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Perspective from the Program Chair

Grant P. Sherwood
Program Chair Student Affairs in Higher Education

This academic year has been one of transition for both the SAHE program and a number of faculty who have moved on to new career/life changes. The program has undergone significant revisions primarily the result of our commitment to identify and evaluate professional competencies. The culminating event in our program is no longer the “paper” but instead a portfolio that highlights experiences of students that directly relate to competency goals. This change has not come without some anxiety, however, the faculty is solidly behind these efforts.

Our faculty continues to transition as well and I want to thank Dr. Mark Denke, Dr. Paul Shang, and Brian Snow for their long-standing dedication to teaching and advising in our program. We also have a number of new faculty accepting the challenge of teaching in SAHE and for that I am very grateful.

For myself, I have chosen to transition to a half-time appointment in the School of Education. My focus in the immediate future, as Program Chair, is to gain approval for exciting curriculum changes, teach and advise students, and continue to advocate for additional resources to support our efforts.

Another important note about our program is the Student of Color Network. Founded in the Spring of 2001, the SOCN has worked hard to address two emerging themes:

1. The struggle SAHE students of color have in finding a supportive community.
2. Effectively recruiting students of color and creating educational opportunities which could become more inclusive for all students.

Under the initial leadership of Portia Bacor (alum currently at Mount Saint Mary’s College) the network has been a driving force of program change. Current student leaders summarize this effort in the following ways:

“The network promotes the infusion of diversity and multiculturalism into the SAHE course curriculum. It also tries to develop strategies to retain and recruit students of color in the graduate program. The network also strives to provide a forum and support network to assist with job search in the field of student affairs and to discuss any job search-related issues. Finally the network provides an outlet for students of color in the graduate program to celebrate their cultures and customs.”

Finally, we hope to see many alums at our receptions at NASPA (Denver) and ACPA (Philadelphia). We continue to have many fine candidates graduating this spring who would enjoy connecting with you at these events.
During the past year, it has been my pleasure to serve as the faculty advisor to the editorial board of the Student Affairs in Higher Education Journal of Student Affairs. It is truly an honor to be associated with the SAHE Journal Board because of their professionalism and integrity. I have been particularly impressed with this year’s Editorial Board members and their dedication to the profession, their insistence on quality, and their attention to journalistic standards.

The Journal Board follows a long twelve-year tradition of producing a high quality communication tool for SAHE alumni and other professionals in the field of student affairs. We hope you enjoy reading this year’s Journal and that you find it thoughtful and stimulating.
Managing Editor’s Perspective
Ann E. Dawson

The Student Affairs in Higher Education (SAHE) graduate program at Colorado State University (CSU) operates under the principle of learning as practitioners. In this spirit of experiential learning, we are challenged with responsibilities that foster our professional and personal development in both our classes and assistantships. The SAHE Journal is one such opportunity for students in our program to experience a unique responsibility.

This year’s editorial board continued the tradition of presenting an APA writing workshop for the first-year SAHE students. The board also continued the practice of selecting from the first-year class a Liaison for Outreach to market the Journal and a Liaison to the Reader Boards to encourage student participation as authors and readers. One change included reorganizing the production process to allow more reader board involvement and to simplify production weekend. In addition, we created an electronic database of drafts, correspondence, and forms, which we hope will prove helpful to future editorial boards.

From my experience in working with this year’s team of editors, I have discovered that a diversity of ideas and personal styles can fuel creative approaches for attaining a common goal.

An effective balance of challenge and support was instrumental in the pursuit of our shared commitment to producing a scholarly publication with broad appeal to diverse readers. I am confident that this Journal reflects the skills and strengths of each editor, and I am grateful for their individual efforts.

As you read the 13th volume of Colorado State University’s Journal of Student Affairs, I encourage you to seek knowledge that will inspire you to act. At the same time, approach each insight with the same critical thinking that was employed in creating recommendations for our authors.

Student development is a key focus in the work of student affairs professionals. Our laboratory is people, our product is people, and our greatest resource is people. Amid changing paradigms in the context of uncertain times, our work can be extremely dynamic and complex. It is therefore important to reflect, envision, create, and actively engage. We must remember that our contributions are unique, meaningful, valuable, and necessary, and that each challenge we face is an opportunity to partner with each other.

I would like to extend special thanks to Dave McKelfresh in his first year as the Journal’s advisor. Dave, your commitment to our success was evident in your attendance at meetings, your intentional conversations with us, and the many hours you spent with us during production weekend. To my colleagues in the SAHE program, thank you for your submissions, and to the editorial and reader board members, many thanks for your invaluable contributions.
The 2004 Journal of Student Affairs Editorial Board wishes to thank the following individuals for their contributions:

- David A. McKelfresh, Director of Staff Training and Assessment and SAHE faculty member at Colorado State University. In David’s first year as an advisor of the Journal of Student Affairs, he has provided our board with vision and leadership, scholarly and professional input on decisions, and a fun and encouraging sense of humor.

- Grant Sherwood, Student Affairs in Higher Education Program Chair at Colorado State University, for his continued support of the Journal.

- Members of the Reader Board, for their hard work and dedication to effective and timely editing.

- Those individuals who submitted articles for publication in the thirteenth volume of the Journal of Student Affairs. We appreciate your research, dedication, and quality contribution.

- Becky Palmisano ('04) for graciously providing the picture used on the cover of the 2004 Journal of Student Affairs.

- Brian Snow, Mark Denke, and Paul Shang for their years of hard work and dedication to the Student Affairs in Higher Education program. You will be missed.
The Importance of Sense of Place and Sense of Self in Residence Hall Room Design

Stephanie A. Clemons        James H. Banning
                                     David A. McKelfresh

Residence halls have been receiving additional attention in recent years as a means to support specific educational objectives. The dormitories of the past, which were perceived as simply places for students to sleep, are being transformed into integrated living-learning environments. New residential models have been explored that foster community, collegiality, communication, and interaction (Godshall, 2000).

The design of residence hall rooms has traditionally focused on functional aspects such as flexible furnishings and lighting issues. In the past, concepts such as sense of place and sense of self have received little attention. Sense of place is a theory that delves into feelings of belonging to an environment and security within it. Sense of self involves the use of symbols to communicate to others one's personal underlying identity (Searing, 2000). Residence hall rooms can be designed to support students' personalities and value systems, thereby fostering a sense of place and sense of self. Information identified may suggest new residential design policies with the goal of enhancing the retention of students in higher education institutions.

Higher education institutions have been examining and researching the design of interior spaces in their residence halls in an effort to improve their condition for over a decade. More recently, a renewed interest surfaced as the result of research that indicated student retention could be correlated to the quality of physical spaces on campus (Hansen & Altman, 1976). As a result, millions of dollars have been spent to remodel old dormitories or build new residence halls to attract and retain students. New residence hall models have been created to foster community, interaction, collegiality, and communication (Godshall, 2000). These models have focused primarily on the common spaces in the residence halls (Godshall).

A review of the literature indicates that there has been little attention given to the design and development of private spaces including residence hall rooms. New configurations of stand-alone singles, rooms shared by two or three, or suites of various sizes have been developed to offer incoming students flexibility and variety in their sleeping and private living spaces (Godshall, 2000). Any issues discussed in the literature seem to revolve around the functional aspects of the private interior spaces. Little literature can be located concerning how the concepts of sense of place and sense of self have been applied or discussed in relation to the design of residence hall rooms, shared or private. Sense of place refers to feelings of belonging to an environment and security within it. Sense of self involves the use of symbols to
communicate to others one’s personal identity (Searing, 2000). Although exploratory in nature, the impact of these concepts may inspire designs for residence hall rooms.

**Background**

In the mid-1980s, colleges and universities faced declining enrollments. As a result, institutions of higher education were competing for a shrinking student population (D’Apice, 1994). The majority of residential buildings on college campuses, constructed in the late 1950s and 1960s, were designed with large community bathrooms and small residential rooms accommodating only two students (Corbett, 1973). This type of communal living was outdated and did not reflect the current student populace. After conducting research, colleges in the late 1980s began making significant changes in residence hall living accommodations.

Literature indicates that several dilemmas existed with the general design of residence hall rooms. First, due to the requirement at many institutions for first-year students to live in the residence halls, overcrowding became a problem. In fact, over two-thirds of students entering four-year institutions lived in residence halls (Boyer, 1987). Second, many incoming first-year students were moving into a smaller space than they were accustomed to in their family home. Most bedrooms in American middle-class residences average about 90 square feet (8.1 square meters). Most residence hall rooms are approximately the same size but are occupied by two individuals rather than one (Wilson & Banning, 1993). Third, privacy is dramatically reduced when sharing a bedroom. The U.S. Census Bureau reported in 1990 that sharing a bedroom in the family home had decreased from 16% in 1950 to 4% in 1990 (Wilson & Banning). Fourth, students arrive on campus with twice as many personal items as their predecessors, yet storage space has not increased in residence hall rooms (Donnelly, 1992). Fifth, year-round use of residence hall facilities and furnishings requires built-in flexibility to accommodate student and non-student use (Thompson, 1996). Traditional students, 18-23 years of age, appear to be seeking greater privacy, larger spaces, and increased control over their personal space (Banning, 1995). Therefore, the residence hall requires more flexibility to accommodate the changing student body and the desired feeling of home.

Between 40 and 45 of every 100 first-time students do not end up earning a degree of any sort (Tinto, 1985). Retention research emphasizes the importance of the interaction between students and the campus environment (Banning, 1984). The degree of fit or sense of belonging may determine the likelihood of students remaining at the institution (Beal & Noel, 1980). Astin (1977) noted that student satisfaction with campus housing is a critical factor of success and retention in the campus environment. Researchers agree that residence hall living plays a vital role in the social and academic success of college students (Astin, Green, & Korn, 1984; Chickering, 1974). Therefore, time spent to analyze the effectiveness of residence hall rooms by college administrators is worth the effort.

**Status of Residence Hall Room Design**

Many institutions have spent millions of dollars retrofitting, refurbishing, and redesigning the interior spaces to respond to changing student needs. College
students of the Millennial generation who entered college since the year 2000 are consumers who need the freedom to control aspects of their surroundings and feel their living quarters are not merely a static environment to inhabit between classes (Reynolds, 2001). This notion of empowering students in their living space seems to be a newer trend in residential hall rooms.

