate from the seven other IU campuses). The Bloomington Faculty Council claimed authority over Bloomington-specific matters and has remained a constant presence in the governance of the campus.

While the BFC example might prove useful to other large, public, research universities, evidence exists to suggest that smaller and private institutions sometimes encounter very different experiences in their faculty senates.

The BFC Archives

This study utilized the records compiled by the Bloomington Faculty Council since its inception in 1969. The BFC archives are kept by the Indiana University Archives and are publicly accessible. The large record collection is comprised of meeting agendas, verbatim meeting transcripts, policy drafts, membership records, committee reports, voting and election materials, and other supporting materials. Researchers compiled a general subject history of BFC activities since 1969 that yielded a broad categorization of BFC discussions under the headings: administrative affairs, student affairs, and academic affairs. From that listing emerged evidence to challenge myths that exist in the general literature on faculty governance.

Subsequently, a more thorough content analysis methodology was utilized to systematically evaluate the subject matter, participation records, and other evidence of the BFC. Analyzing textual information in historical records involves discerning both literal and interpretive meanings. Careful cross-checking of sources and contextualizing of topics with transcript records and policy drafts was conducted by each author independently. Notes and categorizations were compared to ensure inter-coder reliability.

The Myth

Ample evidence could be cited illustrating the role of the faculty council in academic and faculty affairs matters. The tough questions about faculty input typically lie in more traditional areas of administrative and student affairs and examples of the BFC's role in these areas are included below.

Budgetary Affairs

In creating the predecessor to the Budgetary Affairs Committee (BAC), Frank Franz, President of the IU Bloomington AAUP Chapter in 1972 wrote:

> Among its duties and obligations, the Faculty has preeminent responsibility for the maintenance and development of the curriculum and academic stature of the University. The prerogatives of the Faculty in the discharge of this responsibility have long been recognized in matters such as promotion, tenure, degree status, and the determination of academic priorities. It has become increasingly clear that the realization of academic priorities is inextricably coupled to constraints placed upon them by budgetary limitations. Since resources made available for one endeavor often come at the expense of another, and since allocations of resources have become much a matter of administrative discretion, the actual determination of academic

directions and priorities has moved further and further from direct Faculty control, and even, at times, from direct Faculty consultation...The Faculty must expect and demand a far more significant voice in decisions such as these, which can affect the very constitution of the University (Circular B8-1973).

During the February 6, 1973 BFC Meeting discussion of the proposal to create a standing committee on budgetary affairs, Chancellor Byrum Carter indicated that a new standing committee would complement his academic advisory committee and Vice Chancellor for Budget Turner said that "he welcomed a Budget committee since it might take a little heat off of him" (Faculty Council Minutes February 6, 1973). By their Year End Report of 1974-1975, the Budgetary Affairs Committee had established a strong working agenda including: regular meetings with state legislators and university and campus budgeting officers, participation in the school's preliminary budget conferences, recommendations for minimum salary standards for academic appointees, and articulation of budgeting priorities derived from an assessment of faculty opinion (Circular B25-1975). These activities laid the foundation for faculty input into budgetary decisions in future years.

Over a decade later, in presenting his annual budget report to the BFC, Chancellor Kenneth Gros Louis (who had been a faculty member serving on the BAC in 1975) articulated that the procedures for developing the budget were consistent with past years and that the Budgetary Affairs Committee played a significant role in the budgeting process. Gros Louis commented that "As in the past, significant agreement existed on priorities for 1986-87 among the deans, the Budgetary Affairs Committee, and the campus administration" (Faculty Council Minutes September 16, 1986). He went on to describe allocations for faculty salaries and faculty research support, student support, academic equipment purchases, library acquisitions, and enhancement of computing facilities—all of which appear on the "very high" or "high" priorities lists from the faculty's BAC that year (Faculty Council Minutes September 16, 1986).

The productive and collegial relationship between the BAC and the campus administration was no doubt helped by the transition of faculty members into the chancellorship and vice chancellorship for budgetary affairs. As the BAC committee chair stated in his 1988 report to the Faculty Council, "I also want to emphasize that we maintained good relationships with Ward Schaap and Ken Gros Louis...[they] were candid and compassionate and cooperative." He went on to report that "Most members of the Budgetary Affairs Committee feel at the end of the year (and they verbalized this to me) (and I emphasize "most") feel that we've had a significant impact in the directions that the dollars have flowed on this campus. For that reason we felt that we received a return on our investment of time and energy" (Faculty Council Minutes September 20, 1988). These collegial and trusting relationships during good budgetary years led to successful working relationships during bad budgetary years. Again, Chancellor Gros Louis, in 1991:

> To put the budget situation as simply as possible: this is the worst budget year the Bloomington campus has had in my memory...The Budgetary Affairs Committee worked extraordinarily hard under adverse conditions to provide advice and guidance not only to the campus administration, but also to the entire campus. The meeting held in early March for all Bloomington campus faculty and staff was organized and directed by that committee...It was a remarkable meeting, as some of you here know, because faculty and staff did indeed come together to consider how the campus would respond to what at that time seemed to be a worse situation than was ultimately the case. I can't underline enough how valuable the Budgetary Affairs Committee and the individual advisory committees in the schools have been during this most difficult year" (Faculty Council Minutes September 17, 1991).

This positive working relationship still exists in Bloomington between the Budgetary Affairs Committee and the campus administration. This may be because the members of the BAC consider campus-level issues, rather than department or discipline-based issues; or, perhaps, because the individuals holding the positions of chancellor (now called a provost) and vice provost for budgetary administration are still former members of the faculty in Bloomington themselves.

Fundraising

Similarly, when the Bloomington campus embarks on fundraising ventures, the Faculty Council plays an important role. The IU Foundation, the fundraising arm of Indiana University, receives its official marching orders from the IU administrative leadership. However, over the past several decades of capital campaign planning, the faculty council has played its role in providing faculty input to the administration and foundation leadership on academic priorities. In a memo to the Bloomington Faculty Council in 1980, Acting Dean George Springer (who was asked by the chancellor to receive all suggestions for priorities and coordinate the feedback process) articulated the faculty's critical role in the fundraising process as:

> The process of determining priorities continues. The success of the future campaign lies not only with the Foundation but with the careful and thoughtful work of the faculty who must provide not only facts and figures but ideas sufficiently compelling to induce philanthropic gestures from all manner of people" (Circular B29-1981).

This sentiment was reinforced by his statement that almost all the priorities suggested by the faculty to date had been included within the five major categories for the campaign. The following year, BFC President Albert Ruesink outlined the importance of the faculty's role in the priority-setting process and the campaign more generally:

> There obviously needs to be a continuing process regarding the capital campaign and in seeking effective Faculty Council roles in that campaign—both in terms of helping to set priorities and in terms of helping to raise funds. Priority setting is only the first stage. As faculty we cannot turn the job over to the administration and the Foundation and expect them to carry the whole campaign from here. That is the way in ordinary times with ordinary needs. These are extraordinary times and require extraordinary efforts. As members of the Faculty Council representing all faculty, we need to ask when, where, and how we can help with a continuing campaign project (Faculty Council Minutes January 19, 1982).

Professor Roger Newton, who chaired an ad hoc committee of the faculty council to begin the prioritization effort, articulated the committees' perspective on priority-setting as:

> We looked at this long list of requests…we decided that it would make more sense and would have a large impact on Indiana University and its distinction if we selected a small number of items that would make a major difference… As you see from the list, we selected only those things that would not benefit only an individual department or school… we picked only items that would benefit the campus as a whole" (Faculty Council Minutes January 19, 1982).

The Council members, after hearing the presentation of their ad hoc committee, received a ballot where they were asked to assign a High, Medium, or Low priority ranking to 17 independent projects (Ballot February 10, 1982 and Draft Ballot and Memo February 2, 1982). The results of the Campaign Priorities Ballot were disseminated to the campus faculty and the resulting priorities were (in rank order): Endowment for faculty development and research, Endowments for student fellowships (graduate, minority, undergraduate, honors), Endowment for book acquisition and university libraries, Endowed chairs, Research and Instructional Equipment, Music School Library Building, Endowment for Postdoctoral research fellowships, Observatory in Morgan-Monroe State Forest, New Theater Building, Endowment for the operation of the campus museums, Recreational sports building with a 50-meter pool, Addition to the Lilly Library, Endowment for an Institute for Advanced Study, Renovation of the Auditorium, Continuing Education building, Center for the Advancement of Education, and the Neal-Marshall Black Culture Center. The significance of the faculty's prioritiza-

tion exercise is evident when one looks at the actual publication materials of the Campaign which include requests for, among its Eight Goals, "endowed professorships and scholarships" and "acquisition of library books" (Circular B20-1982).

A similar exercise of ranking fundraising priorities occurred in 1993, prior to the Academic Endowment Campaign in Bloomington. Again, the faculty's recommendations through their prioritization ballot weighed heavily in setting the overall goals for the Campaign (Faculty Council Minutes April 20, 1993). The priorities of the Faculty Council members were very similar to the early 1980s exercise.

The values of an institution are often inferred from how the institution chooses to expend its resources. As Hollinger (2001) mentions in his article about the successful role of the UC Berkeley senate, when faculty have input into financial decisions and priority setting at the institution, shared governance tends to follow naturally. These examples of the BFCs role in planning and decision-making in budgeting and fundraising (how the institution chooses to expend its resources) provide clear evidence that in Bloomington, if Hollinger is correct, at least one condition for successful shared governance is present.

Student Affairs and Campus Life

Another area of campus administration that has benefited from the expertise and dedication of deans of men and women, and now deans of students, is the large area of student affairs and campus life. The faculty traditions of involvement in student life at IUB are enduring. From their earliest days of handling misconduct cases in the mid-1800s, the Bloomington faculty have retained their involvement in the out-of-classroom activities of the student body through claiming legislative authority over many student-related policies and consultative authority on other student life matters. The most direct evidence of this involvement is the faculty's ownership and authorship of the Student Code of Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct (previously entitled IU Student Code of Conduct). Intense drafting sessions of this document, with sometimes heated discussions about academic dishonesty, student misbehavior, and speech codes, have occurred every three to four years of the Council and typically extend for several sessions at a time. Although most students (and many student affairs staff on the campus) do not recognize that the faculty still maintain authorship over the Student Code it is a lasting symbol of their influence in the out-of-class behaviors and activities of the student population.

Student activism in the 1960s afforded the BFC an additional opportunity to make a statement about out-of-class activities. A Fall 1969 meeting

agenda in the included discussions on the war in Vietnam and a discussion on fraternities and sororities on the campus. On the first topic, the Council endorsed a resolution on students' political activities against the war in Vietnam:

> The Faculty Council recognizes students' and faculty members' concern about the war in Vietnam. One evidence of the extent of this concern is the proposed nationwide moratorium on October 15. We support a citizen's right to participate in such a non-violent expression of opinion, and ask our colleagues that students who wish to support the moratorium in a lawful and non-disruptive manner, not be penalized" (Faculty Council Minutes October 7, 1969).

On the discussion of fraternities and sororities, the faculty council entertained several motions, each providing an indication of the level of involvement of the faculty in campus activities. First, the BFC members considered that "it be the stated policy of the Faculty Council and of the Board of Trustees at Indiana University that the unanimous vote for purposes of selection of members in fraternity and sorority houses at Indiana University be eliminated" (Faculty Council Minutes October 7, 1969). Second, they discussed the creation of a Standing Committee on Fraternities and Sororities that would provide "close liaison among fraternities and sororities, the Faculty Council, the Student Affairs Committee, and other appropriate bodies. It would follow up Faculty Council and other recommendations, and aid in the improvement and fulfillment of the educational goals of fraternities and sororities" (Faculty Council Minutes October 7, 1969). Third, Professor Hofstetter, presenting for the ad hoc committee assigned to investigate these matters, suggested that the "Faculty Council support the National Interfraternity Council in condemning the practice of harassment in any form" (Faculty Council Minutes October 7, 1969). And finally, a resolution was introduced that commended the efforts of the campus fraternity organizations for improving equal rights and opportunities and urged both the men's and women's organizations to "develop model plans for pledge education including increased attention to the intellectual and moral role of the university in our society and to the great issues now being debated on university campuses through the land" (Faculty Council Minutes October 7, 1969). Speaking on behalf of these recommendations, Professor Remak, representing the local AAUP Chapter, stated that

> the American university has a mission which goes beyond the classroom; the American ideal of higher education aims in some way at the total man. That is why we have a campus and campus activities; and that's why we have extra-curricular activities; and why we have music and art and lectures and even athletics, and other such things, in order to draw in the

whole man and do something for the character and personality, not just for his memorizing to pass examinations (Faculty Council Minutes October 7, 1969).

The Faculty Council discussed issues of Greek life periodically in the agenda records, including an hour-long debate in 2002. While Greek housing was a main topic of that conversation, it was general student campus residence halls that dominated another conversation when the BFC resolved to require all first-year students to live in campus housing beginning in the Fall of 2003. Citing a Student Affairs Committee co-authored report, the resolution stated that "students who start living on campus realize greater benefits almost across the board, which advantage them in later years" (Faculty Council Minutes September 17, 2002). Although this housing requirement was implemented with the full support of the campus administration and Board of Trustees it is more difficult to judge the impact of the Greek Life resolutions. The faculty's influence in those cases appears to be more of expectation setting and persuasion rather than edict.

Another student activity that pervades the Bloomington Faculty Council records since 1969 is intercollegiate athletics. The Constitution of the Bloomington Faculty claimed legislative authority over intercollegiate athletics and the BFC has executed that authority many times over its history. Annually, the Athletics Committee (governed by a policy of the Faculty Council) reports on the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics personnel activities, expenditures and incomes, student-athlete admissions, academic support for athletics, and other topics. In the 1980s, the BFC entertained critical questions about the academic support services available to athletes and the establishment of an athlete's ombudsman to assist student-athletes in grievances against coaches, teammates, and the Athletic Department. Recognizing further problems athletes face when registering for classes around practice schedules, the BFC endorsed a priority registration strategy for student-athletes in 2005. The Bloomington Faculty Council has also served as a representative to the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics, a consortium of faculty governance bodies concerned with faculty governance of intercollegiate (most often, Division I) athletics, since 2004.

The final example of student life that the faculty have involved themselves in at various points in its history could best be described as creating academic enrichment programs for students. Most notably, the BFC spent a year debating the establishment of the Herman B Wells Program for Outstanding Young Scholars. The BFC created this program to attract the very best and brightest undergraduate students to the Bloomington campus. The scholarship for students covers tuition and fees, room and board, study abroad expenses, and a living stipend—a very attractive program that

resulted only after a year-long debate over the balance between recruitment of high-achieving students and open access admissions, commitments by the IU Foundation to raise all the funds necessary for the program from endowment funds and not general fund moneys, and sufficient support from the faculty at-large to proceed with the program implementation.

The second and third enrichment programs created by the BFC are related—a minority achievers program for undergraduates and one for graduate students. In 1987, the Affirmative Action Committee of the BFC brought to the Council a proposal for a merit program for minority achievers. Professor Carolyn Calloway-Thomas argued that the declining minority enrollments at higher education institutions were disappointing and that

> Clearly there is a compelling need to reverse this trend. The proposed Merit Program for Minority Achievers is the Affirmative Action Committee's attempt to break out of the present situation. Our proposal is a serious response to the drain of many capable minority student residing in Indiana who attend universities outside of the state. It is also a serious response to the number of lively minds lost to education (Faculty Council Minutes March 24, 1987).

When the BFC endorsed a proposal to create this Minority Achievers Program (later renamed the Hudson-Holland Scholars Program in honor of two devoted faculty members) in April 1987 it signaled to the campus administration its supportive opinion on the expenditure of campus resources toward the recruitment and retention of minority students. Similarly, in 1989, the BFC approved a version of this program for graduate students, adding that the support at the graduate level was even more critical because "this segment of the population suffers even greater under-representation than at the undergraduate level" (Circular B19-90).

These examples, and other archival evidence, suggested that the BFC has played an influential and meaningful role in the domain of student affairs, and in certain cases, was involved in significant decisions that affect the lives of Indiana University Bloomington students.

Meaningful Participation

Each year, when the Council reconvenes, the BFC President has the opportunity to outline his/her ideas about the coming year as well as offer a bit of an orientation to new faculty members who may never have served on the BFC before. In 1991, BFC President Norman Overly commented that:

> This is certainly a challenging time in the life of higher education. It is a time for all to be engaged in the determination of our future, not a time for faculty to sit on the sidelines, leaving decision making to others...Faculty and student governance structures should play a major part in decisions related to issues faculty the university."

It seems that the "challenging times," or as Tierney (1998) calls them times of "crisis," in American higher education are occurring more frequently, thus, the importance of institutional governance, and the faculty's role within it, gains renewed purpose.

Speaking under different circumstances a decade later, BFC President Robert Eno reflected on the passage of an important resolution and placed that action in the context of the broader purpose and meaning of faculty governance:

> It [the same-sex domestic partner benefits policy] was an example of something that the Council does that actually has a direct and important impact on the lives of people on our campus and in that case on all the campuses of Indiana University and there are a number of times that will happen each year when our group makes a decision, takes a move, prods the Trustees or acts on its own authority, of which we have considerable amount, to do something that really deeply affects the lives of all of us on the campus and that is principally why the Bloomington Faculty Council can be an important body" (Faculty Council Minutes September 10, 2002).

Strong evidence in the BFC records indicates that this faculty senate does entertain questions of particular significance to the institution and has demonstrated its ability to act independently of the administration and responsibly on important issues.

Conclusion

This study attempted to add to the growing scholarship on faculty governance by investigating one faculty senate's activities for evidence of the role of faculty in university governance. The previously cited example, and others within the BFC archives, suggest that, over time, the faculty have been heavily involved in significant decisions. As faculty members around the country look to define their roles within institutional decision-making it is helpful to look to successful examples of faculty governance for direction. Indiana University Bloomington is one of those successful examples. Hollinger (2001) draws insights from the two systems he has worked within to say that, "(a) senates with little power should not pretend to be more than holding operations, (b) senates that aspire to more than that must be given substantial authority over important decisions, and (c) the particular, historical circumstances of any given campus will foster or frustrate efforts to maintain or increase the faculty's role in campus governance" (pg. 30). As demonstrated with the materials reviewed in this paper, the BFC is a senate with power, they have authority over important decisions, and the historical circumstance, in particular the long-term tenure of campus administrators from among the faculty ranks, has increased the role of faculty in campus

governance.

This study utilized a relatively contemporary set of historical materials—faculty senate records from the 20th century. Institutional archives contain a wealth of informative materials documenting the history of individual institutions and many institutional histories rely heavily on university archives for documentary evidence. However, faculty senate records are an excellent resource and should be utilized more commonly to gain insight into the under-explored area of faulty members' campus service activities.

References

American Association of University Professors (1966). Statement on government of colleges and universities. Washington, DC: American Association of University Professors.

Burgan, M. (2004). Preface: Why governance? Why Now?. In W. Tierney (Ed.), Competing conceptions of academic governance: Negotiating the perfect storm. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Douglas, J. (1988). Professors on strike: An analysis of two decades of faculty work stoppages, 1966-1985. The Labor Lawyer 4.

Eckel, P. (2000). The role of shared governance in institutional hard decisions: Enabler or antagonist? The Review of Higher Education, 24(1).

Engstrand, G. (2005). A university senate for all. Academe 91.

Helms. R. & Price, T. (2005). Who needs a faculty senate?. Academe, 91.

Hollinger, D. (2001). Faculty governance, the University of California, and the future of academe. AAUP Bulletin 87(3).

Hutcheson, P. A. (2000). A professional professoriate: unionization, bureaucratization, and the AAUP. Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press.

Kadish, S. (1972). The theory of the profession and its predicament. AAUP Bulletin 58(2).

Kezar, A. & Eckel, P. (2004). Meeting today's governance challenges. The Journal of Higher Education 75(4).

Leatherman, C. (1998, January 30). Shared governance under siege: Is it time to revive it or get rid of it? The Chronicle of Higher Education.

Lucas, C. (1994). American higher education: A history. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Mares, N. (2004). Chronology of Governing Faculty Groups at Indiana University. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Archives.

Minor, J. (2004). Understanding faculty senates: Moving from mystery to models. The Review of Higher Education 27(3).

Rhoades, G. (1998). Managed professionals, unionized faculty and restructuring academic labor. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Rosser, V. (2003). Historical overview of faculty governance in higher education. In M. T. Miller and J. Caplow (Eds.), Policy and University Faculty Governance. Connecticut: Information Age Publishing).

Scott, J. V. (1996). The strange death of faculty governance. PS: Political Science and Politics 29(4).

Tierney, W. (1998). The responsive university: Restructuring for high performance. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Tierney, W. (Ed.) (2004). Competing conceptions of academic governance: Negotiating the perfect storm. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Tierney, W. & Minor, J. (2003). Challenges for governance: A report by the Center for Higher Education Policy Analysis. Los Angeles: University of Southern California.

Williams, D, Gore, W., Broches, C. & Lostoski, C. (1987). One faculty's perceptions of its governance role. The Journal of Higher Education 58(6).

Archival Sources from the IU Archives

Collection C236 Faculty Council Minutes of the General Faculty: 1836, 1837, 1839, 1841, 1846

Collection C233 University Council Minutes

Collection C179 Bloomington Faculty Council:

"Proposal of an Advisory Committee on Budgetary Affairs," Memo from Frank Franz, President IU Bloomington AAUP, to Leo Solt, Secretary, BFC, 23 October 1972, Circular #B8-73.

Minutes of the Bloomington Faculty Council, 6 February 1973.

"Budgetary Affairs Committee, Bloomington Faculty Council, Year End Report, April 22, 1975," Circular B25-75.

Minutes of the Bloomington Faculty Council, 16 September 1986.

"Annual Report of the Budgetary Affairs Committee," Circular B8-87.

Minutes of the Bloomington Faculty Council, 20 September 1988.

Minutes of the Bloomington Faculty Council, 17 September 1991.

Memo from George Springer to BFC reprinted in Circular B29-81.

Minutes of the Bloomington Faculty Council, 19 January 1982.

"BFC Capital Campaign Priorities Ballot," February 10, 1982.

"Memo from Agenda Committee to BFC on Motions Concerning Capital Campaign Priorities," February 2, 1982.

"Draft Ballot"

"The Eight Goals." Circular B20-82.

Minutes of the Bloomington Faculty Council, 20 April 1993.

"Agenda Committee Business" remarks by Professor Robert Eno, September 10, 2002, Minutes of the IU Bloomington Faculty Council.

For materials related to the 1986 salary discussions, consult the following: Memo from Donald Gray to Members of the Faculty of the Bloomington Campus, January 31, 1986.; Circular B29-86; Salary Ballot (February 24, 1986); Minutes of the General Meeting of the Bloomington Campus Faculty, February 6, 1986; Announcement of A Special Meeting of the Faculty of the Bloomington Campus; Circular B56-86. For materials related to the 2005 presidential discussions, consult the Supplemental Collection for 2005-2006 BFC Records.

Memo from Professor Milton Fisk to President John Ryan, 22 February 1973, American Federation of Teachers, 1972-1973.

Minutes of the Bloomington Faculty Council, 6 December 1977.

Minutes of the University Faculty Council, 14 October 1980.

"Informational Seminar on Collective Bargaining" Agenda and supplemental materials, 5 December 1980.

"AAUP-IUB Response to the Trustees' Decision on Collective Bargaining," 7 February 1981, Circular U10-81.

Collection C45 President John W. Ryan papers at the IU Archives:

Memo from D. C. Danielson to Professor Patrick M. Brantlinger, 1 May 1980, American Federation of Teachers, 1979-1980.

Resolution of the IU Northwest Faculty Organization, 8 May 1972, American Federation of Teachers Local 1955 (IUN) 1971-1972.

Memo from Professor Don Gray to Members of the Bloomington Chapter of the AAUP, and Other Members of the Bloomington Faculty and Administration, 30 March 1974, Collective Bargaining 1975-1976.

"Ballot on Collective Bargaining." Collective Bargaining 1979-1980.

"Second Guessing the Faculty's Position on Collective Bargaining," AFT-IUB Speaks Out Newsletter, November 18, 1980. Collective Bargaining 1980-1981.

Memo from D. C. Danielson to Professor Patrick Brantlinger, 1 May 1980, American Federation of Teachers, 1979-1980.

Memo from President John Ryan to The Faculty, 10 February 1981, Collective Bargaining 1980-1981.

Memo from Professor William E. Becker to Mr. Richard Stoner, 23 October 1981, Collective Bargaining, 1981-1982.

Kelly A. Kish is a doctoral candidate in Higher Education at Indiana University Bloomington. She received her B.A. in government and politics from the University of Maryland and her M.S. in Higher Education and Student Affairs Administration from Indiana University Bloomington. Kish has served as Chief of Staff to the Bloomington Faculty Council and currently serves as Research Specialist in the Office of the President. Correspondence regarding this article may be sent to the authors at kekish@indiana.edu.

Lauren E. Morrill-Ragusea graduated with a Master's in Higher Education and Student Affairs from Indiana University Bloomington in 2008. She received her B.A. in History from Indiana University Bloomington in 2005. While at IUB she served graduate supervisor for Residential Programs and Services in Wright Quadrangle and a practicum intern for the Bloomington Faculty Council.

Robin L. Murphey graduated from Indiana University Bloomington in 2008 with a M.S. in Higher Education and Student Affairs. She earned her B.S. in Computer Science and Mathematics from Georgetown College in 2000. While at IUB, Robin served as a Graduate Research Assistant for the Faculty Council Office and Graduate Leadership Development Coordinator in the Student Activities Office.

Predicting Collegiate Philanthropy:
Student Engagement as a Correlate of Young Alumni Giving

John V. Moore III

Alumni giving is an important source of revenue for colleges and universities. This exploratory study is an attempt to find predictors of future alumni giving across multiple institutions using the National Survey of Student Engagement's benchmarks of educational effectiveness. Few effects were found, leading the researcher to speculate that the decision for alumni to donate to their schools may be a decision based more on institutional post-graduation efforts than college experiences.

Introduction

Financial gifts from alumni are an important source of income for American colleges and universities. Nationally, it has become one of the largest sources of revenue for institutions of higher education (Council for Aid to Education, 2003). Beyond the monetary benefits, alumni giving rates are used as a measure of institutional quality by external constituencies. In the highly influential US News and World Report's national rankings of colleges and universities, for example, alumni giving accounts for 5% of a school's overall score (US News and World Report, 2004). Grant-giving agencies and major corporate donors may also use alumni giving in their awards criteria (Winston, 2000).

Given the importance of alumni giving, it is no surprise that institutions invest time and resources in the cultivation of alumni donors. College Web sites indicate that this is done through the work of alumni offices, the hiring of fundraisers dedicated to fund solicitation from graduates, and annual fund drives. Another part of this effort includes statistically modeling student behaviors such as fraternity or sorority membership (O'Neill, 2005) and extracurricular involvement (Taylor & Martin, 1995) or demographic characteristics such as age (Olsen, Smith, & Wunnave, 1989), race (Clotfelter, 2001), and level of financial aid (Marr, Mullin, & Siegfried, 2005). Managers of giving campaigns are interested in factors that are shown to be predictors of alumni giving. This kind of marketing research assists institutions in deciding where it is best to commit resources in the solicitation of funds from alumni (Mosser, 1993; Pearson, 1999).

Because of the personal nature of the data and the way in which the results will be used, many of the studies of alumni giving have been local, in-house examinations of the phenomenon. Few have attempted to look nationally at characteristics associated with alumni giving at colleges (Sears, 1990/1922; Spaeth and Greenley, 1970). It is only recently that there have been attempts to examine a broader context have been published (Clotfelter,

1999; Cunningham and Cochi-Ficano, 2002). This exploratory study seeks to add to the body of literature on alumni giving by examining the relationship between alumni giving and student experiences in college (as quantified by National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) scores) at a number of schools from across the country.

Specifically, the study examines whether there is a relationship between institutional averages on NSSE benchmarks of good educational practice and later giving patterns for graduates. This question will be addressed by correlating measures of student cohorts' experiences while in college with their future alumni giving rates.

History of Alumni Giving

The Beginning of Alumni Giving

In the last 50 years, alumni have been a major source of funding for their alma maters. They have consistently provided one quarter of all voluntary funding for American institutions of higher education (Council for Aid to Education, 2003; Council for Financial Aid to Education, 1987; Smith, 1978). Alumni have always played an important role in supporting their colleges in this country. Like American universities themselves, soliciting donations from alumni fits within an English tradition. Markoff (1978) traced its history back more than 500 years at Oxford University. Early in the history of the United States, four alumni donated a parcel of land to Harvard in 1648 (Markoff). Harvard was also the recipient of the largest alumni gift of the seventeenth century; William Stroughton gave £1,000 to his school in 1699 (Markoff) which is approximately $207,733 in 2007 dollars.

Although these early alumni gifts were significant to the universities that received them, it took more than 150 years for schools to begin organizing their alumni giving programs in a meaningful way. Curti and Nash (1965) cite University of Michigan president James Angell, who, in his 1871 inaugural address, claimed for the university a "hope that the men she [University of Michigan] had been sending forth into the honorable callings and professions might testify to their indebtedness by increasing her power and usefulness" (p. 187). This was to be accomplished by those men giving back to the university. And the fact that Michigan was a public school did not mean that graduates could not assist their alma mater. It should not, he continued, "be thought that the aid furnished by the State leaves no room for munificence" (Curti & Nash, p. 187). Yale University, too, had an important and early foray into the world of organized alumni giving. In 1890, Yale developed the first annual alumni giving program in the United States. The Yale System, as it came to be known, allowed the school to grow its endowment through small donations rather than solely depending on major

contributions. The school had been in financial trouble for years and administrators hoped this program might assist a bit in bringing in some additional funds. It more than met their expectations, raising $11,000 ($250,824) in its first year and about $10,000 each subsequent year for the next ten (Geiger, 1985). By 1905, Yale's alumni giving turned around what had been years of fiscal woes. Indeed, it was viewed by the university leadership as providing the institution with a competitive edge over its peers (Geiger, 1985). In the same year, Harvard University orchestrated a fund drive targeting alumni; the class of 1880, in honor of its 25th year reunion, raised the substantial sum of $100,000 ($2.3 million). That sum, subsequently, became a tradition for each graduating class to give for its quarter-century anniversary. Alumni giving improved the fortunes of these two institutions rapidly in the next two decades. Both added approximately $10 million ($243 million) to their endowments in the decade that followed 1905, and, in the 1920s, the schools received a combined $174 million ($2 billion) in voluntary support (Geiger).

Although these campaigns were successful, the system was not adopted in the greater higher education community (Brubacher & Rudy, 1976). By 1910, only four additional annual alumni funds were in existence, all were at private schools. The University of Illinois was the first public institution to create such a fund in 1915, and by 1922, its program was one of only seven like it that existed at public universities in the United States (Curti & Nash, 1965). Although the number of formal donation programs may have been small, the impact of alumni giving should not be underestimated. Geiger (1985) contends that it was voluntary giving during this time period that allowed top colleges to differentiate themselves from less competitive schools and was one of the major factors in determining the unique character of the top research universities in the country.

Formalization of Alumni Giving

Although there was a group of schools that were successfully raising operational funds from graduates, there was little systematization of the alumni giving process prior to World War II. Conley (1999) points to a 1957 joint meeting of the American Alumni Council (AAC) and the American College Public Relations Association as the turning point in history of alumni giving. A summary of that meeting, The Greenbriar Report, noted the need for organized, regular giving as a goal for institutional advancement. Prior to that meeting, the AAC had published A Primer of Alumni Work by R. W. Sailor in 1944. Sailor was a faculty member from Cornell University and had worked with the AAC for over 20 years doing research into best practices in dealing with alumni (Morrill, 1945). With sections titled Goodwill Building, The Alumni Office, Fund Raising, The Magazine, and Alumni Organization, the text covers all aspects of a development office from staff-

ing and equipment needs to the importance of getting alumni involved in organized groups. Many of the recommendations made by Sailor are still used by alumni offices today.

The 1940s were an exciting time for colleges. Unprecedented expansion occurred between 1942 and 1944, doubling the college alumni population in the United States (Sailor, 1944). In an attempt to harness the financial potential of this new group, the AAC recommended that planning for a yearly alumni fund that would stabilize the giving year to year and get alumni into a habit of giving to their alma maters regularly. Few schools were using such organized planning for their giving; an AAC survey of colleges found that between 1919 and 1944 only 32 of the 300 schools surveyed had annual alumni giving drives. The AAC study also looked at the average annual giving for institutions among alumni contacted. The average giving over the time period remained steady (through a post-war boom, a national depression, and a world war) at about $12.28 ($146) per alumni contacted. Growth would come not from more generous alumni, Sailor advocated, but from volume and consistency: "A fund hopes primarily to increase its list of subscribers, knowing that if it can add a thousand subscribers to the list it will add a presumptive $12,280 ($145,750) to the total annual income" (Sailor, 1944, p. 120).

The goal was not to get big gifts, but rather to "come as nearly as possible to one hundred percent in the number of contributions" (Sailor, 1944, p. 120). He predicted that although new subscribers may start off giving for as little as "five dollars a year…once they are in and sold on the idea, it is not a difficult task to get them to increase the amounts of their subscriptions" (p. 120-121). Sailor also recommended that institutions split up their alumni into logical groups that can compete against each other in categories such as number of subscribers, percentage of subscribers, and giving total. Efforts in standardization such as this, and those that continued through the 1950s, contributed to the institutionalization of alumni drives by the time of Curti and Nash's 1965 review of philanthropy in higher education. Today, alumni development Web sites show signs that Sailor's ideas about most aspects of the creation and administration of alumni relations are still very much in use on college campuses today.