College administrators and architects have made many specific recommendations concerning the design of residence hall rooms. Case studies reported from campuses around the country have detailed the steps taken to retain the architectural and historic integrity of the residence hall building while redesigning the interior spaces (Pocorobba, 2001; Reynolds, 2001). One set of recommendations regarding room design involves the reconfiguration of the interior spaces themselves. These include redesigning the traditional-style residence hall rooms into apartments and suite-style living arrangements (Godshall, 2000). In addition, new living options were integrated into existing facilities to make them more attractive to certain student populations, such as thematic housing, coeducational housing, living-learning centers, and co-op housing (Anchors, 1996; Biddison & Hier, 1994).

A second set of recommendations deals with equipment, furnishings, finishes, and fixtures in the residence hall rooms. Thompson (1996) offers the following recommendations:

- Flexible, versatile bed system specified with safety side rails (easy adjustment to multiple heights, meets ADA requirements, and can be safely lofted)
- Increased size of desk tops for more surface use
- Supported technology needs in personal space
- Dressers modified to maximize vertical space
- Computer and storage security issues addressed
- Residential atmosphere enhanced
- Multiple furniture configurations made available

Heilweil (1973) indicated that room furniture is the single most important factor in the student’s room and is perhaps the least understood. D’Apice (1994) added to the list and suggested:

- Cover concrete walls with upscale, fire retardant materials to enhance the environment visually and absorb sound
- Use lamps rather than overhead institutional lighting
- Use industrial-grade (but attractive) carpeting, thereby replacing the once-exclusive use of linoleum

Biddison & Hier (1994) also suggested:

- Carefully chosen color palette applied to walls and floors
- Textured patterns on the floor to introduce warmth into the environment
- Mobile file pedestals
- Closet storage systems
- One-inch blinds to create uniform look on exterior of building
- Wall hung shelves to save on floor space
- Contemporary lighting solutions, such as track and recessed fixtures to cut down on energy costs

More recently, Reynolds (2001) added to the list of recommendations by suggesting:
Articles published over the past decades have highlighted functional, aesthetic, and personalization factors that may enhance an interior space on campus. Functional factors of a quality interior space can include those items that give an individual a perception of control over the space and enhance the function of an event or activity. These factors include the ability to induce relaxation and enhance creativity (McCoy & Evans, 2002), use of day lighting (Butler & Steuerwald, 1991; Kim, 1998), privacy, and physical comfort. Aesthetic factors include those that relate to perceived beauty and personal well-being (Ritterfeld & Cupchik, 1996). Personalization factors include establishment of status, depiction of family in the space, identity, and a home-like environment (Thompson, Robinson, Graff, & Ingenmey, 1991).

Students are demanding more in the way of creature comforts. These creature comforts involve requests for privacy, better lighting, increased power and data connections, individual control of heating systems, and closer proximity to services such as dining, retail, and mail services (Pocorobba, 2001). The challenge for housing administrators seems to be common institutional problems related to non-flexible structural systems, lack of fire protection and security systems, non-flexible physical layouts, and poor performing building envelopes including windows, doors, and roofs (Pocorobba).

What is interesting in this glance at residence hall room design is administrators’ reported lack of interest in support of an individual student need such as the personalization of space. Only one or two articles briefly mentioned the need to support this value. Little attention in the literature has been given to enhancing the students’ sense of belonging in their personal, private space on campus: the residence hall room.

**Sense of Place and Sense of Self in the Home**

Every aspect of the environment carries symbolic meaning that may affect the individual (Venolia, 1988). Forms, shapes, styles, materials, lighting, colors, and spatial configurations all portray meaning (Miller & Schlitt, 1985). Environmental psychologists have studied this phenomenon of meaning in terms of appropriation, attachment, and identity (Altman & Werner). Place attachment and place identity suggest that a bond develops between people and objects or spaces when people attach psychological, social, and cultural significance to them (Altman & Werner). No matter what the space is, an individual adds a personal touch to it, therefore personalizing it (Marcus, 1995). Consciously or unconsciously, individuals portray information about themselves in their homes through personalization of space. An individual’s unique identity is established through personalization of space, which is critical to overall development of self (Baillie & Goeters, 1997). Having a home where dwellers feel secure, self-aware, expressive, and connected with life enhances
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their health and well-being (Venolia, 1988). Personalization is the human way of adapting to the environment (Kron, 1983).

The home is an environment that can exhibit a sense of place for the dweller. Hiss (1990) described a sense of place as the theory of belonging to an environment and feeling secure within it. Sense of place may also refer to the experience of a person in a particular place or how he or she feels about the place (Steele, 1981). For example, it is critical that elderly persons have artifacts that symbolize memories and a sense of place about where they have been or where they are when moving into a nursing home (Boschetti, 1995). If they do not feel a sense of place, they may give up on life, not feeling an identity with a place.

Home also represents an important sense of self or identity; it is an experience in which one feels connected to the place, people involved, and memories that occurred in that environment (Altman & Werner, 1985). Sense of self involves the use of symbols to communicate to others one’s personal underlying identity. The home is a symbolic environment that fulfills many needs. It is a “place of self-expression, a vessel of memories, a refuge from the outside world, a cocoon where we can feel nurtured and let down our guard” (Marcus, 1995, p. 4). A house is a home only when the inhabitants have control over the space (Kron, 1983). The home’s interior reflects how individuals view themselves (Cooper, 1974).

Through the use of symbols, feelings and attitudes can be conveyed and emotions can be communicated. Csikszentmihalyi and Rochberg-Halton (1981) found that objects embody problematic needs, feelings, or ideas and have an important place in the Freudian, or unconscious, view of the human experience. In trying to define self, people turn to symbols, things that are meaningful to them, to describe who they are in a physical, concrete way. Possessions convey meaning and transform an anonymous space into a place (Boschetti, 1995).

**Importance of Sense of Place and Sense of Self in Residence Hall Rooms**

Can concepts of sense of place and sense of self in the home be transferred to the sense of place and sense of self in residence hall rooms? In part, it seems probable. A study concerning personalization, a factor of sense of place and sense of self, was conducted at the University of Utah in the mid-1970s. Hansen and Altman (1976) were interested in analyzing how college students personalized their dormitory rooms. They hypothesized that for the majority of first-year students, dormitory living is probably a new experience. It is devoid of immediate parental presence and a place where they can more or less freely impose their own values on the environment.

As researchers, Hansen and Altman (1976) had the unique opportunity to see how students place their personal stamp on their physical environment. To assess personalization, photographs were taken of walls above the subject’s bed. Certain areas were omitted from the study, such as shelves, desks, and other items. The results of this study indicated that those students who personalized their dorm rooms early and whose decorations covered a large area of their walls had higher grade point averages and lower university dropout rates than students who did not
personalize their rooms to any extent. Interestingly, a relatively high proportion of students did some decorating within the first two weeks of coming to the university (88%); thus reinforcing the belief that personalizing was a rapid and near-universal process. However, students who ended up dropping out of college decorated more with photos of family and partners perhaps reflecting loneliness and ties with home that were not balanced with memorabilia of their college life (Hansen & Altman). The limitation in this study is that it relates to only two-dimensional pictures/posters over a student's bed and does not take into account other types of three-dimensional memorabilia that can act as symbols of self in an interior space.

A more recent study conducted by Wilson and Banning (1993) assessed the phenomenon of home to residence hall as an ecological transition. They asked 345 students to complete a survey describing their furnishings at home. Eighty-five percent of the students indicated that they were able to decorate their room most of the time.

Attachment of sense of self to smaller elements of the physical environment has crucial implications for developing a sense of place in the college residential setting. As Boschetti (1995) indicated, “Because possessions are small, tangible, and portable, they represent pieces of the environment over which the person has the most control” (p. 10). It is important for students to transform a new space into a place with meaning. Symbols act as strong supports for maintenance of psychological well being. “It is this role of possessions, to convey meaning and to transform an anonymous space into a place, that is crucial for [designers] to grasp when making decisions concerning interior spaces…” (p. 10).

Discussion & Summary

The residence hall challenge is to provide a marketable housing facility with a comfortable environment. The environment should be one that meets the greatest percentage of student needs, yet stays within an acceptable budget, and one that attracts the new student but retains the upper-class student (Thompson, 1996). However, based on the few studies that have been conducted relating to personalization and sense of place, it can be hypothesized that a sense of belonging can be heightened if the design of residence hall rooms can enhance sense of place and sense of self for the inhabitants. Moreover, Marcus (1992) suggests that institutional rules that severely limit personalization of the space “can be serious inhibitors of self-expression in the physical environment, and thus [inhibitors] of a positive sense of self-identity” (p. 88).

Bott, Wells, Haas, Lakey, and Banning (2003) commented, “Environments that offer solace in their authenticity, quality, beauty, uniqueness, and appropriateness of development often serve as a refuge from the pressures of modern-day society” (p. 2). Stress on students, and particularly on incoming first-year students, can be significant. When inhabitants are granted the autonomy to personalize their space, residence hall rooms can offer a place of solace and refuge. More time and attention needs to be given to the concepts of sense of place and sense of self within private interior spaces that act as home.
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International Students and Immigration: The Introduction of SEVIS

Lisa Ingarfield

This paper discusses the changes in the immigration law pertaining to international students in the United States. With the tighter focus on national security since September 11, 2001, international students find themselves in a precarious situation. The mechanisms implemented by the new laws to track international students coming to the United States are cumbersome and complicated. International Offices are struggling to maintain this new system without sufficient guidelines from the government. Current and future issues are tied to the introduction of the tracking system – the Student and Exchange Visitor Information System (SEVIS). The new laws, SEVIS, and the implications and problems with this new system are addressed.

The status of international students in the United States has changed over the past few years. The issue of tracking international students has been present in student affairs since the 1990s, and has gained renewed impetus since September 11, 2001 (Meissner, 2003). International educators are caught between a government trying to make the U.S. secure and legitimate international students wanting to study in the U.S. Since the introduction of the Student and Exchange Visitor Information System (SEVIS) developed by the U.S. Government, the position of international students within the U.S. education system and society is more precarious than it has been.