Alumni Giving Today

Charles Eliot, president of Harvard from 1869-1909, noted a relationship between the influx of money from alumni and the quest for additional finances from other sources:

> It is, of course, largely by the extent of the support accorded to a college by its own graduates that the world judges the right of that college to seek co-operation of others in planning for the future. An institution that cannot rally to its financial assistance the men who have taken its degrees and whose diploma is their passport into the world is in a poor position to ask any assistance from others. It is not merely what alumni give; it is the fact that they do give that is of supreme importance (Markoff, 1978, p. 80).

Eliot's words proved prescient. Schools today take this same message directly to students. Kalamazoo College, for example, informs its alumni on its Web site:

> The percentage of alumni participation is as important as the total dollars raised. It is a way for Kalamazoo College to say to the world 'our alumni believe in what we do here,' a fact that helps the College raise funds from outside sources (Kalamazoo College, 2008).

In the rankings game that has become so influential in American higher education, percentage of alumni giving is used as one measure of an institution's strength and success. The rationale behind the use of alumni giving is that former students will contribute to their institutions if they were happy with the experiences they had while enrolled. Giving, then, is a proxy for student satisfaction (US News & World Report, 2004). This point is also driven home by the schools' messages to their alumni. Princeton's Annual Giving (AG) campaign Web site notes that perhaps more significant than the dollars given are the messages sent through alumni donations: "As important as the funds are, AG's equally significant purpose is its spirit. Through gifts to AG, Princetonians demonstrate their regard for the University, their affinity with their classmates, and their desire to help current students" (Princeton University, 2008). Others make the direct connection to rankings:

> Alumni giving is a key factor in determining national rankings; therefore your gift helps increase the value of every Madison diploma. This in turn, makes our graduates more competitive in the job market. … The number of alumni who make a gift every year is a key factor in determining national rankings of colleges and universities, such as U.S. News & World Report's annual top-20 list (James Madison University, 2008).

In addition to the status that a high percentage of alumni giving can add to an institution, revenue from alumni giving can represent an important source of discretionary funds for an institution (Leslie and Ramey, 1988). This has become particularly important in a time of decreasing public funding for higher education (Leslie and Ramey). In 1990, the Council for Financial Aid to Education calculated that donations from alumni to colleges and universities totaled about $1.2 billion ($1.9 billion in 2005 dollars) (Council for Financial Aid to Education, 1991). By 2005, that number had grown to $7.1 billion (Council for Aid to Education, 2006). The efforts by institutions of higher education to maximize their share of that multi-billion dollar

sum have been labeled by at least one researcher as part of the arms race in education (Winston, 2000).

Predicting Alumni Giving

An important part of the arsenal in this arms race is the ability for institutions to maximize their returns on investments geared toward generating alumni gifts. This drives schools to better understand the giving patterns of their graduates. Indeed, the vast majority of the scholarship in this area appears to come from this motivation. Many of the studies of alumni giving have been done by single institutions attempting to understand more efficient ways of targeting former students (Conley, 1999). Generally, these studies look at various characteristics of the alumni population, although school characteristics may also be considered in the rare cases of cross-institutional studies.

Of the variables commonly studied, only a few have consistently predicted alumni giving effectively across multiple studies. In his review of 33 studies of alumni giving, Conley (1999) found that among the 24 variables, only 6 were significant factors in differentiating donors from non-donors. These factors included: involvement in alumni activities, reading alumni publications, decade of graduation, previous giving history, additional education (degrees), and perception of financial need of the institution. The remaining 18 variables have been used in either one study only, or have had mixed, inconclusive, or non-significant results. Among institutional variables, only two were consistent predictors of higher rates of alumni giving: larger endowments (Dunn, Terkla, & Secakusuma, 1988; Loessin & Duronio, 1990) and a more active or experienced development office (Boyle, 1990; Pickett, 1981). Boyle also found that institutional quality was a significant factor in alumni giving. Through interviews with students, alumni, faculty, and administrators, he gathered information on student integration into the campus, student faculty interaction, involvement in extracurricular activities, and a well-articulated set of college values. These factors are quite similar to those measured by NSSE in its College Student Report.

Other student experience factors that have been found to be predictive of alumni giving include level of involvement on campus as a student (Miller & Casebeer, 1990), level of alumni involvement with the institution (Bruggink & Siddiqui, 1995), emotional attachment to the alma mater (Brittingham & Pezzullo, 1989), academic success while at the school (Gaier, 2005), and overall satisfaction with the undergraduate experience (Miller & Casebeer, 1990). These studies, with the exception of Gaier's, were at single institutions. They also looked at individuals' reflections back on their college experience, rather than longitudinally asking current students about their institutional perceptions and later examining their giving rates as alumni.

44

Methods

Study Sample

Institutions who participated in the four NSSE annual survey administrations between 2000 and 2003 were included in this study. The Web sites of the 725 schools in this group were searched for information on alumni giving rates by class year. There were 23 schools that published alumni giving rates by graduation year. Several of these institutions had partaken in the NSSE project for multiple years. (Of the 23 schools, six had two years of data, five had three years, and two had four years. The remaining 10 had one year of data.) There were 45 appropriate cases with alumni giving percentages that were able to be matched to NSSE data.

Variables

The independent variables for this study come from the NSSE benchmarks of educational practice, which summarize student responses to clusters of questions on the NSSE survey. They are summarized below:

- Academic Challenge: the extent to which a student feels they are being challenged by in and out of class coursework;
- Active and Collaborative Learning: the amount of participation a student reports working with other students in and out of the class room to complete their academic work;
- Student-Faculty Interaction: the amount and quality of contact with faculty on academic and career issues;
- Enriching Educational Experiences: the level of involvement in beneficial educational and co-curricular activities such as an intern ship, community service or a learning community; and
- Supportive Campus Environment: the student's rating of their school's climate in terms of its support for them and the quality of their relationships with peers, faculty and staff. (National Survey of Student Engagement, 2003a)

To look at the relationship between alumni giving and students' experience in college, NSSE benchmarks were correlated with alumni giving rates (percentage of students contributing to the alumni fund) by class year for institutions. Information was gathered about alumni giving rates from schools' Web sites.

The 2004 giving rates for individual classes were matched with scores on the NSSE Benchmarks for seniors in the equivalent year. That is, the percent of students in the class of 2000 (at a given institution) who gave money to their institution in 2004 was paired with the mean scores on the NSSE benchmarks from students who were seniors (at the same institution) in 2000.

45

The National Survey of Student Engagement

NSSE was designed by a team of higher education researchers under the auspices of the Indiana University Center for Postsecondary Research. The survey consists of approximately 98 items (including demographic questions) that assess students' educational experiences, interactions with university officers and peers, and perceptions of campus culture. The items were developed based on research into good practices in higher education. The benchmarks are five groups of NSSE questions that are used to assist institutions in understanding areas in which they can improve practice on their campus (National Survey of Student Engagement, 2003b).

NSSE's benchmarks have been used in a number of studies and have been found to be significantly associated with student success and persistence (Kuh, Cruce, Shoup, Kinzie, & Gonyea, 2007; Kuh, Kinzie, Cruce, Shoup, & Gonyea, 2006). These benchmarks also align well with the previous work on predictors of alumni giving mentioned above. They capture student experiences that have previously been associated with graduates' voluntary giving such as interaction with faculty and staff, participation in campus activities, and satisfaction with academics.

Analysis

Because of the relatively small sample size in this study (n=45), the most appropriate way to explore the relationship between alumni giving percentage and NSSE benchmarks is through correlation. Correlations measure the existence of a relationship between two variables, the extent to which changes in one is associated with changes in the other. It is important to note, however, that it does not directly speak to a reason for this relationship, nor does it necessarily indicate any causation (Ary, Jacobs, & Razavieh, 2002).

The use of multiple cohorts from the same institution may have the impact of reducing variance by making the sample more homogenous. This concern must be balanced with the additional accuracy that comes from the inclusion of additional cases, however (Hinkle, Wiersma, & Jurs, 2003). An analysis of the data with and without the multiple years included indicated only small changes in both the means and standard deviations for each of the variables. This suggests that the structural features of the data remain intact and that the variability is not being suppressed in a way to significantly alter the strength of any of the correlations. A t-test conducted on the two data sets further suggests that they come from the same population (t (68) =.615, p < .05, two-tailed). A final check was made to ensure that there was no correlation between the number of cohorts a school had in the study and the other variables. There was no significant relationship on any of the variables,

indicating that the schools with more cohorts are not biasing the data in a particular direction.

Before conducting the analysis, several assumptions of correlation analyses were examined. The first was to plot each benchmark against alumni giving percentage to ensure that the relationship between the variables was not clearly curvilinear. The second was to check the normality of the distribution of each variable. The relationships among dependant and independent variables appeared sufficiently linear, and the skewness and kurtosis for each was within an acceptable range, indicating that the normality assumption was not violated. With the assumptions checked, each benchmark was then correlated with the alumni giving percentage.

Results

The percentages of alumni giving for the 45 cases ranged from 2%-36% with a mean 15.3% and a standard deviation of 8.8%. Table 1 contains the means, and standard deviations for the variables included in the study.

Means and Standard Deviations of Variables

Variable Name	Mean Score	Standard Deviation
Percent of Cohort Giving	15.13	8.83
Level of Academic Challenge	60.84	4.36
Active and Collaborative Learning	52.26	3.77
Student Faculty Interaction	51.73	5.00
Enriching Educational Experiences	56.02	6.69
Supportive Campus Environment	62.18	4.66

The correlation analysis did not show any strong or significant relationships between alumni giving and three of the benchmarks: Level of Academic Challenge, Active and Collaborative Learning, and Student-Faculty Interaction. There was a moderate, positive, and significant relationship between Supportive Campus Environment and alumni giving (R2=.351, p<.05). Institutions with students who found the environment more supportive had higher percentages of alumni giving. There was also a small, significant, negative correlation between Enriching Educational Experiences and giving (R2= -.253, p<.10). Institutions with students who participated more in activities such as study abroad or community service had lower percentages of participation in giving by alumni. Additionally, there were significant correlations among some the benchmarks as well, indicating that there are relationships between these variables and perhaps some overlap in what they measure. A complete list of the correlation results can be found in Table 2.

Intercorrelations Between NSSE Benchmark Scores and Alumni Giving Percentage

	% Giving	LAC	ACL	SFI	EEE	SCE
Percent of Cohort Giving (% Giving)	---	.093	-.082	.001	-.253*	.351**
Level of Academic Challenge (LAC)		---	.249*	.707***	.686***	.238
Active and Collaborative Learning (ACL)			---	.357*	.193	.219
Student Faculty Interaction (SFI)				---	.645***	.313**
Enriching Educational Experiences (EEE)					---	.115
Supportive Campus Environment (SCE)						---

*p < .10 level, **p<.05, ***p<.01

Conclusions

Discussion

This study looked at the relationship between student experiences in college as measured by NSSE's College Student Report and those students' giving rates as young alumni. Only one of these correlations, Supportive Campus Environment, was found to be significant and positive. Another benchmark, Enriching Educational Experiences, was negatively correlated with alumni giving. The remaining indicators did not have a significant relationship with the percent of alumni who donated to their alma mater.

Institutions that do a better job making students feel supported on campus have higher percentages of students who give back as alumni. Perhaps this commitment to student satisfaction is something that is continued after graduation through frequent contact with alumni and invitations to continue to participate in campus life. Alternately, students who leave institutions where they have felt supported are likely to, as graduates, retain their positive feelings and be more likely to give back financially. Institutions looking to improve their alumni giving rates would do well to examine ways in which they can be more supportive to their future alumni while they are on campus as students by cultivating respectful relationships between students and their faculty and administrators and by carefully assessing their needs and supporting them appropriately. This relationship also supports prior research by Miller & Casebeer (1990), who found a correlation between student experiences and later giving.

The second significant correlation is less straighforward. Institutions with a greater number of seniors more engaged in enriching educational experiences such as community service, learning communities, or internships have a lower percentage of graduates who donate as alumni. Perhaps a clue here lies in one of the limitations of the study—that its focus is younger alumni. Studies have demonstrated that students who are more involved in community service are more likely to pursue careers in service oriented professions (Astin, Sax, & Avalos, 1999) and those that require further education (Astin & Sax, 1998). Both of these factors might limit the discretionary income that younger graduates have to donate back to their schools. This idea is lent additional support from previous studies which found that individual income is a strong predictor of giving both in and outside of academe (Lakford and Wyckoff, 1991; Okunade, Wunnava, & Walsh, 1994).

The non-significant results challenge some previous studies, particularly those that suggest that involvement on campus or with faculty has a positive relationship with future giving as alumni (Brittingham & Pezzullo, 1989; Miller & Casebeer, 1990). As previously mentioned, however, these studies generally have two differences with this one: they do not time-lag their data (they measure giving and experiences simultaneously), and they take place within the context of a single institution. Despite the fact that this study provides little evidence for a relationship between a student's college experience and their willingness to donate to the institution later in life, it does not mean that these relationships do not exist at any given school.

Limitations and Future Research

The limited scope of the sample is a fault of the study. By no means are the schools in the sample representative of the current landscape of higher education today. The majority of the schools (81%) were classified as Baccalaureate Liberal Arts (Bac-LA) schools (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2000). Bac-LA schools are generally smaller schools through which students travel in more traditional patterns. It is easy to extrapolate why these schools were more likely to track alumni giving by class. Their smaller size makes it more likely that individual students will have stronger class year identifications than those at larger institutions, where associations are more likely to be associated with a school, department, or other affinity group within the university.

Baccalaureate schools are also better performers overall on the benchmarks that NSSE measures (National Survey of Student Engagement, 2003b). The selection criteria for this study (i.e. schools that contained information about alumni giving by class year) directly influenced the types of institutions included in the study in a way that potentially restricted the range of the sample on the benchmark scores. Range restriction of this type can easily mask correlations in a sample (Ary, Jacobs, & Razavieh, 2002). However, this limitation of range also made the schools in the sample more similar and may have prevented large differences in size of alumni affairs departments or other factors that might have explained differences.

A second limitation of the study is that the relationship between these two aggregate variables may be of limited usefulness. This study examines the relationship between a mean score of a sample of students on benchmarks and an average of giving. Perhaps a model with student level, rather than institutional level data would be more revealing. Such a model would

examine a more direct link between a student's experience and their giving as an alumnus and would provide more variability in the model.

Institutions have more variability within their students' NSSE benchmark score than they have among each others' (National Survey of Student Engagement, 2002). This greater range of scores and more direct relationship between an individual's experiences and their gift-making decisions would likely provide new, useful information that is being concealed by the aggregate nature of the current study. Therefore, a better way to examine the issue might be to measure students' individual scores on the benchmarks, then track whether they, as alumni, contributed to their former institution. Performing this type of analysis, however, would necessitate significant co-operation from participating schools and may be difficult to achieve.

A final limitation is the small nature of the sample size. Although 45 cases is adequate for correlation, with a larger sample a study could be conducted that permitted a more complex more utilizing multiple regression. This would allow for statistical control for some potentially extraneous variables such as competitiveness (Boyle, 1990), size of alumni programs (Boyle; Pickett, 1981), or endowment (Dunn, Terkla, & Secakusuma, 1988; Loessin & Duronio, 1990). With the correlation used in this study, there was no way to test for the impact of these variables. A more complex model could aid in teasing these issues apart.

Implications for Practice and Research

In a study on schools that outperform their predicted NSSE scores, Kuh, Kinzie, Schuh, Whitt, & Associates (2005) discuss specific programs that contribute to improving scores on specific benchmarks. Schools looking to create a more supportive campus environment would glean much from these findings. Specifically, the researchers examined transition programs, advising networks, peer support programs, multiple safety nets, residential environments, and support programs for special populations. Across all of these programs, three notable themes emerge: 1) close relationships between students and those that are intended to support them throughout their time at the university; 2) an integrated approach to student success that welcomes overlap among services and multiple points of access for students; and 3) a clear vision across faculty, staff, and students of what it takes to be a successful student at that institution. Institutions that replicate these types of systems would likely create a more supportive campus environments, causing more students to contribute back to their institution as alumni.

Having researched both charitable giving, generally, and alumni giving, specifically, Clotfelter (1999) views the latter as different from more traditional types of voluntary support. Some consistent predictors, however, have been found in both academic and non-academic sectors. The most

prominent among these are the relationship between income and giving. Wealthier individuals are more likely to regularly donate to charities as well as their alma maters (Lakford and Wyckoff, 1991; Okunade, Wunnava, and Walsh, 1994). Schools interested in understanding their own alumni giving patterns would do well to control for these variables when examining their former students. Nonetheless, even this may not lead to conclusive information about what motivates alumni to give.

Some scholars have noted that findings on the reasons for philanthropy, even those that specifically examine philanthropy in education, are difficult to apply to alumni giving (Mosser, 1993). Graduates often have very personal and somewhat irrational attachments to their alma mater that make finding appropriate variables. These attachments are quite difficult, if not impossible, to quantify and would likely vary immensely among institutions and individuals. Although it is easy to be critical of studies that only examine predictors of giving at single institutions, perhaps these are the most useful to the institutions, given the complexity of that decision and the difficulty in finding valid and reliable variables to serve as predictors. Indeed, some have suggested the project might be best abandoned altogether. Seligman (1998) claims that philanthropy is, at its core, an irrational decision and is therefore not predisposed to empirical study. However, this is should not mean that we abandon all hope of understanding the phenomenon of giving, only that is may be more complicated than we initially believed.

Alumni centers and researchers looking to better understand giving at their schools could take Seligman's advice and study the issue qualitatively. Asking alumni who do and do not donate what their motivation was for their giving decisions might begin to capture the supposed irrationality of student attachments and donation patterns. This could allow for some measure of theory building upon which future quantitative studies could build their analytic models.

Given the ambiguity in the research, institutions best techniques for improving their alumni giving rate may be to work harder at reaching students in new and creative ways. Unsurprisingly, researchers found a relationship between development center activity and alumni donation rates (Baade and Sundburg, 1996; Grunig, 1995; Pickett, 1981). This idea was confirmed by conducting a bit of post-script research. The researcher examined several institutions not included in the original sample, but whose characteristics paralleled those of the original study. Specifically schools that had increased their young alumni (less than 10 years out of the institution) giving rates significantly during a short period of time were sought out. All of the schools with such increases reported new, targeted campaigns that were often developed in coordination with the alumni at which they were aimed.

An excellent example of this is the campaign by Macalester College: Dead Rich Guys are No Way to Fund a College. It was directed to address the low giving rate for young alumni. After the campaign, the rate of giving for this group went from 1-3% per class to 6-10% per class, a strong improvement (Macalester College, 2003). The school took steps to ensure that the alumni understood the importance of giving and limited their asking to just ten dollars, a sum that was intended to be within the reach of most young alumni.

Given the importance that external constituencies place on the percent of alumni donating rather than the total amount of those donations, this campaign makes much sense. Ten dollars is a reasonable amount for even the least solvent of graduates. Receiving ten dollars from half your young alumni is potentially more valuable in the long run than one large donation of a similar dollar amount. It also establishes a pattern of giving to the institution, an important part of long-term donor cultivation (Lakford and Wyckoff, 1991).

If, as hypothesized above, a lack of disposable income in younger graduates at schools with higher Enriching Educational Experiences scores is a barrier to their giving, then this changing a fundraising focus from dollar amounts to simply giving something could prove quite fruitful. Outside agencies look less at total dollars collected from alumni, and more at giving percentages (US News and World Report, 2004; Winston, 2000). This means that even these small donations could have a large impact on the institution if collected in large numbers.

Conclusions

Alumni support of institutions of higher education has been an important part of college and university success almost since they were first established in the United States. Given the funding situations at many institutions today, and the sheer volume of alumni dollars that are donated each year, it would appear that its importance has not diminished with time. In 1952, John Pollard referred to the process of university fundraising as "operation endless" (p. 300), and those words are still true today. Research into the motivations and patterns of giving by alumni can make a valuable contribution to the lives of those who are charged with soliciting money from alumni in support of their alma maters. It can help them design programs and strategies that are more efficient and effective and can contribute to the financial (and academic) success of their institutions.

References

Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., & Razavieh, A. (2002). Introduction to research in education. 6th ed. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Astin, A. W., & Sax, L. J. (1998). How undergraduates are affected by service participation. Journal of College Student Development, 39, 251-263.

Astin, A. W., Sax, L. J., & Avalos, J. (1999). Long term effects of volunteerism during the undergraduate years. Review of Higher Education, 22, 187-202.

Baade, R. A., & Sundburg, J. O. (1996). What determines alumni generosity? Economics of Education Review, 15(1), 75-81.

Brubacher, J. S., & Rudy, W. (1976). Higher education transition. New York: Harper.

Boyle, J. J. (1990). College quality and alumni giving. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Syracuse University, 1990.

Brittingham, B., & Pezzullo, T. (1989). Fund raising in higher education: What we know, what we need to know. ERIC Document ED 313 988.

Bruggink, T. H., & Siddiqui, K. (1995). An econometric model of alumni giving: A case study for a liberal arts college. American Economist, 39(2), 53-60.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (2000). List of Institutions by

Carnegie Classification, Control, and State. Retrieved April 24, 2004, from http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/Classification/CIHE2000/PartIfiles/partI.htm

Clotfelter, C. (1999). Alumni giving to private colleges and universities. Unpublished Manuscript. Retrieved February 10, 2007, from http://www.ilr.cornell.edu/cheri/conf/chericonf1999/chericonf1999_01.pdf

Clotfelter, C. (2001). Who are the alumni donors? Giving by two generations of alumni from selective colleges. Nonprofit Management and Leadership, 12(2), 119-138.

Conley, A. T. (1999). Student organization membership and alumni giving at a public, research I university. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1999.

Council for Aid to Education. (2003). 2002 voluntary support of education. New York: Author.

Council for Aid to Education. (2006). 2005 voluntary support of education. New York: Author.

Council for Financial Aid to Education. (1987). Voluntary support of education, 1985-1986. New York: Author.

Council for Financial Aid to Education. (1991). Voluntary support of education, 1990. New York: Author.

Curti, M., & Nash, R. (1965). Philanthropy in the shaping of American higher education. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Cunningham, B. M., & Cochi-Ficano, C. K. (2002). The determinants of donative revenue flows from alumni of higher education: An empirical inquiry. The Journal of Human Resources, 37(3), 540-569.

Dunn, J. A., Jr., Terkla, D. G., & Secakusma, P. (1988). Fundraising in US colleges and universities: The fifty best performances 1979-80 through 1985-86. Paper presented at 23rd annual meeting of the Society for College and University Planning, Toronto, August 1988.

Gaier, S. (2005). Alumni satisfaction with their undergraduate academic experience and the impact on alumni giving and participation. International Journal of Educational Advancement, 5(4), 279-288.

Geiger, R. (1985). After the emergence: Voluntary support and the building of American research universities. History of Education Quarterly, 25(3), 369-381.

Grunig, S. D. (1995). The impact of development office structure on fund-raising efficiency for research and doctoral institutions. Journal of Higher Education, 66(6), 686-699.

Hinkle, D. E., Wiersma, W., & Jurs, S. G. (2003). Applied statistics for the behavioral sci-

ences. New York: Houghton Mifflin.

James Madison University. (2008). The Madison fund: Why give? Retrieved February 13, 2008 from http://www.jmu.edu/development/madison_fund/why_give.shtml

Kalamazoo College. (2004). Giving to the Kalamazoo College fund. Retrieved April 22, 2004 from http://www.kzoo.edu/afgiving/

Kuh, G. D., Cruce, T., Shoup, R., Kinzie, J., & Gonyea, R. M. (2007). Unmasking the Effects of Student Engagement on College Grades and Persistence. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.

Kuh, G. D., Kinzie, J., Cruce, T., Shoup, R., & Gonyea, R. M. (2006). Connecting the dots: Multi-faceted analyses of the relationships between student engagement results from the NSSE, and the institutional practices and conditions that foster student success: Final report prepared for Lumina Foundation for Education. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University, Center for Postsecondary Research.

Kuh, G. D., Kinzie, J., Schuh, J. H., Whitt, E. J. & Associates. (2005). Student success in college: Creating conditions that matter. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lakford, R.H., & Wyckoff, J.H. (1991). Modeling charitable giving using a Box-Cox standard Tobit model. Review of Economics and Statistics, 73(3), 460-470.

Leslie, L. L., & Ramey, G. (1988). Donor behavior and voluntary support for higher education institutions. Journal of Higher Education, 29(2), 115-132.

Loessin, B. A., & Duronio, M. A. (1990). Fund raising outcomes and institutional characteristics in ten types of higher education institutions. The Review of Higher Education, 13(4). 539-556.

Macalester College. (2003). 2002-2003 Fiscal Year: A Year of Incredible Generosity. Retrieved April 2, 2004 from http://www.macalester.edu/development/annual_fund/previous_results.html

Markoff, R. M. (1978). An analysis of the relationship of alumni giving and level of participation in voluntary organizations: A case study. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Toledo, 1978.

Marr, K. A., Mullin, C. H., & Seigfried, J. J. (2005). Undergraduate financial aid and subsequent alumni giving behavior. Quarterly Review of Economics and Finance, 45(1), 123-143.

Miller, M. T., & Casebeer, A. L. (1990). Donor characteristics of college of education alumni: Examining undergraduate involvement. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 323 836.

Morrill, J. L. (1945). Up to date. Journal of Higher Eduation, 16(7), 395.

Mosser, J. W. (1993). Predicting alumni/ae gift giving behavior: A structural equation model approach. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1993.

National Survey of Student Engagement. (2002). 2002 Institutional Report. Retrieved April 22, 2004 from http://www.indiana.edu/~nsse/html/details2.shtml

National Survey of Student Engagement. (2003a). Construction of the 2000-2003 NSSE benchmarks. Retrieved April 15, 2004 from http://www.iub.edu/~nsse/2003_annual_report/html/benchmarks_construction.htm

National Survey of Student Engagement. (2003b). 2003 Annual Report. Retrieved April 2, 2004 from http://www.iub.edu/%7Ensse/2003_annual_report/

Okunade, A. A., Wunnava, P.V., and Walsh, R. (1994). Charitable giving of alumni: Micro-evidence from a large public university. American Journal of Economics and Sociology, 53(1), 73-84.

Olsen, K., Smith, A. L., & Wunnava, P. V. (1989). An empirical study of the life-cycle hypothesis with respect to alumni donations. The American Economist, 33, 60-63.

O'Neill, P. P. (2005). The impact of undergraduate Greek membership on alumni giving at the College of William and Mary. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The College of William and Mary, 2005.

Pearson, J. (1999). Comprehensive research on alumni relationships: Four years of market research at Stanford University. New Directions in Institutional Research, 1999(101), 5-21.

Pollard, J. A. (1952). Raising funds: Operation endless. Association of American Colleges Bulletin, 38(2), 300-309.

Pickett, W. L. (1981). Prerequisites for successful fund raising. In F. C. Pray (Ed.), Handbook for Educational Fund Raising (pp. 11-14). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Princeton University (2008). Princeton's margin of excellence. Retrieved January 3, 2008 from http://giving.princeton.edu/ag/

Sailor, R. W. (1944). A primer of alumni work: Handbook series #7. E. W. Durham. (Series Ed.). New Brunswick, NJ: American Alumni Council.

Sears, J. B. (1990/1922). Philanthropy in the history of American higher education. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.

Seligman, D. (1998). Is philanthropy irrational? Forbes, 161(11), 94.

Smith, H. W. (1978). Student and their institutions: A changing relationship. M. V. Massengale & J. W. Peltason, (Eds.). Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Spaeth, J. L., & Greenly, A. M. (1970). Recent alumni and higher education: A survey of college graduates (Carnegie Commission on Higher Education). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Taylor, A. L., & Martin, J. C. (1995). Characteristics of alumni donor and nondonors are a Research I, public university. Research in Higher Education, 36(3), 283-302.

US News & World Report. (2004). Undergraduate ranking criteria and weights. Retrieved April 22, 2004 from http://www.usnews.com/usnews/edu/college/rankings/about/weight_brief.php

Winston, G. C. (2000). The positional arms race in higher education. Discussion Paper 53. Williamstown, MA: Williams Project on the Economics of Higher Education.

John V. Moore III is a doctoral student in Higher Education and Inquiry Methodology. He earned an BA in psychobiology and English from Drew University, an MEd in college student affairs from the University of South Florida, and a graduate certificate in institutional research from IU. He works as a research associate for the Center for Postsecondary Research.

The Founding of Student Health Services at Indiana University: A Brief History (1833-1924)

Philemon Yebei

This paper traces the establishment of health services at Indiana University (IU) between 1833 and 1924, and delineates the factors, successes, and individuals who contributed to this growth. In the late 19th and early 20th centuries, efforts to conserve student health at IU were sluggish, primarily in response to epidemics, and were weighed down by scarce fiscal resources. Over the years student health services gained attention, becoming a standard element on campus.

It is widely acknowledged that education and health are intertwined, and the health of students is recognized to be an important determinant of educational and occupational achievement (Diehl & Shepard, 1939; Marx, Wooley, & Northrop, 1998). This premise is echoed in the current mission statement of the Indiana University Health Center (IUHC), which emphasizes provision of high quality health care (IUHC, 2007). The mission statement links physical and mental well being to the successful pursuit of academic goals, and stresses the importance of education, support, and counseling to make possible informed choices, positive behaviors, and healthy life styles (IUHC, 2007). The link between student health and academic activities cannot be overemphasized and underscores the need for comprehensive student health services in academic institutions.

The current focus of student health services is on both preventative care as well as treatment. The wellness of students is not limited to physical well being, but also includes dimensions such as mental, intellectual, vocational, emotional, environmental, and spiritual health (Ratner, Johnson, & Jeffery, 1998). By expanding the dimensions that define student health and wellbeing, colleges and universities have recognized the importance of incorporating these aspects into the overall educational experience and care of students. The move to include comprehensive health care to students on campus is a result of propositions by leaders and health practitioners in the late 19th century who became aware that tragedies such as death and disability could have been prevented by a greater use of modern protective and educational measures (Diehl & Shepard, 1939).

From their inception until the mid-1800s, institutions of higher education in the United States did not have formal student health services or regular physicians on staff. In the mid-1850s, these institutions began to recruit physicians to care for students on campus, as did other social institutions, including almshouses, penitentiaries, and houses of industry (Rogers, 1937;

Turner & Hurley, 2002). The focus of student hygiene[1] was centered on treatment of students, not on preventative care, as we know it today.

There is speculation about why student health centers were established, and while the thrust may have differed from campus to campus, there are numerous similarities in the structure and precursors to their establishment. These include (a) the perceived need to safeguard and improve the health of students by presidents, (b) institutional responsibility for the provision of accessible health care to students, (c) traditional medical practices in the community did not meet the required short access time and could not cope adequately with a large number of students, (d) tendency of students not to pay their medical bills, and (e) the need to deal with epidemics and other infectious diseases (Christmas, 1995).

This paper traces the growth of student health services at IU,[2] from the cholera epidemic of 1833 to the period following World War I (WWI). The student health service environment in 19th century American colleges and universities will be examined, followed by an investigation of the factors, individuals, and challenges that influenced the development of student health services at IU. This paper argues that the establishment of student health services was erratic, beleaguered by financial difficulty, and primarily a reaction to epidemics. The conservation of student health gradually gained attention as the student population increased and institutions sought to deal with epidemics and contagious diseases that afflicted students. This paper concludes with recommendations for increased earmarks for student health services.

Student Hygiene and Physical Health in the United States

Student Health on Campus

In the early 19th century, emerging institutions of higher education in the United States followed the European philosophy of "a healthy mind and a healthy body" to introduce the idea of teaching hygiene and physical education to students (Christmas, 1995, p. 241). The introduction of mass physical education to colleges and universities in the United States was an adaptation of practices in Germany and Scandinavia (Boynton, 1961). Harvard was the first to initiate mass physical education and provided a gymnasium for students as early as 1825, and was followed by Dartmouth, Wil-

---

1 "Hygiene" was the term used in place of what we now call "health", but was limited to physical aspects of health such as prevention and treatment of infectious diseases. A substitution of the term occurred in the1940s. It followed advancements in the teaching of health, which began to infuse concepts of behavior and attitudes in preservation of health. See Diehl & Shepard (1939) and Christmas & Dorman (1996).

2 Indiana College officially became Indiana University following a legislative act in 1838; see The Chronology of Indiana University History at http://www.indiana.edu/~libarch/iuchron/iuchron.html. In this paper Indiana College is used when reference is made to the university prior to 1838.of health, which began to infuse concepts of behavior and attitudes in preservation of health. See Diehl & Shepard (1939) and Christmas & Dorman (1996).

liams, Yale, and Amherst thereafter (Boynton, 1961; Turner & Hurley, 2002). Physical education was mandatory for all students at some institutions, a practice that continued into the early 20th century. For instance, at the University of Chicago, students had to work in the gymnasium four times a week as part of the curriculum offered through the Department of Physical Culture (Capps, 1900). Intercollegiate and intramural sports developed towards the end of the 19th century, following the inclusion of hygiene in the curriculum (Christmas, 1995).