In November 2002, at the onset of the annual International Education Week, President George W. Bush issued a statement about the benefits of international educational exchange, and the understanding of cultures through education. Bush stated:

International Education Week promotes greater understanding among students from different nations. When students study abroad or host foreign students, they gain greater respect for the principles and aspirations of others around the world, as well as for the differences among countries and cultures. They also realize many values are common and shared around the world. (Bush, 2002, ¶3)

Ironically, at the same time, the guidelines for student visa issuance were further restricted by SEVIS and new visa application procedures. The new SEVIS requirements have “created headaches for institutions with large numbers of international students. ‘SEVIS has been a great equalizer,’ said Dania Brandford-Calvo, Director of International Education at the University of Rhode Island. ‘It has brought trouble to everyone’” (Borg, 2003, ¶10). These new restrictions, the history of the new regulations, and the ramifications on international education and international students will be addressed.
History

Since the first attack on the New York City World Trade Center in 1993, there has been a public outcry to enhance the governmental systems that track international students within the U.S. until recently, colleges and universities retained paper records of international students and then informed the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS - now the Bureau of Customs and Immigration Services) if a change of status occurred (Hartle & Burns, 2002; Rodgers, 2002). The suicide bomber that detonated a bomb in the World Trade Center parking garage in 1993 was in the country on a student visa (Rodgers). With the bomber’s student visa status still resonating, and growing concerns over an inefficient paper trail for tracking international students, a far more comprehensive system was written into the 1996 Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act (IIRIRA). Section 641 of this Act declared that a system to record information about international students on three visa categories – F, J, and M – should be enacted no later than January 1, 1998. The F visa category is for students attending an academic institution, the J visa is for exchange visitors, and the M visa is given to students applying to a vocational or non-academic institution (IIRIRA, 1996).

The specifications in IIRIRA led to a pilot program known as the Coordinated Interagency Partnership Regulating International Students (CIPRIS). This was implemented in 1997 and upheld until October 1999. CIPRIS, “[W]as star-crossed from the outset. Congress neglected to provide adequate funding and initial efforts by the INS to create a funding stream-by requiring institutions to collect a fee from students and remit it to the agency-were exceptionally controversial” (Hartle & Burns, 2002, p. 88). The responsibility for the collection of fees that would ultimately fund CIPRIS was eventually passed to the U.S. Attorney General (Rodgers, 2002). CIPRIS was re-engineered as SEVP, the National Student and Exchange Visitor Program in the summer and fall of 2000 and was tested in and around Boston (Rodgers).

September 11, 2001

After the attacks on the World Trade Center in New York, it was discovered that one of the terrorists involved had been admitted to the U.S. on an F1 student visa. Calls for the system that had been mandated in 1996 to track international students but had never fully been implemented were renewed (Rodgers, 2002). The U.S. government was under extreme pressure from both policy-makers and the public to make CIPRIS and SEVP a reality even though they were years behind the deadline mandated in IIRIRA and severely over budget (Hartle & Burns, 2002). The USA Patriot Act, or the Uniting and Strengthening of America by Providing Appropriate Tools Required to Intercept and Obstruct Terrorism Act of 2001, reinstated an abandoned January 1, 2003 deadline imposed in 1997 by IIRIRA. Despite the lack of mechanisms available to meet the deadline, the INS “moved aggressively and unilaterally...to implement the system as quickly as possible” (Hartle & Burns, p. 89). The Enhanced Border Security and Visa Reform Act (EBSVER) was passed into law in May 2002.
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and further amended section 641 of IIRIRA by requiring additional features to be incorporated into SEVIS.

SEVIS

The idea of the new electronic tracking system is national security. The prevention of another September 11 is paramount in the minds of U.S. legislators. However, SEVIS and the more stringent visa application requirements at U.S. Embassies send a message "that foreign students aren't welcome in the United States" (Borg, 2003, ¶29). NAFSA: The Association of International Educators warns against sending this message "openness to international students continues to serve the fundamental interests of U.S. foreign policy, our economy, and our educational system" (NAFSA, 2003, January-a, p. 5).

SEVIS electronically records the details of all F, J, and M visa applicants and holders. It also prints out the students' visa documentation that allows them to apply for a U.S. visa in their home country. The INS published a proposed rule on May 16, 2002 in Federal Register 64 (FR 34862) to implement SEVIS in line with the regulations laid out by IIRIRA, the USA Patriot Act of 2001, and EBSVER 2002 (Fed. Reg. 67, No. 238, 2002). This rule set a date of January 30, 2003 for colleges and universities to use SEVIS to generate documents (Hermes, 2002). What this meant for colleges and universities in the U.S. is that in just over seven months, from May 2002 to January 2003, they would have to use SEVIS to issue all visa documentation. International office administrators at colleges and universities had to learn the process and train their staff with little time for error.

Colleges, universities, and organizations such as NAFSA were vocal in their opposition to the proposed changes and the speed at which the INS expected them to come to implement the new system. Despite understanding the "government's heightened concern" over tracking international students, college administrators "have little praise for the new process" (Ritzel, 2003, p. B-1). The main argument was that the technological changes required were too vast and administrators did not have "sufficient time to assess the system changes necessary to implement SEVIS at their school" by the compliance date of January 30, 2003 (Fed. Reg. 67, No. 238, 2002, p. 76257).

The EBSVER (2002) stated that a permanent electronic system to verify student exchange visitors was now required. Since SEVIS was not complete, this act allowed for an interim system called ISEAS (U.S Department of State Interim Student and Exchange Authentication System). ISEAS had to be implemented by September 11, 2002. ISEAS and SEVIS required that international students cannot be issued a visa until the U.S. Department of State receives electronic confirmation of their acceptance into a program. In addition to the January 30, 2003 deadline, all colleges and universities in the U.S. accepting students with F, J, or M visas had to enter data for continuing and transfer students that needed new documentation into either ISEAS or SEVIS by August 1, 2003.

The August deadline affected international students already in the U.S. if they wished to travel outside of the country during the summer period. If their travel
would bring them back to the U.S. after August 1, 2003, then their documentation from the university would require updating to the SEVIS system. In some cases, international students were stranded in the U.S. during the summer because of the restraints of this system. Over 582,996 international students studied in the U.S. (NAFSA, n.d.). The data entry requirements that emerged were burdensome.

**Implications and Problems**

Full effects of SEVIS will not be known for a few years since the process is still new. From January to August 2003, there were many implications for international students and universities. Maintaining a database continues to be difficult in its initial stages. Colleges and universities staff members have complained that "student files...vanished, and, in a few cases student information has been discovered in the databank of another [institution]" (Borg, 2003, ¶ 11). International office staff members over the past year have had to contact and review the files of international students at their institution. They must ensure that student information is correctly into the system. Every international student needs to be informed that they must come to their international office, update their records, and acquire the new forms to enable them to travel. Universities and colleges have met the challenge of SEVIS well, "but not before they had wrestled with numerous technical glitches with the system, which, they say, was rushed into production by the federal government" (Borg, ¶ 6).

Another negative result from the policy change is a longer delay in visa issuance at U.S. Embassies around the world. This is due to the new requirement of personal interviews for applicants of F, J, and M visas. This is a change from previous years when only students from certain countries were required to interview. In June 2003, the author's experience of working with the U.S. Embassy and the Fulbright Commission in London, revealed that the turn around time for a student visa at the U.S. Embassy was approximately one month. This was an increase from previous years. Borg (2003) in her article on SEVIS stated:

> The new visa requirement...could be far more disruptive than the reporting system [SEVIS].... Getting a visa used to take a few weeks; now it takes anywhere from 30 to 90 days. Moreover, some foreign students report that they have had to repeatedly visit the U.S. embassy, creating a logistical nightmare for those who live in rural areas. (¶ 18)

The U.S. Department of State did not allocate funds or personnel to aid in the interviewing of prospective students (Arnone, 2002). The increased workload from in-person interviews has been overwhelming for embassy and consular staff (Ritzel, 2003).

The policy changes have also affected how early international students can enter the U.S. before the start of their program. Students can no longer enter the U.S. more than 30 days prior to the start of their program (Fed. Reg. 67, No. 238, 2002); previously it was 90 days. This change created challenges for those with work-study jobs or assistantships that begin prior to 30 days before the start of semester.
Additionally, the information submitted by the student to the embassy must match the information the embassy retrieves from SEVIS. When this does not happen, the student could be required to obtain new documentation from their institution. If a student receives his or her visa documentation from the university, and then his or her travel date changes, a new document will need to be issued. A university’s international office staff must understand this new system and gain expertise in its operation to avoid delaying an international student’s opportunity to study in the U.S.

A broader implication of the new immigration requirements is that they could be a deterrent to international students. By increasing the regulations around international students coming to the U.S., the government limits the interaction between U.S. citizens and the rest of the world. International students bring crucial educational benefits and diversity to a college or university. Their presence within the student body gives many Americans their first opportunity to have “close and extensive contact with foreigners” and is beneficial (Johnson, 2003, p. 2).

Despite these negative implications of SEVIS, one must consider how inefficient and outdated the system of monitoring international students was prior to its introduction. Since the 1950s, schools maintained paper-based information on their international students. Anything that affected a students’ status was reported from the college or university to the federal government in paper form (Hartle & Burns, 2002). The INS would receive “literally tons of paper documenting all the required information” on international students (Hartle & Burns, p. 88). Despite the amount of information that existed on international students, the federal government knew very little about them. They were not if an international student enrolled in a college or university after their arrival in the U.S. The paper trail became so overwhelming that in 1988, the INS instructed colleges and universities to retain the information and send it to them when requested. Glenn A. Fine, Inspector General at the U.S. Department of Justice argued that the paper based system was “inefficient, inaccurate, and unreliable” and that “SEVIS has the potential to improve the INS’s monitoring” of international students (Rodgers, 2002, p. 43).

As a computerized system, SEVIS is a technological advancement in the area of international student tracking. It centralized the monitoring process into one system that U.S. colleges and universities, U.S. consular offices around the world, and the Department of Homeland Security can access. SEVIS has removed much of the paperwork that was previously involved with monitoring international students. In theory, once the glitches in SEVIS have been rectified, it should increase the efficiency, reliability, and the accuracy of monitoring international student information.

The Future

While the U.S. government applauds international student exchange programs as a way to shape the world and bring diversity to U.S. campuses, it closes the doors on international students (Johnson, 2003). Victor Johnson (2003), an Associate Director for Public Policy at NAFSA stated, “the federal government is beginning, however unintentionally, to dismantle an industry that we spent 50 years establishing in the
conviction that the presence of international students and scholars serves the national interest” (p. 2). NAFSA urged Congress to make international education and study abroad a priority. Although there has been an increase in U.S. students studying abroad over the past five years (NAFSA, n.d) Americans remain “woefully ignorant of the rest of the world” (NAFSA, January 2003-b, ¶ 2).

Associations such as NAFSA and the Alliance for International Educational Exchange have implored the leaders of the Department of Homeland Security, to “exercise the necessary oversight to ensure that the monitoring of international students and exchange visitors is implemented in a way that bears in mind their significant contributions to U.S. interests” (NAFSA, January 2003-d, ¶ 1). The fear is that the new regulations will affect the U.S.’s ability to attract international students. Franklin and Marshall’s Dean of International Programs, Nathaniel Smith “has already seen increased recruiting competition from universities in Australia, New Zealand and the United Kingdom” (Ritzel, 2003, p. B1).