The concern for student health on campus grew out of the parental role ascribed to antebellum colleges. As the Yale Report of 1828 outlined, the object of the college was "to lay the foundation of a superior education: and this is to be done, at a period of life when a substitute must be provided for parental superintendence" (Best, 1976, p. 176). Although the primary function of colonial American colleges was to prepare competent rulers, learned clergy for the church, cultured men for the society, and "youth who were piously educated in good letters and manners," the college was also responsible for the welfare of students (Rudolph, 1962, p. 7).

Students in the colonial American colleges, who had spent their younger years under the direct care of parents, were now expected to know what to do in the event of sickness. They were expected to know where to seek competent healthcare and how to make proper decisions on personal care. Despite the fact that many students in the early American colleges did not seek education at institutions outside their home state, those who did were away from the familiar home environment. For these students, educational experiences involved not only academic learning, but also included aspects of survival in a new social environment. The impetus for institutions of higher education to find the means by which to care for sick students grew out of a concern for students missing class and institutional closure due to epidemics, e.g. Indiana College in 1833 and 1918, and Mount Saint Mary's College in 1882 ("Mount St. Mary's Closed", 1882, April 13). Christmas (1995) argues that college presidents and faculty were concerned about the absenteeism of students as a result of epidemics and sickness. These factors, among others, resulted in the creation of university policies that provided for the employment of college physicians. In an 1856 address, President Stearns at Amherst College passionately described the need to preserve student health as follows:

> The breaking down of the health of the student, especially in the spring of the year, which is exceedingly common, involving the necessity of leaving college in many instances, and crippling the energies and destroying the prospects of not a few who remain, is in my opinion, wholly unnecessary if proper measures could be taken to prevent it. (Cited in Diehl & Shepard, 1939, p. 11)

Dr. John W. Hooker is the first known college physician in the United States and was appointed as Professor of Hygiene at Amherst in 1859 (Turner & Hurley, 2002). Hooker resigned after one year of service and Dr. Edward C. Hitchcock Jr., who is now credited as the "Father of American College Health," filled the position (Turner & Hurley; p. 3). Dr. Hitchcock introduced a system of anthropometric measurements, as suitable indices of health status. These became a model for college hygiene and were copied by many campuses across the United States and the world (Christmas & Dorman, 1996; Turner & Hurley, 2002). There were other health professionals such as Dr. Thomas A. Storey, who had a lasting positive influence on the development of college hygiene in the United States through their vision to improve the health status of people in the nation (Boynton, 1961).

Infirmaries and Isolation Wards

Although pneumonia and influenza led to the largest number of deaths in the United States in the 20th century (Armstrong, Conn, & Pinner, 1999), health services in colleges and universities were greatly influenced by the typhoid and scarlet fever epidemics, (Turner & Hurley, 2002). In order to care for students with communicable diseases, many colleges established infirmaries and isolation wards (Boynton, 1961). This practice reflected the developments and scientific advances in epidemiology, imported to the Americas from Europe in the early 19th century, that demonstrated that typhoid and cholera were waterborne diseases (Christmas & Dorman, 1996). These and other scientific findings on the transmission of disease necessitated the quarantine of populations who were infected or had been exposed to the disease-causing pathogens.

Some institutions had affiliated medical schools, which afforded students the opportunity to observe and participate in the treatment and care of patients. In his 1890 account of the history of IU, Theophilus A. Wylie, Professor Emeritus of Physics, stated that the College in Indianapolis had a "… dispensary where gratuitous professional services were rendered enabling the students to witness and take part in the management of… cases" (Wylie, 1890, p. 79). However, Wylie did not indicate whether health services, such as vaccinations and treatment, were extended to students. The recruitment of college physicians and the establishment of infirmaries and isolation wards signaled the advent of student health services in institutions of higher education in the United States.

Student Health at Indiana College: 1829 to 1899

From the inception of Indiana College in 1829 until the late 1890s there was no formal system for treatment and care of students on campus. The cholera epidemic of 1833 was lethal and resulted not only in the dis-

ruption of classes, but also in the demise of some students and citizens of Bloomington. In August 1833, students at Indiana College were sent home after Cuthbert Huntington, a student from Indianapolis, died after a cholera attack (Roache, 1890). In his letter dated December 27, 1890[3] to Judge D. D. Banta, Addison Locke Roache stated that Huntington was buried the morning after his death and also noted,

> Almost immediately after the funeral the students left for their homes. Those who were able to secure conveyances, or horses, went that way, but my recollection is that the great majority could not secure any conveyance, and in their wild hurry to escape from the pestilence, left town on foot. (Roache, 1890)

Following this incident President Wylie authorized the immediate closure of the institution. The College did not reopen until September 1, 1833. In addition to the cholera epidemic, the College was facing other pressing matters, which prompted the residents of Bloomington to prepare a statement to be sent to the public. They addressed the cholera epidemic of which they stated: "… the epidemic which has visited us has been mild here in its operations and has now subsided" (Brandon et al., 1833, p. 1). They also dealt with concerns about the negative pubic image, financial viability, and prejudices[4] that they believed were operating against the image of the College and the city of Bloomington.

By 1890, fifty-seven years after the cholera epidemic, IU still did not have a student health facility. A health committee chaired by Professor W. D. Hamer[5] carried out an assessment on student health and care for sick members of the college using a four-item questionnaire (Hamer, 1890). The assessment wanted to obtain student responses on (a) how many terms they had been at IU, (b) whether they had been sick, (c) for how long they had been sick, and (d) who provided attention to them while sick. While this assessment marked the beginning of coherent steps to review and initiate

---

3 A. L. Roache wrote this letter to Judge Banta in response to a controversy regarding a historical document authored by Dr. Wiley. Three professors involved in this controversy were Dr. Wiley, Professor Hall, and Professor Harney. In his letter, Roache provided a description of events in Bloomington during the cholera epidemic of 1833, and stated that he was too young to recall the difficulty between Wiley, Hall, and Harney.

4 These prejudices against the College had apparently arisen out of a continuing feud between Professors Baynard R. Hall, John H. Harney, Samuel Givens, and the recently recruited President Wylie. In his book Indiana University: Its history from 1820-1890, Theophilus A. Wylie (1890) briefly alludes to this controversy and states "…the cause and nature of which it is unnecessary to inquire into…" (p. 49). However, Thomas Clark gives some detail in his rendition of the same period in Indiana University: Midwestern

5 The committee chaired by W. D. Hamer consisted of the following members: Georgetta Bowman, President Swain, Kerr, F. B., Knipp, C. T., Craig, H. V., and Spain, P. A.

formal student health services, the findings did not lead to the immediate establishment of formal mechanisms to care for the sick.

In the fall of 1895, a meeting was organized to elect another committee to look into means of providing health care to students in the event of illness. The urgency of the matter was given impetus by numerous incidents of sickness among students at the college the preceding year. The call to the student body read in part:

> Last years experience with sickness among the students has suggested the idea of an organization on the mutual benefit plan for the care of its members during sickness. This object might be secured by renting a house, equipping in a suitable manner as many rooms as deemed necessary, and putting a trained and competent nurse in charge. … If deemed advisable bathrooms could be fitted up in connection with such a sanitarium. Every student interested in this movement is invited to meet at Mitchell Hall on Thursday evening, Sept. 26, at 4 p. m. to appoint a committee to investigate the details of such a work and report the most feasible plan of organization. ("To the student body," 1895, September 24)

This announcement was secured by a group of individuals,[6] some of whom had been on the 1890 health committee. There is little evidence to demonstrate that any action was taken by IU to formally establish student health services until 1900. At the turn of the century, the scarlet fever and small pox epidemics caused the IU administration to refocus their attention to student health. President Swain commissioned Professor G. H. Stempel to investigate what other colleges and universities in the United States were doing to conserve student health. This commission indicates that IU did not have a student health policy in place and lacked a unified concept regarding the structure and delivery of health services to students.

Student Health Services at IU: 1900-1921

By 1900, a total of 600 students were enrolled at IU (IU, 1833). On November 10, 1900, Stempel submitted to President Swain his findings and recommendations on what other institutions were doing to conserve student health (Stempel, 1900, November 10). He proposed a student health insurance plan for IU to be organized in a manner similar to the Studentische Krankenkasse[7] at Leipsic (Stempel, 1900, November 10). Stempel arrived at this proposition after a series of inquiries to personal friends who were

---

6 The announcement was prepared and sent out by the following: Endicott, C. E., Binford, E. A., Cook, G. M., Knipp, C. T., Bush, E. D., Hindman, E. E., Brooks, R. C., & Hamer, W. D.

7 Studentische krankenkasse refers to student health insurance programs. These programs were being utilized in Germany, as at Leipsic where Prof Stempel was a student from 1895 – 1897. Prof Stempel had benefited from the krankenkasse and saw the need to have a similar program initiated at Indiana University.

employed at various universities across the United States, some of whom had been his colleagues at Leipsic, e.g. President MacLean and Professor Loos at the University of Iowa, and George Howe at Cornell (see Table 1). Stempel was firmly convinced that the best approach to provide suitable and efficient health care for students was through a health insurance plan, even though some of his peers felt differently. Howe affirmed in his letter to Stempel that the plan "…might not work in this country as well as in Europe and if you are trying to push it through I wish you all success" (Howe, 1900). Some institutions had a fund, managed by the university bursar or treasurer, which was used to offset the medical costs incurred by students. For instance, the Universities of Nebraska, Cornell, Illinois, and Princeton had a sick-fund into which students made annual contributions (see Table 1). Stempel favored the plan in use at Princeton, which required each student to contribute $3.00 per term, and in turn students could use the services provided at the infirmary (see Table 1).

As he concluded his letter, Stempel outlined several health hazards in the city of Bloomington that college students were exposed to:

> There are some special reasons for urging action in the matter for Indiana University. -1. The drinking water in Bloomington is more than usually dangerous. -2. There is no sewerage system in Bloomington. -3. The railroad facilities are such that in many cases a trip home is fraught with undue danger, especially on account of waits in unsanitary stations. -4. There is no city hospital. (Stempel, 1900, November 10)

Bloomington was a relatively small city at the time; therefore the absence of a city hospital was not unique. Some institutions such as the University of Michigan and University of Iowa, relied on their medical hospitals to provide health care for their students, albeit students had to pay full or two-thirds the regular rates (see Table 1). The University of Wisconsin did not have an infirmary, nor was there a city hospital in Madison. Walter M. Smith, a librarian at the university, believed that the university would not need its own infirmary once a city hospital was built (see Table 1).

President Swain did not immediately follow through with the recommendations given by Stempel, but set up a Faculty Committee on Hygiene chaired by R. Lyons. The purpose of this committee was to investigate how to care for students who fell sick and how the expenses incurred for medical services rendered could be paid. On October 23, 1901, the faculty committee submitted their report, which recommended that, (a) each student to be charged 10 cents per term to be deposited in a fund to pay for medical expenses, (b) rooms to be reserved for use in emergencies as a sort of hospital, and (c) competent nurses and proper food be provided for sick students (Lyons, 1901). In principle, the recommendation to charge students a fee of

Reponses to Prof G. H. Stempel's inquiries about health services at different institutions in the United States

Date of Response	Institution	Name of Contact	Health Services Provided
Oct 26, 1900	The State University of Iowa	Prof. Isaac Loos	1. No *Studentische krankenkasse* 2. Free surgery services to football players
Oct 27, 1900	The State University of Iowa	President George E. MacLean	1. Two hospitals (homeopathic and allopathic) belonging to the university 2. Treat students at two-thirds regular rate 3. Dean of women informed of health of women
Oct 27, 1900	University of Nebraska	Ex-chancellor George E. MacLean	1. No hospital or medical facilities 2. Fund administered by the president 3. Used private houses where trained nurses resided
Nov 3, 1900	University of Michigan	President James B. Engel	1. No organized method 2. Hospitals medical school; students pay full rates 3. Woman's Dean looks after women and counsels them
Nov 3, 1900	Cornell University	George M. Howe	1. Infirmary for non-contagious diseases 2. Students pay for bed, board, and nurse 3. Medical attendance at extra cost 4. Annual collection used to cover expenses by poor students 5. Funds available for students $4825
Nov 3, 1900	University of Chicago	Prof. Edward Capps	1. Salaried university physician, with regular one hour office hour on campus 2. Free services for those who can not afford 3. Each student gets physical exam 4. Gymnasium work required four times per week for each student
Nov 4, 1900	University of Illinois	Prof. William L. Drew	1. Hospital fund for student health expenses, administrated by faculty committee 2. Voluntary membership to association: 160 students paid 50 cents per semester (raised $160.00 in 1899) 3. About half of fund used in 1899
Nov 4, 1900	University of Wisconsin	Walter M. Smith (librarian)	1. No infirmary 2. Prospects for a hospital in Madison; thus no need for university infirmary 3. Ladies Hall has a sick room or so
Nov 4, 1900	Yale University	Frederick Fairland	1. Had an infirmary, donated by women 2. Not endowed 3. Students pay for services, those unable pay less 4. Students mother cares for sick son 5. More of a home than hospital
Nov 5, 1900	University of the State of Missouri	President R. H. Jesse	1. Hospital on campus ready for furnishing
Nov 5, 1900	Northwestern University	Prof. Edouard P. Baillot	1. "University Bed" in Evanston hospital maintained by Trustees 2. Infirmary room in Women's Hall, students pay for care
Nov 6, 1900	Harvard University	W. C. Dennis	1. Salaried Medical Visitor (health officer) 2. Receives reports of all sickness, cared through janitors of halls 3. Medical Visitor examines and treats all cases; especially students who do not wish to incur external expenses 4. Stillman Infirmary under construction
Nov 6, 1900	Princeton University	President Francis L. Patton	1. Has infirmary 2. Each student pays $3.00 per term 3. Sick student charged same fee as board off campus 4. Extra cost for special nurses

Source: Correspondence to Guido H. Stempel from the listed contacts regarding the conservation of student health in their respective institutions. Indiana University Archives, President Swain Files.

10 cents per term is similar to the proposal Professor Stempel had given the previous year.

Founding of Student Health Services

Student health care was established at IU in 1902 mainly to tackle infectious diseases, and was limited to the quarantine of students infected with "smallpox, diphtheria, and typhoid" (D'Amico, 1992, p. 37). This necessitated the acquisition of a building to be used as an isolation hospital, which was a common measure taken by many colleges to protect against the spread of epidemics (Diehl & Shepard, 1939). In his Presidential Report of November 6, 1902, President Swain pointed out the difficulty the institution had finding a house for a small pox hospital, and that the identified loca-

tion would cost at least $900 (1902 dollars) (Swain, 1902, November 6). In the midst of these efforts to secure a university hospital, IU had a change of leadership with the election of William Lowe Bryan as the new IU President[8].

In 1902 the university purchased the property at the corner of South Henderson and Hillside Drive in Bloomington. It was to be used as an infirmary for contagious diseases and was commonly referred to as the "Pest House" ("Pest House – Infirmary for contagious diseases," 1957, May, p. 17). For the next decade or so Mrs. W. C. King managed the pest house on a formal contract with the University ("Presidential Report," 1907, April 1).

In his 1912 report, President Bryan acknowledged that the health services at IU were not fully meeting the needs of all students. He stated, "... lack of proper care and failure to have medical guidance combine to spoil many a girls career. We need a University physician and hospital arrangements" (Bryan, 1912, June 14). This was a key indicator that the prevailing arrangements for the medical care of students, especially female, were insufficient and action needed to be taken to remedy the situation.

The IU University Physician

During the late 19th to early 20th century, physical training and student hygiene were under the direct supervision of the professor in charge of physical training in many colleges and universities. Dr. J. E. P. Holland was appointed University physician on December 1, 1914 (Woodburn, 1940). The responsibilities of the physician went beyond ensuring that sanitary conditions were maintained in the gymnasium, and also included ordering equipment, such as sterilizing equipment for athletic uniforms to minimize the possibility of transmitting contagious disease (Holland, 1915, March 10). Dr. Holland held this position until his death on December 4, 1938. It was during this period that student health services at IU matured and became a formal and legitimate element on campus.

Dr. J. E. P. Holland

Dr. Holland earned his M.D. in 1906 from Purdue University School of Medicine. He was a captain in the United States Army Medical Corps in 1918, and a Fellow of the American College Surgeons. His appointment in 1914 occurred one year after the submission of a report on student hygiene by Dr. A. G. Pohlman, who at the time was a member of the Indiana University Athletic Association (IUAA) (Pohlman, 1913). Pohlman recommended "that a university physician be employed to act as a Medical Advisor and Emergency Physician and that his appointment be made in the Department of Physical Training and changing the name of this department to Physical Training and Hygiene or Student Health" (Pohlman, 1913, p. 1). He also recommended that the University Physician be responsible for the University Hospital.

By 1915 the University Isolation Hospital had a capacity of five beds and could accommodate up to fifteen patients in the event of an emergency (Holland, 1915). According to correspondence between Holland and President Bryan, the beds were unsuitable for a hospital, and Holland requisitioned the purchase of three beds and three mattresses for the hospital (Holland, 1916, March 2). Three beds are a relatively small number by today's standards, however, these were deemed sufficient for the needs at the time. Also, there was no urgent need to expand this campus facility because the city of Bloomington had recently built a city hospital that had 14 beds and was equipped with a modern operating room (Holland, 1915).

With the surge in student enrollments, the office of the university physician experienced an increase in workload and responsibilities. In the spring of 1917, Fernande Hachat, M.D. was employed as the assistant University physician on a salary of $1,200 per year (1917 dollars) (Holland, 1916, November 29; Woodburn, 1940). During this period the University physician was required to perform physical examinations of all incoming students, oversee of the University hospital, carry out medical consultation and treatment, review and ensure proper sanitary conditions of the boarding facilities on campus, and prepare annual reports on student hygiene[9]. During the WWI period the University physician had additional responsibilities, such as making recommendations on whether or not students were fit to join the military.

In addition to these responsibilities, Holland was involved in private medical practice, which presented a logistical problem for him. In a lengthy letter dated February 11, 1918, to President Bryan, Holland indicated that his private practice was suffering and he needed to decide whether to keep the IU job or reduce his responsibilities to IU and keep his private practice (Holland, 1918, February 11). Although Holland decided to keep his job at IU, it was not without anxiety. In a follow-up letter to President Bryan, he indicated that he was keen to have the responsibility of rendering general medical service to students discontinued (Holland, 1918, April 15). The employment of Hachat in 1917 as the assistant physician ought to have reduced the workload for Holland, but one year later he still felt the need to have it reduced. The University faced the influenza epidemic, and the physician's office had an increase in the number of patients needing medical attention.

---

8 Professor Bryan had been appointed Indiana University vice-president in 1893, a position he held until 1902. President Swain left IU in 1902 to take up a new position as President at Swarthmore College and Professor Bryan became the IU President.

9 Although the University physician was the official medical consultant for student on campus, there were certain limitations. In his recommendations, Dr A. G. Pohlman recommended that consultations and treatments for venereal diseases not be done by the University physician (see Report to President W. L. Bryan December 26th 1913. Indiana

While serving in the military during WWI, Holland maintained his ties to the University and was keen to address pertinent health issues with President Bryan. As medical officer in the army at Camp Greenleaf Chickamauga Park Georgia, Captain (Dr.) Holland dealt with cases of the Spanish influenza among the troops. In the fall of 1918, Holland wrote to President Bryan outlining the early symptoms of the flu and gave recommendation on how handled students who exhibited these symptoms. In his letter he stated that:

> Every student taken suddenly with a chill followed by fever and grippy symptoms should be immediately moved to a place of isolation and observed until they either have or have not got affection. The common habit of spitting, even in the streets, should be vigorously dealt with, sneezing and coughing must be done in a handkerchief. The bowels must be kept regular and free. I think it would be well to take up the spitting nuisance with the city authorities and have an ordinance passed making it finable (Holland, 1918).

Students Army Training Corps

At this time 60 percent of the 1,935 students at IU were enrolled in the Students Army Training Corps (S.A.T.C.). If students experienced symptoms of the influenza, they were advised to go to Maxwell Hall where the university physician would give them "cold" shots (Woodburn, 1940, p. 366). Despite these precautions, the spread of the flu continued unabated, and on October 10, 1918, the University was closed (Bryan, 1918). This order only applied to the regular students, and those in the S.A.T.C. remained in their barracks as per military regulations. Students who contracted the flu were confined in the University Isolation Hospital, but as the epidemic spread, Assembly Hall and the Student Building were converted to create the IU S.A.T.C. Hospital (IU, 1919; Woodburn, 1940).

In the fall of 1918, Dr. Holland returned to Bloomington having been excused from military service due to a "physical disability existing prior to his entrance in the service" (Bryan, n. d.). It is noteworthy to mention that President Bryan provided both the recommendation letter required prior to Dr. Holland's enlistment into the military and subsequently the letter requesting that he be excused from military service due to his physical disability. In addition to Holland's disability, President Bryan's letter also noted low doctor to patient ratio, 11 physicians served the Bloomington community of over 22,000; therefore, because of the raging influenza epidemic, the services of Dr. Holland were required as a matter of great urgency (Bryan, n. d.).

Student Health in the Post WWI Period

The use of the term health, as a substitute for hygiene, signaled a new trend and global shift in professional terminology in the field of student health services. In the early 1920s there was a shift in the principles that defined and guided the teaching of hygiene in the United States. As outlined by Christmas and Dorman (1996), imparting information about health and hygiene to students was insufficient. Health education involved alteration of human behavior; hence the health educator needed to draw from the social sciences to better understand how to work with people individually and in groups. The personal health problems of the individual student began to take precedence over daily exercise and the earlier focus on control of communicable diseases (Diehl & Shepard, 1939). At this time professionals in the field of student health and education began using the term health, though it was not until the early 1940s that a complete substitution of the term occurred.

At the end of WWI, forty institutions benefited from "federal aid to establish student health centers" (Christmas, 1995, p. 243). The federal initiative aimed at controlling infectious diseases through a unified and coordinated effort of health education, health examinations, physical training, sanitary supervision, and development of health consciousness to be delivered through a single department or service. The chief concern for the federal government was to reduce the "incidence of venereal disease in the armed forces, as well as in the civilian population" (Boynton, 1961, p. 297). Although a laudable move by the federal government, it is unclear whether IU received these federal funds to develop its student health services.

By the mid-1920s, the University hospital was being used to treat both students and faculty, even though the primary function of the hospital was to accommodate IU students. For example, in February 1924, Professor Ede contracted scarlet fever and was admitted at the University Hospital (Holland, 1924, February 28). The admission of a university professor to the student health facility may imply that the quality of service at the University hospital were equivalent to those offered by the city hospital, and also that the existence of the University hospital on campus had been legitimized. Although there were ongoing debates in the 1920s and 1930s regarding the scope of services and potential administrative structure to supervise health programs (Boynton, 1961), ultimately student health services became a fundamental feature in colleges and universities in the United States.

Scarce resources hampered the construction of a new University hospital at IU. On January 12, 1937, the Board of Trustees informed Holland that his request for funds to build a university hospital had been declined. The letter indicated in part that "…the financial questions involved are very difficult and that the Trustees who are responsible for the financial admin-

istration of the University must act with prudence" ("Letter to Dr. Holland from the Board of Trustees," 1937, January 12). The decision by the Board may indicate that improvement and expansion of student health services was not a major concern of the leadership at IU. It could also mean that there was insufficient justification to allocate money towards the construction of a University Hospital.

Conclusion

This brief history outlines some of the key factors and mentions some of the individuals who contributed to the establishment of student health services at IU, but it is far from being a complete account as it only addresses the first 100 years of IU's history. To enable a better contextualize account, decisions by the university administration may require further investigation. For instance, it would be informative to find out why the university administration did not follow through on recommendations proposed by Professor Stempel in 1900, but setup another committee chaired by R. Lyons to do another assessment on student health services the following year. Answers to these, and other administrative decisions, would require an analysis of the deliberations in the meetings of the Board of Trustees and the Faculty Committee on Hygiene regarding student health. This paper ends at the period following WWI. However, there are major advancements in medicine, epidemiology, student and adolescent health, health promotion, and health education that have occurred since then, which would enrich the overall history of student health services.

Readers have been exposed to key historical aspects regarding the growth of student health services at IU and the changing definition of, and attention to, student health over time. This is of key importance for higher education practitioners because it situates student health within the overall administrative and academic landscape on campus. It signifies that ad hoc planning for student health does not lead to favorable consequences and should therefore not be put on the back burner. It provides a lens through which to understand how the University administration in the past responded to the overall health of students relative to their academic trajectory. The interruption of classes due to infectious disease was, and still is, a concern for academic institutions. Infectious diseases, such as the avian flu, HIV/AIDS, sever acute respiratory syndrome (SARS), and multidrug-resistant tuberculosis (MDRTB) among others require consistent efforts to control incidence[10]. As administrative, policy, and budgetary decisions are deliberated;

---

10 The World Health Organization (WHO) website has a detailed factsheet that describes various infectious diseases and gives information about incidence, prevalence and preventative strategies. See http://www.who.int/topics/infectious_diseases/factsheets/en/index.html

higher education practitioners need to keep in mind the necessity of maintaining, if not increasing, attention and earmarks to student health services.

The need for efficient health service programs in colleges and universities cannot be overemphasized. Health practitioners in higher education need to be proactive and pay close attention to the changing perceptions about health by individuals and communities. A history, such as this one, provides a lens through which interpretations can be made and insights gained to accommodate the changing health needs of students on campus.

References

Armstrong, G. L., Conn, L. A., & Pinner, R. W. (1999). Trends in infectious disease mortality in the United States during the 20th century. Journal of the American Medical Association, 281(1), 61-66.

Best, J. H. (1976). The American legacy of learning: Readings in the history of education. Philadelphia, PA: Lippincott.

Boynton, R. E. (1961). Historical development of college health services. Paper presented at the American College Health Association, 39th Annual Meeting.

Brandon, J., Bowland, J., Hester, C. P., Lowe, W., Buskirk, A., Johnston, G. H., et al. (1833). To the public (pp. 1). Bloomington, IN.

Bryan, W. L. (1912, June 14). Presidents Report. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Archives, President Bryan Files.

Bryan, W. L. (1918, October, 10). Official Notice. Indiana Daily Student, p. 1,

Bryan, W. L. (n. d.). Letter to adjunct general Major General Harris (pp. 1). Washington, D.C.: Indiana University Archives, Holland Files.

Capps, E. (1900, November 3). Letter to Guido H. Stempel: Indiana University Archives, Reference Files.

Christmas, W. A. (1995). The evolution of medical services for students at colleges and universities in the United States [Electronic Version]. Journal of American College Health, 43. Retrieved March 13, 2007, from http://bert.lib.indiana.edu:2048/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=aph&AN=9506191886&site=ehost-live

Christmas, W. A., & Dorman, J. (1996). The Storey of college health hygiene. Journal of American College Health, 45(1).

D'Amico, H. (1992). A history of student health care at IUB. Indiana Alumni, November/December.

Diehl, H. S., & Shepard, C. E. (1939). The health of college students: A report to the American Youth Commission. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Hamer, W. D. (1890). Assessment. Indiana University: Students Guild.

Holland, J. E. P. (1915, March 10). Letter to President W. L. Bryan. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Archives, Holland Files.

Holland, J. E. P. (1916, March 2). Letter to President W. L. Bryan. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Archives, Holland Files.

Holland, J. E. P. (1916, November 29). Recommendation letter for Dr. Fernande Hachat to President W. L. Bryan. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Archives, Holland Files.

Holland, J. E. P. (1918). Letter to President W. L. Bryan. Camp Greenleaf, Chickamuga Park, Georgia: Indiana University Archives: President Bryan Files.

Holland, J. E. P. (1918, February 11). Letter to President W. L. Bryan. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Archives, Holland Files.

Holland, J. E. P. (1918, April 15). Letter to President W. L. Bryan. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Archives, Holland Files.

Holland, J. E. P. (1924, February 6). Letter to President W. L. Bryan. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Archives, Holland Files.

Holland, J. E. P. (1924, February 28). Letter to IU bursar. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Archives, Holland Files.

Howe, G. (1900, November 3). Letter to Guido H. Stempel from George Howe: Indiana University Archives, President Swain Files.

IU. (1833). Enrollment records. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Archives, Enrollment Files.

IU. (1919). Arbutus, Indiana University Arbutus. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University.

IUHC. (2007). Indiana university health center mission and goals. Retrieved March 1, 2007, from http://www.indiana.edu/~health/mission.shtml

Letter to Dr. Holland from the Board of Trustees. (1937, January 12). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Archives, Holland Files.

Lyons, R. (1901, October 23). Report of faculty committee on hygiene. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University, Student Health Files.

Marx, E., Wooley, S. F., & Northrop, D. (1998). Health is academic: A guide to coordinated school health programs. New York, NY: Teachers College.

Scarlet fever in a college: Mount St. Mary's closed on account of malignant disease. (1882, April 13). The New York Times

Pest House – Infirmary for contagious diseases. (1957, May). Indiana Alumni Magazine.

Pohlman, A. G. (1913, December 26). Report to president W. L. Bryan. Indiana University: Indiana University Archives.

Presidential Report. (1907, April 1). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Archives, President Swain Files.

Ratner, P. A., Johnson, J. L., & Jeffery, B. (1998). Examining emotional, physical, social, and spiritual health as determinants of self-rated health status. American Journal of Health Promotion, 12(4), 275-282.

Roache, A. L. (1890). Letter dated December 27, 1890 to judge D. D. Banta. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Archives.

Rogers, J. F. (1937). Student health services in institutions of higher education. Washington, DC: US Department of Interior.

Rudolph, F. (1962). The American college and university: A history. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press.

Stempel, G. H. (1900, November 10). Letter to President Joseph Swain. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Archives, President Swain Files.

Swain, J. (1902, November 6). Presidents Report. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Archives, President Swain Files.

To the student body. (1895, September 24). The Student, XXII, p. 8,

Turner, H. S., & Hurley, J. L. (2002). The history and practice of college health. In H. S. Turner & J. L. Hurley (Eds.), The history and development of college health (pp. 1-21). Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky.

Woodburn, J. A. (1940). History of Indiana University. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University.

Wylie, T. A. (1890). Indiana University: Its history from 1820-1890. Indianapolis, IN: W. M. B. Burford.

Philemon Yebei is a HESA doctoral student at Indiana University Bloomington (IUB). He received a Bachelor of Education degree from Moi University, Kenya in 1995, and an M.S. in Applied Health Science from IUB in 2005. At IUB, Philemon has served as an Associate Instructor in the department of Applied Health Science at the School of HPER, and currently serves as a Doctoral Research Associate in the Student Activities Office and also at the Center for the Study of the College Fraternity (CSCF). He is actively involved in student-initiated volunteer activities at IUB, and currently works with Outreach Kenya, and the "Daraja" Children's Project Kenya - a project in which he is co-founder and director.

Student Emotional Adjustment:
A New Model of Student Development Theory, Emotion, and Hardiness

Anthony Masseria

*Literature in student development theory reveals that emotional responses
tied to cognitive, identity-centered, and psychosocial phenomena point toward
issues of student attrition. The theory of psychological hardiness further
elucidates the centrality of cognition, identity, and social adjustment to the
overall emotional adjustment of college students to common stressors of the
undergraduate experience. Careful consideration of these three areas reveals a
number of practical implications for student affairs professionals and direc-
tions for further research into student emotional adjustment.*

In historical psychological literature, emotions have been viewed
in two different lights. In 1930s and 1940s, Young described emotions as
"acute disturbance[s] of the individual as a whole," causing a "complete
loss of cerebral control" with "no trace of conscious purpose" (as cited in
Salovey & Mayer, 1990, p. 2). On the other hand, Leeper found emotions
to be linked with motivation as "processes which arouse, sustain, and direct
activity," while Mandler believed that emotions are vital for directing and
shaping cognitive activities (as cited in Salovey & Mayer, 1990, p. 2). These
opposing opinions allude to the fact that emotion is a dynamic, forceful phe-
nomenon impacting college student development more deeply than present
literature reveals. As such, a novel application of the literature will ultimate-
ly reveal new practical applications. Considering all of this, the following is
the final research question that has guided this paper. What developmental
processes are most influential over the ways in which students respond to the
stress of collegiate life, and what kinds of psychological theory can help the
student affairs practitioner understand the convergence of said processes in
order to support and promote student success and satisfaction?

In order to address this research question, I attempted to take a
series of steps that would hopefully lead to a logical, practical solution. The
first step involved examining existing literature supporting the idea that
emotions impact college student development in a number of ways, presum-
ing that it may be necessary to look outside the field of student development
theory for assistance. The next step involved seeing how student develop-
ment theory and other supplemental literature outside the field of student
affairs complement each other to address the research question. Finally, I
sought to identify implications for practice to help students who are and are

not emotionally prepared to manage common college stressors. I laid out the
present paper to mirror this methodological process.

Through following this process, it is my hypothesis that analysis of
literature on cognitive development, identity development, and psychosocial
development when paired with a novel application of the psychological the-
ory of hardiness will extrapolate how transitional students cope emotionally
with the challenges they face. In turn, this fusion of theories should spark
new ways of thinking about student emotional adjustment to begin creating a
holistic set of practices for the student affairs profession.