NAFSA members recommend that the U.S. government should update immigration laws so they represent the realities of the twenty-first century and remove any regulations that do not “make any significant contributions to national security” (NAFSA, January 2003-c, ¶ 4). In January 2003, NAFSA released a report created by its Strategic Task Force on International Student Access. It stated:

To unduly restrict the access of future leaders – and, indeed, the youth of the world – to this country is to court a greater danger, which is to nurture the isolationism, fundamentalism, and bigoted caricatures that drive anti-Western terrorism. After September 11, it seems clear that the more people who can experience the country firsthand, breaking down the stereotypes they grow up with and opening their minds to a world beyond their borders, the better it is for U.S. security. (NAFSA, January 2003-a, p. 6)

Recommendations from the Task Force include creating immigration criterion that are workable and realistic, a visa screening process that is not lengthy, and a monitoring system that does not impose “overly harsh penalties for inadvertent errors” (NAFSA, January 2003-c, ¶ 5). The Task Force argues that the U.S. government’s lack of strategy to promote international student access to the U.S. has exasperated the situation for international students since September 11, 2001. The Task Force asserts that U.S. visa policies are shortsighted, and therefore denies “exchange opportunities to people from countries where isolation from the rest of the world is driving terrorism” (NAFSA, January 2003-a, p. 11), security risks will only increase. With each new policy and regulation created in the post September 11 era, the U.S. is developing an image of an unwelcome nation. Although the Task Force does not specifically refer to SEVIS, it states, “each new layer of regulation increases the resources - time, personnel, and money - that schools must spend to comply, robbing them of those resources for proactive efforts to recruit international students” (NAFSA, January 2003-a, p. 11).

Conclusion
SEVIS's structure is problematic since it is so particular about the information it requires and any deviation from this can cause major difficulties. With SEVIS being rushed into existence, universities and colleges are dealing with the problems as they develop. For a system of this magnitude, time and thought are vital to its production. The U.S. government needs to re-evaluate the system, aiming for a less restrictive and complicated process and ask itself if SEVIS, in its current state, is doing what it was intended to do to maintain a database of international students in the U.S. rather than limiting their access to a U.S. education.

International education is a fundamental part of the U.S. system of education and is vital to the growth of U.S. students. Educators, student affairs professionals, and groups such as NAFSA must continue to make their voices heard. International students must feel welcome in the U.S. for international exchange in order to continue and grow. The experience an international student has at a U.S. university will affect how studying in the U.S. is viewed by the world. The changes discussed earlier are not conducive to creating a reputation of openness to international visitors. International offices around the country are working to ensure that once a student arrives their experience is first class. Because of the current levels of fear around the other pervading U.S. society, this is a job that international office staffs have to work harder at than ever before.
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Women in Higher Education Revisited: 
Intergenerational Conversations

Linda Kuk Jody Donovan

Today's women in higher education administration are the beneficiaries of previous generations of courageous and committed women who challenged societal rules and expectations governing women in the academy. This research study revisits the cross-generational conversations initiated by Astin and Leland (1991) by exploring female administrators' current perceptions regarding their status in higher education at a public, four-year research university. Women employed as administrators spanning three generations with diverse backgrounds and familial statuses were interviewed. The qualitative data was transcribed and analyzed. Five themes emerged to characterize the current perceptions of the status of the women administrators on campus. Recommendations are offered to support and empower future generations within the academy.

Although women students may be the majority within higher education today, female faculty and administrators have not yet achieved equity in numbers, positions, salaries, or status (Chamberlain, 1991; Chliwniak, 1997; Fogg, 2003; Nidiffer, 2001; Shavlik & Touchton, 1984; Tinsley, Secor, & Kaplan, 1984; Touchton & Davis, 1991). The percentage of female faculty reached an all-time high of 36% in 1880, yet has remained beneath that level, ranging from 22% to 28% throughout the 1900s (Cooper, 2002).

With regard to women in administration, Twombly and Rosser (2002) report, “In 1997, women held 69,432 (46%) of the 151,363 total executive, administrative, and managerial positions…” (p. 461). These women can be found mostly in the areas of student affairs and library services, which are often perceived as marginal to the mission of the institutions and thus compensated at lower rates (Chamberlain, 1991; Touchton & Davis, 1991). According to the National Center for Educational Statistics in 2001, women of color made up 15.5% of the previously mentioned 46% of women holding executive, administrative, and managerial positions held by women (Twombly & Rosser, 2002). Currently, women make up 20% of the presidents of higher education institutions. However only 2% are presidents of major research universities, while the others lead “the less prestigious community colleges, independent colleges, women’s colleges, and comprehensive colleges” (Eddy, 2002, p. 500).

In terms of average salaries, Fogg (2003) reports that a 9.6% gap exists between male and female assistant professors at doctoral institutions, stating that women are “still a dime short... earning 91 cents for every dollar their male counterparts make” (¶ 1). Similar pay inequity exists among the administrative ranks. For example, the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA) Student Affairs Salary Survey conducted in 2002 reports that women Senior Student Affairs Officers
Numerous articles, books, and chapters document other significant issues women in higher education administration face on a regular basis. The *chilly climate* and *glass ceilings* created by sexual harassment and discrimination are tremendous challenges impacting the personal and professional lives of women in higher education (Andruskiw & Howes, 1980; Blackhurst, 2000a; Chamberlain, 1991; Chliwniak, 1997; Johnsrud & Heck, 1994; King, 1997; Sandler & Hall, 1986; Twombley & Rosser, 2002; Williams, 2003).

Higher education administrators who identify as women of color and/or lesbians frequently experience the intersection of discrimination based on their gender as well as their race and/or sexual orientation. This makes it difficult to identify which type of discrimination is operating at any given time (Bassett, 1990; Hersi, 1993).

A number of other issues have been identified, such as dealing with the conflict between the biological clock and the tenure clock (Hensel, 1990; Sagaria, 1988); the challenge of balancing childcare and household responsibilities (Hersi, 1993; Sulliman, 2003; Twombley, 2003); and the lack of mobility and flexibility due to family considerations (Fogg, 2003; Hileman, 1990; Moore, 1984; Williams, 2003). These major personal decisions impact the professional careers of women. Astin and Leland’s (1991) cross-generational study outlines multiple stories of women sacrificing both their personal and professional happiness to meet the demands at work and at home.

**Purpose of the Study**

This research project was undertaken to explore the perceptions of the status of women administrators across three generations of women with varying familial and parenting statuses. The cross-generational conversations among women in higher education administration revisit those conversations initiated by Astin and Leland in 1991.

**Methodology**

Purposeful sampling selected ten women administrators at a public, four-year research university. The sample criteria solicited women from three generations, senior administrators, mid-level administrators, and entry-level administrators, representing diverse backgrounds and familial statuses. A copy of the interview questions was emailed prior to the interview to provide time for participants to reflect on their perceptions of the status of women administrators in higher education. To ensure anonymity, each participant selected a pseudonym. The interviews were audiotaped, transcribed, and analyzed through comparative analysis for emergent themes.
The Voices

Senior Women Administrators

Previously termed the *Inheritors* by Astin and Leland (1991), this generation has taken on the role of the *Instigators* for future generations. The Instigators provide leadership, role modeling, and mentoring as they pave the way through “the patriarchal structure of existing institutions” (Astin & Leland, 1991, p. 33).

Diane, Karen, and Anne are currently employed in senior level administrative positions. They range in age from the late 40s to mid 50s, and they have been employed as either faculty and/or administrators for over 20 years. All three hold doctoral degrees and have been in their current administrative positions for less than three years.

Diane is a Caucasian senior administrator within academic affairs. She is married and has one grown child. She holds tenure in a traditionally male-dominated college and academic program. Diane has served in a number of administrative roles at two different universities and currently serves as Dean. Having acquired her doctoral degree later in her career, Diane did not originally anticipate advancing to her current administrative role. Diane conducted research regarding the role of women in her field, as a result promoting the advancement of women within the profession.

Karen is also a Caucasian senior administrator within academic affairs. She is married, has no children, has a large extended family, and holds tenure in a traditionally female dominated college and academic program. Prior to assuming her current role, Karen served in a number of administrative roles including Department Chair and Assistant Dean of her college. She has experienced a more traditional path through faculty, department, and college administrator roles. Karen praised the support and foundation she received from her experience at a women’s college and identifies this as a key to her success and development as an effective administrator. The fit between her interests, skills, and the requirements of the role brought about Karen’s aspirations toward her current position.

Anne is a woman of color serving as a senior administrator within student affairs. She is married and has four children. While she does not have tenure, she teaches each semester through a special faculty appointment. Anne has served in a number of administrative roles at three different institutions before becoming a senior level administrator. She earned her graduate degrees while married with small children, learning early in her career how to multi-task and set priorities. Anne did not initially aspire to higher-level administrative roles; she was happy and comfortable in her mid-level role. In addition, she had family considerations that required time and created a certain level of inflexibility. Currently, Anne is comfortable in this role and is uncertain about moving to a higher administrative level.

Each of the women expressed a sense of self-assurance in their current role yet indicated that they experienced feelings of uncertainty about their abilities prior to accepting the position. They wondered if their male counterparts had similar feelings prior to assuming these highly demanding roles.
All three women expressed an internalized expectation that they needed better preparation for the day-to-day responsibilities and interactions than their male counterparts. As minorities in the field, they felt the burden of shouldering the expectations associated with representing these broader groups of women.

Mid-Level Women Administrators

The women of this generation can be called the Inheritors, the beneficiaries of the previous generations of women who have fought for women to achieve status and power in the administrative ranks (Astin & Leland, 1991).

Carla, Regina, Skeeter, and Amanda hold mid-level administrative positions and range in age from 39 to 43 years. Working in the profession for less than 20 years, these women serve as directors and assistant directors in student affairs and in another administrative area on campus. Most of these women have served in a number of different administrative roles at other universities prior to assuming their current positions. Three women hold master’s degrees, and one holds a doctorate.

Carla is Caucasian, single, and has no children. She currently serves as a director in a department previously dominated by men. Carla is aware that her professional choices have greatly impacted her personal life. She fills her personal life with friends, family, and hobbies, hoping to someday share her life with a partner. Carla reports feeling comfortable with her level of responsibility and does not wish to further her advancement. Serving in her current role for less than a year, Carla acknowledges her role as an advocate for women students and staff in the department.

Regina is a woman of color in a committed lesbian relationship, and she is contemplating having a child in the near future. She currently serves as an assistant director in a department that has traditionally employed women at the assistant and associate director levels. Family considerations impact Regina’s career aspirations as she worries about balancing her work and home life. Regina works long hours, believing that she must always be on top of her work for fear of being negatively judged on the basis of her gender, ethnicity, and/or sexual orientation. Regina has a strong network of women friends and colleagues on campus who are at the assistant or associate director level. She trusts and depends upon these women to help her cope with the day-to-day stress of the work environment.

Skeeter is a Caucasian, married woman who has no children. She earns the primary income in her household and holds an administrative position at the university. Prior to assuming her current position, Skeeter was employed in the private sector. Watching female and male administrators working collaboratively on campus, Skeeter believes it is important to disregard the dynamics of gender in the workplace. According to Skeeter, this only happens if the administrators respect one another as equals and do not blame difficulties on gender.

Amanda is a woman of color who is married with two young children. She is the director of a unit that works collaboratively with other offices primarily led by
women administrators. Amanda struggles with balancing her roles as an administrator, spouse, and mother. She worries about her children growing up without her and about not giving enough to her students. Amanda sees herself as a role model for male and female students, demonstrating that it is possible to be an administrator, wife, and mother. Amanda has aspirations for upper-level administrative positions, such as Dean of Students or Vice President for Student Affairs.

These women are cautiously optimistic, having experienced sexual harassment and discrimination during their tenure as higher education administrators. They appreciate the female role models that have come before them but recognize the scarcity and silence among women in significant administrative positions on campus.

*Entry-Level Women Administrators*

These women represent the **Idealists**, a name given to this generation by the authors of this article. The Idealists have just begun their careers as administrators in higher education and have not experienced the role gender plays in the workplace. Their level of employment, which looks mainly within the Division of Student Affairs, rather than the larger university administration, limits their perspective.

Susan, Robin, and Natalie represent the youngest generation of women administrators on campus and range in age from 25 to 37 years. Two of the women are enrolled in graduate school, seeking a master’s in student affairs administration, and one has already earned a master’s degree and works full time. They have been in the field less than nine years, working in one or two different areas within higher education.

Susan is Caucasian, married, and the mother of one young child. She is an assistant director, supervising student employees and advising numerous student groups. Susan is pleased with her career choice but struggles with the time demands at work and home. Married to a very supportive husband, Susan strives to have an equal relationship at home. Unfortunately, she is often forced to respond to stereotypical expectations from her spouse’s workplace. Susan frequently thinks about staying home full-time if she were to have another child, but the financial and long-term career implications cause her to dismiss this idea. She frequently feels guilty, never feeling as if she is giving her best.

Robin is a woman of color who is single and has no children. She is in a coordinator position, working directly with students. Robin is working full-time and taking a full schedule of courses in order to complete her master’s degree. She moved out of her mother’s home for the first time this past summer and is enjoying her newfound freedom and responsibility. Robin is optimistic about her career in student affairs but maintains a realistic approach regarding her own aspirations, never wanting to take a position that is too far removed from students.

Natalie is a Caucasian single mother of a young child. She is a nontraditional student, having worked full-time for a number of years prior to returning to school
for her bachelor’s degree. She is currently working on her second master’s degree. Natalie focuses all of her energies on being a mother, a student, and a graduate assistant. She is an advocate for nontraditional students and other underrepresented populations.

These young professionals see a large number of women in assistant and associate director roles and are hopeful that they will reach these levels. They look to women in director roles for guidance, mentoring, and encouragement. All three women are concerned about the daily demands and stress of their chosen professions, remaining flexible for future career changes.

**Emergent Themes**

*Perceptions of the Current Climate for Women on the College Campus*

Among the Instigators and Inheritors there are some common perceptions about the status of being a women administrator. While there are increasing numbers of women in senior level positions, women in each of the generations feel they are not readily supported in their roles by faculty, colleagues, and other administrators in the same way that male colleagues are supported.

Women at all levels face many stereotypes about their competencies and management styles that are not placed upon their male colleagues. Skeeter mentions that she has never seen a man offer to take notes during a meeting; therefore, she has stopped volunteering for that responsibility as well.

The women feel that they are less likely to be trusted in making difficult decisions. Nearly all of the women comment about incidents in which their ideas or comments are ignored or devalued and then later taken more seriously when a male colleague shares the ideas. Karen explains, “I don’t deserve to be discounted and no one else does as well, and at some point in my career it would have played on my self-concept. Now it just makes me angry. How dare you!”

Other issues identified are the inequity of salaries when compared to male colleagues and the under-representation of women administrators in high status positions. The Instigators point to this as the major reason for the continued gap in administrative salaries, believing that universities are reluctant to deal with the issue due to the costs associated with fixing the inequities.

Many of the women feel positive about having increasing numbers of women in mid-level administrative roles. Diane expresses concern, however, that there are not many women in department chair roles and that few women faculty aspire to administrative roles. All of the Instigators and Inheritors express disappointment in efforts to identify and support women seeking training for administrative roles, especially in academic administration. This appears to have disappeared as a university priority. Regina expressed, “The men are okay to let one or two women in at that higher status, but that’s enough. So it’s almost like a men’s club. But if you look at all the assistant directors across campus, they’re all women.”
When specifically asked about their perception of the status of women administrators on campus, many of the Inheritors and Idealists believe that it is fairly balanced between men and women; however, some identify a systemic preference towards men. Both Amanda and Skeeter identify a stronger network among men for promotion and opportunities. They feel that the opportunities are available for women, but they “are so busy climbing the ladder, they don’t help each other,” states Amanda.

Struggling for Balance

One of the most pressing issues for all generations of the women administrators interviewed is the constant struggle to find balance in their lives. All of them love their work, yet it requires so much of their time. The common refrain throughout the interviews is that women are determined to “make it work.”

The women talk about their responsibilities for managing their home life, and how their male counterparts rarely experience this added stress. The women with partners report sharing domestic activities such as cooking, cleaning, and caring for children. However, despite a greater sense of equity at work, the home front is still not viewed as truly egalitarian. The juggling of responsibilities wears on these women. Diana believes that women experience much more stress than their male counterparts because the women have to “suck it up and sacrifice.” She longs for personal time to take care of herself emotionally, physically, and spiritually, commenting on the lack of time for personal reflection.

When asked about how effectively Amanda and her women colleagues balance family and work responsibilities, she shares:

I struggle. I struggle a lot. There are many days I don’t want to be here. I want to be with my kids, I want to be the one to teach them. And then, I’m here until six, seven, eight o’clock at night and either they’re asleep or we don’t have quality time when I do get home. I’m just not good at this. Well, I think I do good with it, I just don’t feel good about it. How do I be the parent that I really want to be and how do I be a good administrator, too?

Two of the senior women also talked about recent experiences in dealing with aging parents and the extra time and emotional strain this adds to an already very demanding executive life. Diana describes her emotional turmoil:

Like parenting, women feel more stress about it. It is something that never leaves our minds. Men can compartmentalize things. Women have to deal with it emotionally, and it does not go away. It is always on your mind when you are dealing with other things.

Career Decisions

None of the Instigators planned to be at their current administrative level, and none of them aspire to a higher level within the administrative hierarchy. All of the
women perceive that the more senior level positions are not worth the personal costs. They view these roles as being fairly absorbing of time and energy, leaving nothing for other interests and commitments. Regina comments, “I look at the VP position and I ask myself, do I really want to be there, as a woman? Do I really want all that grief?” Given their other commitments, all the women feel they do not want to make this type of total commitment to only one aspect of their lives.

**Mentoring and Role Models**

The Instigators identify both women and men as mentors as well as their supervisors who assisted them in reaching their current administrative levels. They indicate that the qualities and characteristics of these people are the important factors, not their gender. All three Instigators highlight the ability to listen, to be supportive, to challenge, and to provide opportunities for personal and professional growth as the keys to success.

This view is different from the Inheritors and Idealists who specifically look to female role models and mentors. Susan appreciates the women role models she has had, but she comments that the majority have been single, lesbian, and without children. For the first time, she has a female supervisor who is also a mother, sharing that they have cried together and relate on both a personal and professional level. Surrounded by strong women role models and mentors, Amanda stresses the importance of finding white men to serve as mentors to get in the door and gain access to opportunities for promotion and development.

All of the women in this study believe they have a major responsibility to be role models and to help advance the careers of younger women and men. The Instigators express concern that the university has lost interest in identifying young women faculty and administrators to be prepared for more senior administrative roles. They also mention their experience with the classical *Queen Bee Woman* who does reach out to aspiring women. They are committed to not taking on this role. They talk about their desire to influence young men and encourage them to understand and appreciate their domestic and career roles. The women with children speak of their additional responsibilities of role modeling, parenting, and caring for the family. They are always mindful of the eyes watching and judging when they bring their children to the office or campus events.

**Networks**

Given the demands on their very busy lives and their desire to make time for their families and partners, many of the women express regrets that they do not have more time for friends. The Inheritors and Idealists request that informal and formal networks be established as a support system to share vulnerabilities and help one another through difficult times. Diana desires a place “to bare [her] soul without negatively impacting [her] status or job advancement.”
Discussion

Each of the three generations of women provides a unique perspective regarding the status of women administrators. As expected, their perspectives are based both on their range of experiences and their positions within the university.

The Instigators are more focused on systemic issues related to women, indicating that the climate is better for women administrators today, though not all issues have been fully addressed. They speak of being discounted and not being supported in the same way as their male counterparts, but no senior level woman mentions experiencing overt discrimination.

The Inheritors are aware of the low numbers of upper-level women administrators and identify the imbalance of power among male and female administrators at their own level. Each woman was able to provide examples of when her voice was not heard, valued, or allowed at the decision-making table. One participant commented:

“There are some people who are willing to look beyond gender and really listen to me. But I also want them to look at me because I am a woman, and I am a woman of African American descent. Look at all of who I am, and understand that this adds to my ability.”

There is a common perception among Inheritors that upper-level women administrators fight gender discrimination on a regular basis. Robin questions whether she would ever “want to be in an upper-level administrative position and have to constantly have to fight, day in and day out.”

The Idealists are positive about the significant number of female assistant and/or associate directors and the visible women in upper-level leadership positions within student affairs. They do not refer to women administrators in any other part of the university and are not concerned about this omission. The future appears bright for these women, who believe that there are more opportunities available to them and that their ideas, voices, and creativity are more welcome in the workplace.

The Instigators are committed to the mentoring of both younger women and men, citing the need to shape future generations of higher education administrators. The Instigators also speak of the tremendous personal and professional lessons taught by both male and female mentors and colleagues throughout their careers. Unlike their predecessors, the Inheritors and Idealists yearn for women mentors and role models, discounting the value of learning from male mentors and role models.