Literature Review on Emotion and Student Development

Cognitive Development

Several researchers have contributed to the body of literature on the
notion of cognitive development as it relates to the emotional development
of college students. Baxter Magolda (2001, 2004) addresses this concept
when she constructs her theory of self-authorship. According to Baxter
Magolda (2001), the student faces certain crises during which he or she
re-evaluates various dimensions of their thinking, the resolution of which
will ultimately guide them toward self-authorship. She identifies the episte-
mological dimension of self-authorship as most closely related to the depth
of the student's cognitive development. By examining their epistemological
perspective, the student is able to address the question of "how to know"
(2001, p. 38). In examining this dimension, the student is able to shift away
from acquiring others' ways of thinking and developing a sense of cognitive
maturity which Baxter Magolda (2001) defines as "characterized by intel-
lectual power, reflective judgment, mature decision making, and problem
solving in the context of multiplicity" (p. 38; cf. Baxter Magolda, 2004,
and King & Kitchener, 1994). King and Baxter Magolda (1996) assert that
advanced cognitive development will extend the student's ability to manipu-
late emotion in order to assist in critical thinking, reasoning, and decision
making processes. In the present literature, there seems to be a general con-
sensus that cognitive development is necessary to understand emotion and to
manage it in order to facilitate processes of thinking and learning.

Identity Development

Researchers who have studied identity development have acknowl-
edged that emotion is essential to acquiring a complete sense of self. Baxter
Magolda (2001) addresses the connection between emotion and identity
development, particularly in the intrapersonal dimension of self-authorship.
According to Baxter Magolda (2004), identity development is "characterized
by understanding one's own particular history, confidence, the capacity for
autonomy and connection, and integrity" (p. 6). Erikson (1968) asserts that

the greatest emotional crisis of traditional age college students is identity confusion, exacerbated by the college experience itself in delaying occupational and ideological identity. Marcia's (1980) contention is that successful identity development will result in stable, favorable emotions and emotional processes, such as the capacity for intimacy, empathy, and vocational industry. The relatively new field of research on emerging adulthood validates the conclusions that Erikson and Marcia reached. Arnett (2000) states that exploring a sense of self in the late teens through the early twenties is necessary to acquire an understanding of love, work, and worldview. The general presumption among these identity theorists is that developing a strong sense of identity leads naturally into a state of positive and stable emotionality.

Psychosocial Development

Erikson (1968) recognized the role that social context plays in the development of personal identity in that one's surroundings largely dictate the manifestation or the impediment of identity development. In terms of psychosocial development, Chickering and Reisser (1993) name managing emotion as the second vector of their comprehensive student development theory. The goal of this vector lies in recognizing reactions to the environment and regulating one's responses so as to externalize emotion in a positive, self-controlled manner. Part of the process of learning to manage emotion is recognizing the role emotions play in a social context and how emotion affects not just the self, but the other as well. Specifically, Chickering and Reisser (1993) assert that managing emotions involves "participatory tendencies, which involve transcending the boundaries of the individual self, identifying or bonding with another, or feeling part of a larger whole" (p. 47). In his life course paradigm, Elder (1995) explains that social context is essential for the development of the whole person in terms of self-regulation of emotions and behaviors and in terms of agency in the environment itself. According to Elder (1995), a well-engaged and well-developed individual has a strong sense of both human agency and self-regulation. The individual is always engaged in society, and as such, the individual's emotions have social context.

Hardiness: A Model of Stress and Health

Each of the theory families mentioned above recognizes the value of examining emotion in the development of various components of the whole student. However, these are observational models, and as such, there is no explanation of how students learn to manage emotions, what happens as the student learns to manage emotions, or the conditions required for learning to manage emotions.

Since student development theories are merely descriptive of student behavior, a theory outside of student development may elucidate the role emotions play in adjustment to the undergraduate experience. Suzanne C. Kobasa's theory of hardiness, which comes from the psychological field of stress and health, could help to fill in the gaps and answer the question of how emotion affects the college student's experience. After studying literature and research on the relationship between stress and health, Kobasa (1979) proposed that some people possess what she calls hardiness. She observed that in all of the literature on stress and health, certain people seemed more resistant to negative somatic responses to external stressors than others. This led her to the conclusion "that persons who experience high degrees of stress without falling ill have a personality structure differentiating them from persons who become sick under stress" (p. 3). Hardiness is this personality structure that she identifies in the hypothesis of her seminal study.

Although it is referred to as a single personality structure, hardiness is in reality a three-pronged phenomenon. One who is said to be a hardy person will be psychologically advantaged in three areas: control, commitment, and challenge (Kobasa, 1979). A strong sense of control consists of (a) decisional control, or the ability to discern among alternatives when faced with a stressor, (b) cognitive control, or cognitive powers of interpretation and appraisal, and (c) coping skills, or a set of techniques for successfully coping with a stressor. On the other hand, an individual who lacks a sense of control is often nihilistic, powerless, and low in motivation. A strong sense of commitment refers to depending on one's own sense of identity to give value to the stressor and to elicit a positive response. Strong commitment means a commitment to self and to one's own values, beliefs, and relationships. Finally, a sense of challenge takes a more external focus than the other two components. A person with a strong sense of challenge responds positively to stressors, views them as an opportunity for change, and knows how their environment can both aid in the facilitation or impediment of a resolution. Kobasa's (1979) overarching hypothesis is that those individuals who lack in any of the above areas are more susceptible to physical illness and emotional distress than those who are developed fully in each area.

Theoretical Comparisons

How is this theory of hardiness helpful in complementing the question of the role that emotions play in student development? Looking at the above definitions of hardiness, control, commitment, and challenge, one can see that various other psychological functions and processes come into play. Where do control, commitment, and challenge originate? Cognitive development, identity development, and psychosocial development correlate with control, commitment, and challenge, respectively, and successful development is necessary for an individual to be considered a psychologically hardy

person. In accordance with my hypothesis, psychologically hardy students will be most successful in college in terms of academic achievement, acquiring a sense of self, and engagement in the campus community. The next piece is examining how developmental processes converge in relation to the hardiness of the college student, and the following is an interpretation of how these bodies of theory blend together.

First, a student's sense of control correlates directly with their cognitive development. According to Kobasa's (1979) definition of control, a higher level of cognitive ability is required to differentiate among alternatives when presented with a stressor, to interpret the meaning of the stressor, and to choose a coping mechanism. Baxter Magolda's (2004) definition of cognitive maturity – intellectual power, reflective judgment, mature decision making, and problem solving in the context of multiplicity – is almost directly parallel with Kobasa's characteristics of a person with a strong sense of control. Other literature on cognitive development (cf. Baxter Magolda, 2001; King & Baxter Magolda, 1996; King & Kitchener, 1994) also point to the connection between advanced cognitive abilities, such as critical thinking, logical reasoning, and problem solving, and Kobasa's sense of control.

Second, Kobasa's sense of commitment refers directly to identity development. Kobasa (1979) states, "staying healthy under stress is critically dependent upon a strong sense of commitment to self," and an ability to recognize and to understand one's values and priorities in the context of identity is "essential for the accurate assessment of the threat posed by a particular life situation and for the competent handling of it" (p. 4). A strong, healthy sense of personality identity is the goal of every theory in the identity development family (cf. Arnett, 2000; Baxter Magolda, 2004; Erikson, 1968; Marcia, 1980). A person with a well-developed sense of identity according to any of these developmental theories possesses all of the characteristics of a person with a strong sense of commitment.

Finally, psychosocial development can be linked to Kobasa's sense of challenge. A person with a strong sense of challenge seeks out new experiences in the environment and views stressors as an opportunity for growth that is both personal and social in nature. People who have positive responses to challenge are those who catalyze change in their environments and are quick to adapt to opportunities, crises, and problems (Kobasa, 1979). People who are advanced psychosocially are heavily engaged in their environments and can see the role that their actions play in a broader, social context. This is the basic premise of Elder's (1995) life course paradigm. In addition, Chickering and Reisser (1993) view managing emotions as necessary for responding not just to one's own emotions, but also to the emotional responses that situations elicit in other people. Operating fluidly in one's environment

and social context is the goal of psychosocial development, and is also the basic characteristic of a person with a strong sense of challenge.

Student Emotional Adjustment:

Implications for Student Affairs Practice

An examination of current student development theory and Kobasa's model of hardiness fused together create a new way of looking at student development and potentially predicting student success based on their level of hardiness. I call this fusion the student emotional adjustment model, which I define as an application of student development theory that gauges the ability of a traditional-age college student to confront and to cope emotionally with stressors and decisions related to the undergraduate experience. I propose that an emotionally adjusted student will be able to confront events, decisions, and stressors related to the undergraduate experience (e.g. orientation, residential living, choosing a major, career counseling, graduation, etc.) depending on how developed they are cognitively, socially, and in terms of identity. Conversely, a student lacking in any of these areas will have difficulty adjusting emotionally to the common rigors of the undergraduate experience, and in turn, the maladjusted student will encounter challenges in these areas (e.g. homesickness, roommate difficulties, changing their major, career confusion, fear of graduation, etc.). Since undergraduate students' experiences are so diverse, student emotional adjustment must take into consideration three basic aspects of student development: cognition, identity, and social adjustment. Each element of the student emotional adjustment model correlates directly with Kobasa's concept of hardiness.

The first element for consideration is cognition. A student with well-developed cognitive abilities ought to be able to make sound academic decisions, to succeed scholastically, and to earn high grades in their courses. Such a student will view academic challenges as rich and valuable and view new avenues as opportunities for personal and intellectual growth. A student with low cognitive abilities will suffer academically, might struggle with choosing a major, and will likely harbor feelings of helplessness and frustration. Because of such negative emotions, the cognitively underdeveloped student may also be hesitant to seek out help with their academic endeavors, they might challenge their sense of self-worth, and they may be resistant to advice and help from their instructors.

Identity is also central to the student emotional adjustment model. Students with a strong sense of personal identity ought to be able to seek career counseling in a field that they find interesting, to maintain integrity when faced with peer pressure, and to seek out clubs, organizations, and activities that are important to them personally. A student with a well-developed sense

of self will not just know who they are but also be able to recognize and appreciate the diversity in those they encounter. Students with an underdeveloped sense of identity will struggle with peer pressure and will not be able to find extracurricular activities that they find engaging. Since identity is also connected with career choice as indicated by Marcia (1980), this student may not be satisfied with their major or may have problems in selecting a distinct career path.

Finally, psychosocial factors complete the model. A student that is well adjusted socially will be invested in the campus culture, will feel a sense of school pride, and will be concerned with social issues that impact the school and the student body as a whole. This will perhaps be a leader among other students and who will garner respect and influence among their peers. A student with poor social adjustment will have trouble finding a niche on campus, and will feel disengaged from the campus culture. Feelings of dissatisfaction have the potential of running high, and attrition is a severe risk. Clearly further research will be required to determine how to utilize this model more precisely, but for now, I merely present a speculative sample of ways it can pinpoint possible problems students may encounter.

The goal of the student emotional adjustment model is to provide a framework for student affairs professionals to help students who are at risk of experiencing difficulties in coping with college life and perhaps dropping out of school. Finding the extent of a student's emotional adjustment has several practical implications to help improve student success, satisfaction, and retention. First, if the practitioner were to discover that a student is underdeveloped cognitively, then academic support programs, such as tutoring, learning communities, or mentoring, could help the student improve. Also, if a student came to a counselor with identity issues, further psychological assistance or a typology analysis could help the student explore who he or she is and find activities or organizations that align with the student's personal interests and values. Finally, a student who feels disengaged from the campus presents a larger problem. The job of the practitioner in this case is finding a way to get the student engaged with the campus community, perhaps again through student organizations or one-on-one mentoring programs. Certainly, the range of practical implications is much wider than is currently presented, but this hopefully helps to demonstrate the possibilities for further inquiry into student emotional adjustment.

Future Research

Further investigation into student emotional adjustment would be required to connect it with a broader range of current literature, to examine the impact of developmental disabilities and other environmental and biological factors, to test the validity of this model, and to ascertain the full scope of

its practical applications. In terms of literature related to this model, Salovey and Sluyter (1997) have produced an entire body of work based on research into emotional development, emotional intelligence, and the educational implications of both. Their research could contribute great insight into how students perceive common challenges and how their emotions guide their decisions. Further research into hardiness and the question of whether or not the practitioner may instill it in students would also expand the uses of the student emotional adjustment model. As of now, no information is included in this paper that addresses such a possibility, and additional investigation will help answer this question.

Another idea to consider is how mental disorders and disabilities fit into this model. All research in this paper presupposes that developmental processes are what primarily influence emotional adjustment. However, mental disorders and disabilities are real problems that affect how students respond to their academic and social environment, and further investigation would be required to see how such phenomena play into this model, if at all. Consideration of environmental factors will be necessary to examine the full application of this model, as I have thus far assumed that emotional adjustment is an internal process. Study of literature in the field of environmental theory may provide more insight into how students adjust to college life.

In order to test this model, I propose a mixed-methods, exploratory design to gain a broader understanding of how students perceive themselves and to quantify measurements of hardiness. I would begin with a qualitative study during which several students are interviewed to gain insight into their perceptions of self in terms of cognitive, identity and psychosocial development. A multiple-step quantitative analysis including a measurement of academic achievement, a self-report personality inventory, and a social adjustment rating scale would follow the interviews to connect student perceptions and measureable development. Deeper inquiry into student emotional adjustment could potentially produce a longitudinal study to trace one group of students all the way through their college experience.

As more investigation occurs, there will be more opportunity to develop new methods and techniques of individualizing attention to the students to improve their success, satisfaction, and retention. Consultation with various functional areas, such as advising, counseling, academic support, and student activities, could produce a strong list of services to help students who are underdeveloped in cognition, identity, and social adjustment.

References

Arnett, J. J. (2000). Emerging adulthood: A theory of development from the late teens through the twenties. American Psychologist, 55, 469-480.

Baxter Magolda, M. B. (2001). Making their own way: Narratives for transforming higher education to promote self-development. Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Baxter Magolda, M. B. (2004). Self-authorship as the common goal of 21st century education. In Baxter Magolda, M. B., & King, P. M. (Eds.), Learning partnerships: Theory and models of practice to educate for self-authorship (pp. 1-35).

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

Elder, G. H., Jr. (1995). The life course paradigm: Social change and individual development. In P. Moen, G. H. Elder, Jr., & K. Luscher (Eds.), Examining lives in context: Perspectives on the ecology of human development (pp. 101-139). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Erikson, E. H. (1968). Identity, youth and crisis. New York: W.W. Norton.

King, P. M., & Baxter Magolda, M. B. (1996). A developmental perspective on learning. Journal of College Student Development 37(2), pp. 163-172.

King, P. M., & Kitchener, K. S. (1994). Developing reflective judgment: Understanding and promoting intellectual growth and critical thinking in adolescents and adults. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kobasa, S. C. (1979). Stressful life events, personality, and health: An inquiry into hardiness. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37, 1-11.

Marcia, J. E. (1980). Identity in adolescence. In J. Adelson (Ed.), Handbook of adolescent psychology. New York: Wiley.

Salovey, P., & Mayer, J. D. (1990). Emotional intelligence. In Salovey, P., Brackett, M. A., & Mayer, J. D. (Eds.), Emotional intelligence: Key readings on the Mayer and Salovey model (2007, 2nd ed., pp. 1-27).

Salovey, P., & Sluyter, D. J. (Eds.). (1997). Emotional development and emotional intelligence: Educational implications. New York: Basic Books.

Anthony Masseria is currently a student in the Indiana University HESA program, and is expected to graduate with a Master of Science in Education in May 2009. He earned a B.A. in Spanish Language and Theological Studies from Hanover College in 2003, and continued undergraduate studies in Anthropology at Indiana University – Purdue University Indianapolis. His academic interests include first-year and transitional students, academic affairs, and GLBT issues in higher education.

Meaning Making Processes
The Roles of Dissonance, Influencers, and Reflection
Robert F. Stagni

Building off of research performed on service-learning courses and theories of reflection and intervention, this paper suggests a comprehensive model for meaning making processes involving students. The roles of dissonance, the influence of others, and self-reflection are discussed; and implications for a new, comprehensive theory are examined.

Dissonance, as it is defined in social science research, occurs when a person or group undergoes internal change, growth, or development (Brehm, 2007). Dissonance manifests as a catalyst, reference point or major event that prompts a person to develop new ideas of self, understandings of society, knowledge of systems or a number of other outcomes (Baxter Magolda, 1999). Some of social science's most-cited theories of psychosocial (Chickering & Reisser, 1993) and moral development (Kohlberg, 1972) acknowledge the presence of dissonance in the transition between stages. Chickering and Reisser (1993) specifically refer to dissonance, declaring that it may be "dramatic and sudden," but acknowledge that "most occur gradually and incrementally" (p. 43).

The literature lacks a comprehensive, holistic understanding of exactly what dissonance offers to meaning making, how it must be facilitated and how the individual undergoing change focuses it internally. One possible idea is that dissonance serves as a central component of significant meaning making, and that with influencing guidance and reflective introspection, dissonance is the most powerful tool to foster personal development. To this end, the following questions will be examined in this article:

- What is the precise role of dissonance in meaning making processes?
- What are the roles of influencers, such as teachers and advisors, in channeling and facilitating dissonance?
- What are the roles of self-reflection in making meaning of dissonance?