Family issues are significant for all generations of women administrators in higher education. The differences rest with the Instigators taking care of aging parents in contrast to the Inheritors and Idealists planning for and raising children. Finding time for family, friends, and self are common issues across generations.

In terms of career aspirations, while some of the Inheritors and Idealists aspire to positions of greater responsibility, all three generations identify the personal costs of aspiring to upper-level administration positions. They remain ambivalent about
actively pursuing these types of positions, preferring to enjoy their current roles while being flexible for future job changes.

**Limitations**

The voices of the participants reflect the perceptions of ten women employed at a public, four-year, research university. As a qualitative study, no attempt at generalizability is being offered. Another limitation involves the researchers’ administrative positions, which may have influenced the willingness to honestly disclose perceptions of the status of women in higher education administration on campus.

**Recommendations**

**Address Issues of Equity**

While there are increasing numbers of women in higher education administration, there are few at senior level positions. Salary inequity, discounted contributions from women, and continuous stereotyping of women’s abilities remain issues. Renewed attention to dispelling these myths and addressing the remaining issues of equity in salary and opportunity need to occur.

**Highlight Women Role Models**

With the advent of more women in leadership positions throughout higher education, the opportunity for role modeling increases. It is crucial for the younger generations to see successful women, from all types of backgrounds and lifestyles, leading healthy and happy lives in and outside of the workplace. Being exposed to the coping strategies of top women administrators can provide a realistic perspective as well as a learning opportunity for younger, less-seasoned administrators.

**Promote Informal and Formal Networks and Mentoring Programs**

Creating informal and formal networks could provide a systemic approach to career advancement, access to power and resources, and ultimately job satisfaction for women. Research also demonstrates that mentoring programs for women, by women, play a significant role in providing skills, training, strategy building, and constructive feedback necessary for taking risks and assuming additional responsibilities (Anderson & Ramey, 1990; Blackhurst, 2000; Blackhurst, Brandt, & Kalinowski, 1998b; Chamberlain, 1991; Hersi, 1993). At the same time, it is important to recognize the important role that male mentors and supervisors can play in assisting women pursuing new opportunities. Women can also play a significant role in mentoring men. Institutional support should be directed toward developing and maintaining such mentoring opportunities.

**Encourage and Promote Research**
Research must continue to focus on women in higher education administration. It also is important to explore gender roles as they impact career achievement and mobility for all higher education administrators.

**Conclusion**

Women make up more than half of the students enrolled in higher education today (Guido-DiBrito, 2002). It is therefore imperative for both men and women to be exposed to women administrative role models. As Amanda declares, “We are an obvious force to be reckoned with. You can’t ignore all of us.”

The challenges women administrators face is more than an equity issue; they represent an effectiveness issue. Colleges and universities need all of their talent, both male and female, to successfully lead higher education institutions into the future. They cannot afford to do anything less.
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Chicano(a) and Mexican American College Students: Examining the Relationship between Academic Self-Concept and Academic Achievement

Sylvia Mendez

The relationship between academic self-concept and academic achievement of Chicano(a) and/or Mexican American students at Colorado State University was investigated in this study. The participants included 114 undergraduate, full-time students who self-identify as Chicano(a) and/or Mexican American. The quantitative instrument utilized to measure academic self-concept was developed by Reynolds, Ramirez, Magrina, and Allen (1980) and called the “Academic Self-Concept Scale” (ASCS). The results of this study clearly indicate that there is a high correlation and positive relationship between academic self-concept and academic achievement for Chicano(a) and Mexican American college students. The academic self-concept constructs designed by Reynolds, et al. provide support to the importance of acknowledging and valuing non-cognitive variables as an important aspect in the development and academic success of college students, particularly racially, ethnically, and culturally diverse students.

Educators began to give attention to the idea and value of self-concept through the belief that non-cognitive variables have a role in the academic success of students (Cokley, 2000; Frazier & DeBlassie, 1982; Gerardi, 1990; House, 1997; Messick, 1979; Nettles & Johnson, 1987; Reynolds, 1988; Reynolds, Ramirez, Magrina, & Allen, 1980; Shavelson & Bolus, 1982; Shavelson & Stuart, 1977; Smith, Reynolds, & Serlin, 1986). Researchers have identified students’ academic self-concept as a significant predictor of future academic achievement for students pursuing higher education (Cokley, 2000; Gerardi, 1990; House, 1997; Lent, Brown, & Gore, 1997; Reynolds, 1988; Reynolds et al., 1980). Academic self-concept can generally be regarded as how a student believes his or her academic ability and academic standing compares to his or her academic peers. Brookover, Paterson, and Thomas (1962) defined academic self-concept as “a person’s conception of his [or her] own ability to learn the accepted types of academic behavior . . . [and academic] performance in terms of school achievement” (p. 271). While academic self-concept has been studied, there has been little research dedicated to the construction of Chicano(a) and Mexican American college students’ academic self-concept.

Enrollment of students from Chicano(a) and Mexican American ethnic backgrounds has been increasing at colleges and universities over the past few decades in record numbers; however, this population lacks the proportional representation in higher education enrollment and graduation rates (Aguirre & Martinez, 1994; Gandara, 1994; McGlynn, 1998; Nevarez, 2001; Solorzano & Solorzano, 1995). Overall, Chicano(a) and Mexican American students are the least likely to complete high school, pursue higher education, and graduate with a college degree (McGlynn, 1998; Nevarez, 2001). An examination of the literature related to Chicano(a) and
Mexican American college students suggests that they are academically and emotionally under-prepared for college, which can have effects on their academic self-concept (Gloria, 1999; Nevarez, 2001). With the growing number of Chicano(a) and Mexican American college students in the American educational system, it becomes important for student affairs practitioners to understand the construction of students’ academic self-concept and become more cognizant of their academic needs.

There have been few academic self-concept and academic achievement studies that examine college students and there are even fewer studies that focus specifically on ethnically diverse populations (Cokley, 2000; Gerardi, 1990; House, 1997; Nettles & Johnson, 1987). Gerardi’s research concluded that non-cognitive measurements of academic self-concept are a better predictor of grade point average (GPA) for minority and low-socioeconomic background students than are cognitive predictors, such as standardized test scores. This research indicated “that the empirical reality of minority and low-socioeconomic background students’ academic potential becomes unrecognizable and unelucidated, because these academic capabilities are hidden behind the traditional cognitive variables as the sole predictor of academic success” (Gerardi, 1990, p. 406). Gerardi’s study infers that valuing only cognitive variables for academic achievement misrepresents the academic potential of minority and students of low socioeconomic status.

The author of this study was unable to locate any academic self-concept studies conducted exclusively with Hispanic, Latino(a), Chicano(a), or Mexican American college students. There is, however, academic self-concept research pertaining to African American and Asian American college students (Cokley, 2000; House, 1997). Cokley used the Academic Self-Concept Scale (ASCS) developed by Reynolds et al. (1980) and revealed a positive correlation between academic self-concept and academic achievement for African American students attending predominantly white institutions and historically black colleges and universities. The largest predictor of academic self-concept was GPA, with student-faculty interactions second, and class status third (Cokley, 2000). House discovered that Asian American college students’ academic self-concept was significantly correlated with high school curriculum, financial goals, social goals, achievement expectations, desire for recognition, and GPA. In addition, academic self-concept was the strongest predictor of GPA (House, 1997).

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study is to investigate the relationship of academic self-concept and academic achievement of undergraduate, full-time students who have self-identified as Chicano(a) and/or Mexican American at Colorado State University. The research questions of the study are: (1) What is the relationship between academic self-concept of Chicano(a) and Mexican American college students and academic achievement? (2) Which of the seven academic self-concept constructs (grade and effort dimension, study habits/organization self-perceptions, peer evaluation of academic ability, self-confidence in academics, satisfaction with school, self-doubt about ability, or self-evaluation with external standards) predict academic achievement for Chicano(a) and Mexican American college students? (3) What is the
relationship between the demographic variables (sex, age, academic classification, first-generation college student status, and family/household income) and academic achievement for Chicano(a) and Mexican American college students?

Method

Participants

The population of interest is all undergraduate, full-time students who self-identify as Chicano(a) and/or Mexican American college students attending Colorado State University (n = 1,024). The researcher distributed 512 mailings, which included a letter requesting the population of interest’s consent and participation in the study, a demographic questionnaire, and the ASCS as approved by the Colorado State University Human Research Committee. The total response used in the analysis was 114 completed surveys or 23% of the total population surveyed. Table 1 displays the demographic variables and cumulative GPA for the study population. The sample demographics appear to be similar to the general Hispanic population at Colorado State University, which can also be examined in Table 1.

Instrument

The quantitative instrument, the ASCS (Reynolds et al., 1980), was used to measure academic self-concept in this study. The instrument consists of 40 Likert-scale items regarding an individual’s academic self-concept and is keyed in a positive direction extending from (1) strongly disagree to (2) disagree to (3) agree to (4) strongly agree. Within the ASCS, the seven constructs of academic self-concept include: grade and effort dimension, study habits/organization self-perceptions, peer evaluation of academic ability, self-confidence in academics, satisfaction with school, self-doubt about ability, and self-evaluation with external standards. Reynolds et al. formulated the seven constructs of academic self-concept and the ASCS has been utilized in repeated studies on various college student populations (Cokley, 2000; Lent et al., 1997; Reynolds, 1988). Reynolds (1988) elected to measure academic achievement by GPA stating, “academic achievement in the form of college grades is viewed as a more salient value and attribute by which a student may judge himself or herself” (p. 225).

The ASCS instrument has been found to have an estimated reliability (internal consistency) of 0.91 (Reynolds et al., 1980; Reynolds, 1988). Reynolds et al. and Smith et al. (1986) reported correlations between ASCS and students’ GPA of 0.40 (p<0.001). Cokley (2000) reported the test-retest reliability to be 0.88 and the Cronbach’s alpha for the entire scale was reported at 0.92. The convergent validity, after correction for attenuation is reported to be 0.44 and the discriminant validity with the Marlow-Crowne Social Desirability Scale is reported to be 0.17 (Reynolds, 1988). Reynolds and Lent et al. (1997) performed studies on undergraduate students using the ASCS along with other self-concept measurements that established a correlation between academic self-concept and academic achievement. The results of the study concluded that academic self-concept related to the overall academic achievement of their participants and the measurement of academic self-concept may
be useful in forecasting aggregate academic performance (Lent et al., 1997). These data lend support to the reliability and validity of the use of the ASCS as a measurement of academic self-concept.

In addition, the population of interest was asked to answer dichotomous and nominal demographic characteristic questions to be used in analyzing relationships between demographic variables and academic achievement.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Information of Study Participants and the Total Self-Identified Hispanic Population at Colorado State University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Study Population (n=114)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>n</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Classification</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshmen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>First Generation Status</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 and under</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 and over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family/Household Income</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000 and below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,001-$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,001-$75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,001-$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,001 and above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reliability Analysis

The statistical analysis was conducted employing the Software Package for Social Sciences. Descriptive statistics were employed to calculate mean values and the standard deviation of the cumulative GPA of the study population for each item on the ASCS. A reliability analysis was used to verify the item total scale correlations for each of the ASCS surveys that were completed. The reliability analysis was performed on the 114 completed surveys and yielded a Cronbach’s coefficient alpha of 0.9608, which is an extremely high measure of reliability.
Findings Related to Research Question One

The main purpose of this study was to determine if there was a relationship between academic self-concept and academic achievement for Chicano(a) and Mexican American college students. A correlation matrix was created to address question one; correlation matrices disclose the Pearson correlation coefficients and the significance levels. Of the 40 ASCS items, 37 of the questions were highly correlated with cumulative GPA at the 99% confidence level, two ASCS items were highly correlated with cumulative GPA at the 95% confidence level, and one item was not correlated. The total value of the ASCS is correlated with GPA by 0.701, which is highly significant at the 99% confidence level.

Cokley (2000), Lent et al. (1997), and Reynolds (1988) illustrated a significant relationship between academic self-concept and cumulative GPA. Cokley found that “students with higher GPAs had statistically higher academic self-concept scores than students with lower GPAs” (p. 161). According to Lent et al. (1997) “the ASCS self-concept measure yielded the only significant path to overall term grades” (p. 313). The findings related to research question one indicate that there is a strong, highly correlated relationship between academic self-concept and academic achievement.

Findings Related to Research Question Two

Another purpose of the study was to determine which of the seven constructs of academic self-concept (grade and effort dimension, study habits/organization self-perceptions, peer evaluation of academic ability, self-confidence in academics, satisfaction with school, self-doubt about ability, and self-evaluation with external standards for academic achievement) was correlated with cumulative GPA among Chicano(a) and Mexican American college students. A correlation matrix was also created to address research question two. Each of the academic self-concept factors were highly correlated to cumulative GPA at the 99% confidence level. The findings related to research question two indicate that each of the seven constructs of academic self-concept have a strong, high correlation to academic achievement.

Findings Related to Research Question Three

This study also sought to determine if there was a relationship between the demographic variables of sex, age, academic classification, first-generation college student status, and family/household income with academic achievement for Chicano(a) and Mexican American college students. Table 2 shows the mean and standard deviation of cumulative GPA for each demographic variable examined.
Table 2

Mean and Standard Deviation of the Cumulative GPA by Participant Demographic Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cumulative GPA</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(n=114)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.066</td>
<td>0.685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2.962</td>
<td>0.656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Generation Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3.036</td>
<td>0.711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3.035</td>
<td>0.606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Classification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td>3.179</td>
<td>0.592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>2.680</td>
<td>0.589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>2.900</td>
<td>0.865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>3.329</td>
<td>0.571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 and under</td>
<td>3.182</td>
<td>0.534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-20</td>
<td>2.813</td>
<td>0.740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-22</td>
<td>3.282</td>
<td>0.459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-24</td>
<td>3.056</td>
<td>0.459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 and over</td>
<td>3.536</td>
<td>0.199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family/Household Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000 and below</td>
<td>3.272</td>
<td>0.506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,001-$50,000</td>
<td>2.814</td>
<td>0.638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,001-$75,000</td>
<td>2.832</td>
<td>0.942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,001-$100,000</td>
<td>3.202</td>
<td>0.421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,001 and above</td>
<td>2.886</td>
<td>0.648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know</td>
<td>3.377</td>
<td>0.454</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A generalized linear model was fit to quantify the overall relationship between the demographic variables and academic achievement. Table 3 specifies the effects of the variables on cumulative GPA. This table shows the highly significant relationship between academic classification, family/household income, as well as a smaller yet, significant relationship with age and cumulative GPA. Sex and first-generation status are not significant effects.

In addition, independent sample t-tests were used to assess the relationship between sex and first-generation college student status with cumulative GPA. Separate one-way ANOVAs were used to address possible effects that age, academic classification, and family/household income have on cumulative GPA.

An independent samples t-test was conducted using sex and cumulative GPA, resulting in a test statistic of -0.740 with 112 degrees of freedom. The data indicates that there was no significant difference between the relationship of cumulative GPA between females and males since the 2-tailed significance level is 0.461. Likewise,
Cokley (2000), Lent et al. (1997), and Reynolds (1988) found the differences between females and males were negligible and not statistically significant.

Table 3
**Generalized Linear Model Testing the Effect of Demographic Variables on Cumulative GPA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Covariates</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.895</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.895</td>
<td>2.337</td>
<td>0.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.220</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.220</td>
<td>0.575</td>
<td>0.450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Classification</td>
<td>4.708</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.180</td>
<td>4.097</td>
<td>0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Generation Status</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Income</td>
<td>4.616</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.923</td>
<td>2.410</td>
<td>0.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>12.818</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.068</td>
<td>2.788</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>38.689</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>0.383</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>51.507</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>0.456</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An independent samples t-test was conducted using first-generation status and cumulative GPA, resulting in a test statistic for the independent samples t-test of 0.012 with 112 degrees of freedom. The data indicate that there is no significant difference between cumulative GPA between those who are first-generation college students and those who are not since the 2-tailed significance level is 0.990. The researcher found no other studies involving the relationship of first-generation status and academic achievement in an academic self-concept framework.

Table 4 shows the ANOVA testing effect of academic classification on cumulative GPA. The effect of academic classification on cumulative GPA was significant, with a p-value of 0.001. The LSD multiple comparisons procedure revealed that freshmen and sophomores are statistically different with a p-value of 0.001, sophomores and seniors are statistically different with a p-value less than 0.001, and juniors and seniors are statistically different with a p-value of 0.032. There was no significant difference between sophomores and juniors. As hypothesized and confirmed by Reynolds (1988), academic classification will yield an effect on a student’s academic self-concept; a student will exhibit a higher cumulative GPA in the upper levels of college. Cokley (2000) found this to be untrue in his study and found that underclassmen had higher mean academic self-concept scores than upperclassmen. Cokley (2000) attributed this difference to the “cross-sectional non-experimental design of the study” (p. 161).
Table 4
ANOVA Testing Effect of Academic Classification on Cumulative GPA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>7.288</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.429</td>
<td>6.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>44.219</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>0.402</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>51.507</td>
<td>113</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 shows the ANOVA testing effect of age on cumulative GPA. The effect of age on cumulative GPA was significant, with a p-value of 0.008. The LSD multiple comparisons procedure revealed that 18 year olds and under are statistically different with a p-value of 0.020, 19-20 year olds and 21-22 year olds are statistically different with a p-value of 0.009, and 19-20 years olds and 25 year olds and above are statistically different with a p-value of 0.006. The researcher found no other studies pertaining to the relationship between age and academic achievement but hypothesizes that age is similar to academic classification; the older a student is, the more experienced and confident they are, which results in a higher academic self-concept.

Table 5
ANOVA Testing Effect of Age on Cumulative GPA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>6.013</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.503</td>
<td>3.602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>45.494</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>0.417</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>51.507</td>
<td>113</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 shows the ANOVA testing effect of family/household income on cumulative GPA. The effect of family/household income on cumulative GPA was significant, with a p-value of 0.027. The LSD multiple comparisons procedure revealed that those from family/household incomes of $25,000 and below are significantly different from those from $25,001-$50,000 and $50,001-$75,000 with a p-value of 0.012 and 0.019, respectively. Also, those from the study population who did not know their family/household income are significantly different from those from the $25,001-$50,000 and $50,001-$75,000 income by 0.021 and 0.028, respectively. The researcher found no other studies pertaining to the relationship between family/household income and academic achievement in an academic self-concept framework.

Table 6
ANOVA Testing Effect of Family/Household Income on Cumulative GPA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>5.634</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.127</td>
<td>2.653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>45.873</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>0.425</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>51.507</td>
<td>113</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusions

Throughout the literature relating to the academic factors for Chicano(a) and Mexican American college students, a consistent theme was providing the adequate and appropriate access and opportunity for successful academic endeavors. The *Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education Book of Professional Standards for Higher Education* discusses the need for all students to have the opportunity to be assisted in the development of their academic learning, in the enhancement of their self-esteem, and in the improvement of their academic skills to be successful in the classroom (2001).

The results of this study denote that academic self-concept is a critical factor in a student's academic achievement. In addition, the results of this study clearly indicate that there is a positive relationship between academic self-concept and academic achievement for Chicano(a) and Mexican American college students in this study population. The results also lend support for the ASCS as a measurement to be used with Chicano(a) and Mexican American college students. These data illustrate the presumption that students with higher academic self-concepts will have higher GPAs and those with lower academic self-concepts will have lower GPAs. The academic self-concept constructs suggested by Reynolds et al. (1980) also support the importance of acknowledging and valuing non-cognitive variables as an important aspect in the development and academic success of college students, particularly racially, ethnically, and culturally diverse students. The significant relationships found between the demographic variables and cumulative GPA of academic classification, family/household income, and age are important to note. Understanding the significance of the demographic variables can aid student affairs professionals, campus administrators, and faculty members in assisting and understanding factors of students’ academic development.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are based upon the research conducted and the literature related to Chicano(a) and Mexican American college students and academic self-concept. Each of the recommendations calls for a bridging of the gap between academic and student affairs.

First, it is important to weave academic development programming and student development theory aimed at increasing students’ overall academic self-concept and the specific constructs of academic self-concept. There is also a need to create programs built to increase formalized relationships and mentorship opportunities for students with peers, student affairs professionals, and faculty members. Furthermore, incentives and standards should be developed for faculty members to diversify and infuse multiculturalism into the daily curriculum. In addition, programs in higher education should be created to provide early outreach to primary and secondary schools on admission, financial aid, and postsecondary educational opportunities. Lastly, research should continue to examine the relationship of academic self-concept and academic achievement for Chicano(a) and Mexican American college students. This study has produced statistically significant results, which may be of
use to various campus offices and departments; however, further research is needed for increased understanding and utilization of these results and recommendations.
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Changing Social Culture on Campus:  
A Study of Existing Alternative Programming Initiatives

Zane S. Reif    Mark S. Denke

Alternative programming initiatives, or late night and weekend programming, are relatively new innovations to curtail alcohol abuse. There is a need to understand current practices at other colleges and universities, the effects these programs are having, and how the initiatives interact with the current social culture on campuses. The research reflects a connection between social norm theory, alternative programming initiatives, and the positive impact they can have on the social cultures within higher education communities.