Examining these questions requires a number of sources from the areas of social theory, psychology, project facilitation, and service learning. Service learning research, particularly the work of Jones & Abes (2003; 2004), stands out to provide an excellent example of how dissonant experiences can be purposely planned and used to promote growth and understanding. While service learning is certainly not the only source of dissonance for students,

it is an excellent example of the potential that educators and advisors may strive for in prompting meaning making experiences.

Furthermore, some evidence suggests that students do not develop in spite of themselves; that is, the student must have some desire or reason to participate in the experience (McClellan, 2006). Even in situations where dissonance is imposed, a student will not and cannot change unless he or she has the desire to do so (McClellan, 2006). Whether seeking clarification on an issue, searching for more meaning on a firmly-held belief or exploring new ideas, a student must have a desire to grow and develop in order for dissonance or advising to provide any real benefit (Baxter Magolda, 1999). Practitioners are advised to keep these ideas in mind when exploring the functions and roles of these phenomena.

The Role of Dissonance

The majority of research on the role of dissonance deals primarily with the classroom setting, describing how excellent teaching methods force students to think about new ideas (Baxter Magolda, 1999). While useful for instructional purposes, this body of work does not address the role dissonance plays in the learning process. The following provides an examination of the background to meaning making, the importance of dissonance, and the impact it can have.

When individuals are placed in a new situation, they generally rely on prior experiences, current beliefs and pressing influences in any meaning making that may occur (Baxter Magolda, 1999). Baxter Magolda draws from a number of prior studies noting that students' "position," their set of held beliefs, "is a major component of the 'experience' from which they make meaning" (p. 22). While this does give students grounds from which to make meaning, a problem of experiential limitation can still exist: the less that a person has experienced "in life," the fewer examples and related events that individual has from which to draw conclusions, i.e., make meaning (Jones & Abes, 2003). Jones and Abes (2004) also indicate in their research that even if an individual has already had experiences from which to make meaning, those influences may not empower that person to further develop in his or her decision-making. Examples of this can be seen in Jones and Abes' longitudinal study (2004) of students in service-learning courses, where the participants' community service "enabled them to reflect upon their upbringing in typically homogenous environments" and seek meanings deeper than those they had simply assumed (p. 154). In essence, without dissonance, the students had not examined their backgrounds with a critical eye. This is a significant problem, as much social research (Kolb, 1984) indicates that many students are unable to grasp significant cognitive concepts

and principles, a key component in making meaning of dissonance (Jones & Abes, 2003).

The role of dissonance in meaning making, then, starts to become clear. It serves as the catalyst for engaging in the examination of prior-held notions, or "points of view" (Mezirow, 1997, p. 6). The general understanding is that dissonance, through new ideas, thoughts or experiences "forces students to a level of understanding that is sometimes not obtained when they read and glibly summarize what they have read" (Eyler & Giles, 1999, p. 9). It is a process that affects both a person's thoughts and feelings (Eyler & Giles, 1999). This dissonance is necessary, as a person typically does not engage in deep developmental changes, since most people do not actively seek out ideas that conflict with their normalized frame of reference (Mezirow, 1997).

One example of this dissonance comes in the form of service-learning experiences with AIDS patients. Longitudinal research has examined the internal effects of students' interactions with AIDS patients, clinic volunteers and community leaders in awareness efforts (Jones & Abes, 2004). The study reports internal confrontations students faced when interacting directly with members of the AIDS community. The most common among the students' observations involved the ideas of "I was surprised," "I had a real life example," "I assumed," and "I have come to realize that most of my expectations were wrong" (Jones & Abes, 2004, p. 478). Stereotypes were challenged, prior-held notions were seen as inadequate, and students began searching for ways to make meaning of and incorporate these new values (p.480). As a result of this dissonance, problems are no longer seen dichotomously, but rather as situated in grays, contexts and relative perspectives (Eyler & Giles, 1999). The dissonance forces the student to examine "the complexity of factors surrounding these problems" (Eyler & Giles, 1999, p. 18). With respect to a meaning making process, dissonance is both an initiating and complicating factor. If this dissonance that students experience in times of inner change can be channeled or directed to proven, productive ends, the individuals will experience a lasting impact through "complex mental development" (Baxter Magolda, 2000) as a result of the experience.

The Role of Influencers

The role of influencers in meaning making processes, much like the role of dissonance, is becoming clearer with research (Mezirow, 1997). Whereas dissonance research is theoretical in nature (Brehm, 2007), influencer roles are frequently studied with empirical observation of practitioners in action (Baxter Magolda, 1999). Most commonly, research on influencers groups places them into two categories: above-role influencers, like teachers and mentors (Baxter Magolda, 1999), and co-role influencers, like volun-

teers and patients (Jones & Abes, 2003). These two distinctions are useful in clarifying the influencer's role in the meaning making process.

Above-Role Influencers

There have been numerous studies of teachers and advisors employing "best practices" in classrooms and group settings (Baxter Magolda, 1999; Mezirow, 1997). In these studies, the focus of the research is on the words, actions, and attitudes of the influencer within the context of a well-defined relationship, such as teacher-student or advisor-client. In these "best practices" studies, researchers have gone to great lengths to identify teacher and facilitator strategies that maximize dissonance in productive and developmental ways (Baxter Magolda, 1999).

Above-role influencers in student affairs are typically student advisors (McClellan, 2006), whether academic or co-curricular. When students enter for advising, they do not seek blatant answers as much as help exploring "the complexity of the conflicts they are facing" (McClellan, 2006, How It Really Works section, ¶ 4). In facing this challenge, advisors and facilitators are discouraged from exclusively providing easy answers, and instead, are encouraged to strike a balance of challenge (dissonance) and support, which McClellan calls "motivational conflict and psychological safety" (McClellan, 2006, Step 2 section, ¶ 1). A prime example of this scenario is a student's lack of concern about low or failing grades or behavioral issues. Strategies in such a scenario involve everything from exploring behavioral options to introducing additional conflict, and possible outcomes like failure or expulsion (McClellan, 2006). Providing critical support to students struggling to sort through and process internal dissonance can be a crucial step in the meaning making process (Baxter Magolda, 1999).

Another example of such a teaching strategy involving dissonance is known as "learning as mutually constructed meaning" (Baxter Magolda, 1999, p. 70). In this method, teachers remove themselves from the traditional authoritarian role of standing in front of and lecturing to a class. Instead, Baxter Magolda tells us, the instructor presents a scenario, situation or problem and lets the class work together to figure it out. Forcing participants to begin sorting through their own internal dissonance can lead to valuable self-introspection and meaning making (Jones & Abes, 2003). The instructor remains on the side as much as possible, jumping in only to assist the students in times of mental roadblock or off-track conversation. In assuming control of their own education the students must individually and collectively come to grasp that their perspectives and ideas are major sources for the meanings they make (Jones & Abes, 2003) and that many conclusions are situated in context (Baxter Magolda, 1999). This idea is referred to as "the facilitator model," and works best when the facilitator, through transfer of

leadership to the participants, ceases to be an authority figure and becomes a co-learner (Mezirow, 1997).

Co-Role Influencers

The other category of these influencers involves the idea of "face to the name," or the personalizing of what was formerly no more than a cognitive structure. Eyler and Giles (1999) describe this phenomenon as it relates to policies on the homeless becoming "more compelling when the policies affect someone you know" (p. 87). The female student in the case at hand had never before interacted with the homeless, and was initially hesitant to open up to a homeless man and learn about his world. Although the time of their interaction was limited, the simple act of knowing an individual under these conditions "kindled her need to know more about the issues that affected her new acquaintance" (p. 88). In fact, comparing the classroom responses of students who interacted directly with these clients to those of volunteers who did not (Eyler & Giles, 1999) showed a significant, positive difference in engagement, issues, causes and outcomes (p. 89).

Similar results were observed in a service-learning study of students volunteering in AIDS clinics (Jones & Abes, 2003). In discussion with the course leaders and researchers afterwards, a majority of student participants in the program gave credit for their new outlooks to the clinic staff with whom they worked. In particular, they commented heavily on their direct interactions with clinic staff, and observed how the staff interacted very closely with AIDS patients. In the staff's dedication, the students found meaning that went beyond admiration (Jones & Abes, 2003). The study also reports the value of the staff's willingness to "help students grapple" with emerging issues and "assist them in making meaning of their purpose" (p. 484).

Even with this new desire to find information, however, Eyler and Giles (1999) indicate that this change, left unchecked, will not always (in fact, rarely) be a smooth process. Students participating in service-learning opportunities are far more likely to advance cognitively and morally if their program involves a period of deliberate discussion and reflection led by a competent instructor (Eyler & Giles, 1999). McClellan's (2006) description of support as a combination of "encouragement and assistance" is useful in that it provides professionals a theoretical framework from which to create and assess the work of influencers in meaning making.

The Role of Reflection

Reflection has been overlooked as a formal step in some meaning making process (Jones & Abes, 2004). Its role however is a vital one, as it is where meaning is "made" (Rodgers, 2002). Dissonance serves as the

initiator of this process. External influencers give direction and idea, and may even force dissonant situations, but typically it is up to the student or individual to examine and decide what meaning is made of an experience (Mezirow, 1997). The need for a dedicated opportunity to reflect on experiences and information is obvious in long-term studies of student participation in service learning. Again, Eyler and Giles (1999) give examples of students in service-learning programs who do not even realize that they have begun to undergo change (p. 36), but upon reflection, find that their outlooks and attitudes have shifted drastically. These students can then reflect further on how they have changed, making fuller meaning of their new attitudes (Eyler & Giles, 1999). Reflection has been found to benefit even individuals who have prior exposure to these dissonant experiences, but who have not themselves had opportunities to make meaning of what was going on (Jones & Abes, 2004). The same study demonstrated that participants who had this chance to reflect were able to "develop some of their own values… based on these internally generated values rather than external explanations" (Jones & Abes, 2004, p. 162). Another strong outcome was that these same individuals often sought out additional service-learning experiences, allowing for more reflection, exploration, and meaning making.

Tangible examples of reflection are found in handbooks and field guides for teachers and community service facilitators, such as Susan Spangler's The Service Learning Link (2001). Guides like these offer many basic ideas of how reflection on dissonance is best offered to student participants. The most important recommendations, according to Spangler, are providing multiple times and settings for reflection, varying the methods by which students are reflecting on the new information, using theory-proven reflection guides like EDIT and R3A3, and allowing students to creatively express the thoughts and emotions they are feeling (Spangler, 2001, pp. 7-13).

Since dissonance often touches students on a personal level, any methods or techniques the students use to reflect should intentionally allow them to combine their intellectual observations with personalized notions of the experience (Eyler & Giles, 1999). Part of Eyler and Giles' research focuses on the value of self-awareness as a part of the meaning making process, and some reflection methods have been linked developmentally to this concept: specifically, discussion and journal-writing. Deliberate and purposeful designing of reflection activities, though, is essential for any meaning making to take place (Jones & Abes, 2004).

Implications for Student Affairs Practitioners

The ideas of dissonance, influencing, and reflection are already established as important components of student affairs practice, whether in programmatic or advisory roles (Jones & Abes, 2003; McClellan, 2006).

Many student affairs preparation curricula already include the basic study of these ideas within the contexts of student development theory and advising (Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education, 2006). Until specific research provides more deliberate conclusions regarding the link between these three ideas, the current body of work can support three general recommendations:

> 1. Make opportunities for dissonance specific, deliberate, and immersive. Research has shown that experiences providing dissonance are far more impactful if the participants have direct contact with the new group, individuals, or hands-on situation (Jones & Abes, 2003). If possible, link the type of experience to the perspectives and needs of the individual, which may have a more precise, relevant impact (Baxter Magolda, 1999).
>
> 2. When providing guidance for students, give them advice that still allows them to form their own conclusions about a matter. Students are coming to mentors to receive direction, not a specific answer (McClellan, 2006). Learning how to direct students in this manner can be a difficult task for both educators and professionals, but it ultimately allows the student to assume more responsibility in the formation of opinions and conclusions (Baxter Magolda, 2000).
>
> 3. Give students time and space to process ideas and experiences. Providing the guidance mentioned previously places the student in such a situation. Students are not fully engaged in meaning making if a superior or instructor constantly feeds new information and ideas without a period of reflection (Jones & Abes, 2004).

Implications for new theory

One comprehensive theory is needed binding these three concepts - introduction of, channeling of and reflection on dissonance - within the context of meaning making. This theory should be grounded in comprehensive research that tracks the characteristics, developmental aspects, programmatic themes, and learning outcomes of programs and activities that use this three-step dissonance approach. This research might support a specific role of dissonance, and could demonstrate the benefits of such a system. One good place to conduct this research is within service-learning programs that place students in new situations, use frequent interaction and class time to put observations into context, and give plenty of individual reflection and processing space for students to make meaning. After studying best-practice programs, and observing emerging common characteristics, researchers should seek out other venues like classrooms or college activity programs that engage students similarly.

This research could show that programs providing these three opportunities (dissonance, guidance, and reflection) are ideally structured to push participants further along developmentally, specifically, cognitively, morally and spiritually. Potential research questions could include, "What is the critical mass of dissonance needed to begin this process," or "What specific steps should above-role influencers take to turn dissonance into development?"

This grounded theory could also provide new insight into holistic student development. If studied alongside psychosocial, cognitive, spiritual, and moral development theories, this idea might broaden the understanding of transitions between major levels or stages in these theories. When studying Chickering & Reisser's (1993) vectors, for example, the professional who comprehends the ideas of dissonance, guidance, and reflection would be better equipped to determine exactly how a student might transition between vectors. Additionally, the new theory could allow for a more practical approach to teaching student development theory-to-practice topics by giving students another potential solution to explore.

In a general sense, the pieces needed to begin exploration of this holistic theory are already in place at some institutions and programs. It will take a dedicated research team with a sufficient knowledge of student development theory, dissonance theory, and learning outcomes to fully understand exactly how dissonance and meaning making work.

Social science research has shown the benefits of these ideas individually. Synthesizing the aforementioned techniques and principles from advising, service learning, and research, student affairs professionals can work to create student opportunities that are more targeted in purpose, stronger in impact, and more developmental in their outcomes. In this way, the practice of student affairs can do a much better job of helping students make meaning.

References

Baxter Magolda, M. B. (1999). Creating contexts for learning and self-authorship: Constructive-developmental pedagogy. Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press.

Baxter Magolda, M. B. (2000). Interpersonal maturity: Integrating agency and communion. Journal of College Student Development, 41, Number 2, 141-156.

Brehm, J. W. (2007). A brief history of dissonance theory. Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 381-391.

Chickering, A. W., & Reisser, L. (1993). Education and identity (2nd Edition). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education. (2006). CAS professional standards for higher education (6th ed.). Washington, DC: Author.

Eyler, J., & Giles, D. (1999). Where's the learning in service-learning? San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Jones, S. R., & Abes, E. S. (2003). Developing student understanding of HIV/AIDS through community service-learning: A case study analysis. Journal of College Student Development, 44, Number 4, 470-488.

Jones, S. R., & Abes, E. S. (2004). Enduring influences of service-learning on college students' identity development. Journal of College Student Development, 45, Number 2, 149-166.

Kohlberg, L. (1972, November 23). Moral Development and the New Social Studies. Boston, MA.

Kolb, D. A. (1984). Experiential learning. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

McClellan, J. L. (2006, November 29). Student motivation: How much can we really do? Retrieved November 28, 2007, from The Mentor: http://www.psu.edu/dus/mentor/

Mezirow, J. (1997). Transformative Learning: Theory to Practice. In P. C. (Ed.), Transformative learning in action: Insights from practice (pp. 5-12). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Rodgers, C. (2002). Defining reflection: Another look at John Dewey and Reflective Thinking. Teachers College Record, 104(4), 842-866.

Spangler, S. M. (2001). The service learning link: Residence life management manual. Garfield, NJ: PaperClip Communications.

Robert Stagni is a member of the 2009 HESA Cohort. He received a B.B.A. in Accounting from Texas A&M University in 2005. At IUB, Rob serves as a Resident Leadership Specialist in Willkie Residence Center, and is involved with conference activities of the Association of College Unions International.

Indiana University
Higher Education and Student Affairs
Gift Form

As members of the Indiana University Student Personnel Association, we thank you for your contribution to the organization! Your continued support is crucial to the financial health of the Journal. We hope you consider sending a gift this year as you enjoy the 2008 edition of this high-quality student publication.

Please accept my gift of $_____

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

_____ Other_____ (38-E009-02-2)

Name: _____

Address: _____

City/State/Zip: _____

Please make checks payable to the Indiana University Foundation, the designated fundraising agent of Indiana University.

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

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

_____ Mastercard _____ Visa _____ Check Enclosed

Card #_____ Exp. Date _____

Signature _____

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

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