At a recent conference of the American College Personnel Association (ACPA), William Berkowitz (2002), a leading expert in social norm theory, declared that colleges and universities are “fooling themselves” if they believe that there is one answer or approach to changing a social culture in regards to alcohol abuse, retention, incidents of sexual assault, and many other unfortunate student issues. The social norm theory is based on “people’s beliefs about behavior that is expected of them in a particular social context” (Langford & Gomberg, 2002, p. 1). Social norm intervention focus on peer influences, which have been found to be more influential in shaping individual behavior than “biological, personality, familial, religious, cultural and other influences” (Berkowitz & Perkins, 1986, p. 963). In relation to alcohol abuse, Berkowitz (2002) responds that he does recognize alternative programming initiatives as social norm tools; however, he questions the timeliness of their effects in deterring high risk drinking as immediately as colleges and universities would hope.

Alcohol abuse has been the primary target of social norm approaches and is the main reason for alternative programming initiatives. This abuse has plagued campuses for years and shows no sign of slowing down (Wechsler, 2001). Within the last decade, many student affairs professionals believe that proactive programming approaches are most effective in reducing this abuse and creating community (Maney, Caldwell, & Mortensen, 2001). O’Neill (2000) echoes these sentiments, “The social norm approach assumes that much of behavior is influenced by how other members of social groups behave, and that the beliefs about what others do are often overestimated” (p. 97). The desired results of changing the social culture and promoting peer interaction are the key components of any social norm campaign (Berkowitz, 2002).

Alternative programming initiatives are defined as “activities that are free of alcohol, tobacco, and illicit drugs and for which participation is voluntary” (Center for Substance Abuse Prevention, 2001, p. 4). Typically, these activities are held at late night hours and on weekends when there is a greater threat of high risk drinking for
Alternative programming initiatives are designed to decrease the negative effects of drinking, increase student awareness of the problems associated with alcohol use, and provide alternatives to alcohol abuse (Riordan & Dana, 1998, p. 51). By placing students in an environment where misperceptions about alcohol use can be corrected, student affairs professionals attempt to alter behavior through positive examples of alcohol use and meaningful social interaction. Since alternative programming initiatives have only recently become a popular approach to combating alcohol abuse on college campuses, many student affairs administrators have begun to discover obstacles that must be overcome in order for these activities to truly discourage unhealthy behavior (Berkowitz, 2002). For example, Pierce (2000) identified five challenges for changing an alcohol-reliant culture:

- Some students equate alcohol with their rite of passage into adulthood and see it as a personal right, even if they are underage;
- Some students turn to alcohol as a social lubricant, leading such groups as athletes and fraternity members to drink excessively because their peers do;
- Students believe that other students drink more than they do and so in turn drink more than they might otherwise;
- Advertising and alcohol promotions at bars and clubs promote drinking; and
- On many campuses, grade inflation, diminished faculty expectations, Fridays without classes and few early morning classes enable students to drink with impunity. (p. 2)

Opportunities to socially interact help distract students from becoming part of an alcohol-reliant culture. Therefore, alternative programming initiatives may be instrumental in offering students other avenues of social interaction outside of drinking establishments and student initiated parties, where a lot of irresponsible drinking occurs (Wechsler, 2001). Student affairs professionals are challenged to actively participate in changing social norms and establishing programs that will curtail high-risk drinking, thus assisting in altering the campus culture (Berkowitz, 1997).

**Changing Social Culture through Alternative Programming Initiatives**

*Alcohol as a Social Lubricant*
According to Wechsler (2001), “Two in three college presidents consider binge drinking a problem and are looking for ways to combat it” (p. 4). The Harvard University School of Public Health college alcohol study reports that the majority of students, 56%, are not binge drinkers. Students use alcohol to experiment with identity development and sexual relationships, to create a sense of belonging, and to cope with stress and inadequacy. Socially, they feel pressure from friends to partake in binge drinking in order to feel accepted or to manage insecurities (Zucker, Reider, Ellis, & Fitzgerald, 1997). As a result, norms are reevaluated to emphasize social interaction without alcohol as the primary agent of belongingness.

Since alcohol is used as a tool for students to belong, colleges and universities are making intentional decisions about the types of programs they design, and whether or not they will reach the intended audience. Karen Morse, President of Western Washington University (WWU), understands that peer interaction has to be tailored to reach three different populations of students. She identifies the first group as those individuals who do not drink; therefore, substance-free housing and activities are implemented to normalize their behavior and build on social interaction (Potts, 2000). The second group is high-risk drinkers or those individuals who consume to excess on numerous nights of the week, with or without other individuals. Intervention programs, such as Alcoholics Anonymous (AA), are developed to reduce this type of high-risk drinking and are usually outside the scope of the college or university. Morse categorizes the final group of students as moderate drinkers, or individuals who drink socially with friends at bars or parties, sometimes to excess. These are the students targeted by WWU because alternative programming initiatives would have the greatest effect on peer relationships and their attitude toward alcohol since they are still forming opinions about its use in social situations. Morse believes that students are confused about the amount of alcohol their peers consume. Consequently, they view getting drunk on weekends or even during the week as an accepted part of collegiate life. By offering alternative programs, WWU is shaping social culture before it has a chance to turn moderate drinkers into alcohol abusers.

Since the implementation of a social norms approach at WWU, student perceptions of peers drinking once a week or more dropped from 89% to 49%. In this three-year period from 1995 to 1997, high-risk drinking also dropped from 34% to 27%. Morse (Potts, 2000) states, “This approach has really moved our moderate drinkers to be more responsible in their consumption of alcohol” (p. 1). Morse understands that you cannot tell students not to drink, yet you can help them make educated decisions about alcohol consumption by establishing social norms and clarifying misconceptions about peer use.

Social Norm Theory as a Combatant to Alcohol Abuse

Additional research related to alcohol abuse and possible prevention programs would offer a better understanding of social norm theory and the potential for alternative programming initiatives to influence student culture. Astin (1993) supports this argument by stating that “...students tend to change their values, behavior, and academic plans in the direction of the dominant orientation of their peer group” (p. 8). Astin also feels the values or attitudes of peer groups are of greater influence than...
individual characteristics like ability, race, or religious orientation. These findings are critical because they provide a basic understanding of pressures that students are facing to consume alcohol.

Berkowitz and Perkins (1986) agree and have expanded on Astin’s theory in their development of a social norm theory. In regard to alcohol, the social norm theory states, “College students greatly over-perceive alcohol use among their peers and are influenced, both positive and negative, by these individuals” (Feldman & Kromm, 2001, p. 5). Essentially, students regularly overestimate their peers’ support of drinking behaviors and how much those individuals actually drink. Since there is no context for students to base their opinions on, they assume that an observed behavior is the correct one, explaining the values or moral disposition of the group.

Using Social Norms Approach to Change the Social Ecology

The establishment of a social norm approach is difficult because it requires that student affairs professionals have an understanding of their students and are able to influence them in a productive and positive manner. Students may overestimate the importance of peer attitudes related to alcohol; however, they may also underestimate healthy behaviors displayed by the same group of friends. Essentially, social norm theory suggests that these overestimations will increase bad behavior and underestimations will decrease the prevalence of healthy decisions (Berkowitz, 2001).

Social ecology is closely related to peer interaction because it is based on the assumption that in addition to individual influence on one’s beliefs and actions, this culture is also changed through large social movements (Hansen, 2001). Social ecology, or culture, is defined as “persistent patterns of norms, values, practices, beliefs, and assumptions that shape the behavior of individuals and groups in a college or university” (Kuh & Whitt, 1988, p. iv). Kuh and Whitt go on to state that these patterns provide a framework to interpret meanings of on and off campus events. These on and off campus events can be interpreted as social interaction opportunities involving alcohol. In other words, a culture of high-risk drinking is encouraged by variables like “…traditions, rituals, inter-personal relationships, group value systems, and social norms” on a college campus (Hansen, 2001, p. 2).

Students should have the ability to decipher the difference between peer groups that are unhealthy and those that are influential to their own personal development as individuals. William D. Novelli, a marketing veteran, stated:

It’s not enough to change individuals. You have to change the social environment. If we want to convince people to reduce the amount of calories they take in through fat, it’s not enough to focus only on the individual’s behavior. We have to change the social environment, so that when people go to a supermarket or a restaurant, there are low-fat choices and it is seen as normal behavior. (as cited in Zimmerman, 2001, p. 8)

The social norm approach provides theory and research designed to alter the social environment and peer influences. Alternative programming is one subset of the
social norm approach, whereby students are able to interact in a safe environment without alcohol. When this is accomplished, misperceptions concerning alcohol will be altered and students will begin to change the social culture because they no longer view the consumption of alcohol as critical to fitting in with peers (Berkowitz, 1997).

Limitations to Using Social Norm Theory to Combat Alcohol Abuse

Richard Keeling (2000), editor of the *Journal of American College Health*, is concerned that social norm strategies are ineffective for high-risk drinkers. He feels as if this approach is entirely too hopeful and that “changing behavior for students whose drinking causes no problems for themselves or others, is not necessary, or, at least, not a priority” (p. 55). Keeling stresses that social norm campaigns promote conformity and are not changing the way high-risk drinkers view their own peer groups of college students. Conformity, he believes, is not intellectual and goes against the missions of higher education and student development theory. Rather, Keeling would like to see some form of the social norm approach where students are given alternatives, such as late night or weekend programs, or shown responsible drinking.

Hansen (2001) agrees with Keeling and adds that campus-sponsored events, such as alternative programming initiatives are excellent avenues for students to be influenced by their peers. It provides students with the opportunity to socialize and set norms, either through casual conversation or storytelling. Of course, these passed rituals could become overused and ineffective if student affairs professionals do not exercise caution and establish policies governing student behavior.

Current Alternative Program Initiatives Using Social Norming

*West Virginia University: WVUp All Night*

Alternative programming initiatives are a unique approach to establishing social norms and redefining a social culture on many college campuses (Sirk, 1999). One example of productive alternative programming comes from West Virginia University (WVU). Since 1997, WVU has produced WVUp All Night, a late night program designed to combat alcohol abuse among students. It has six primary objectives:

- Offer weekend entertainment (mostly free) for students that provides an attractive alternative to nightclubs and house parties;
- Provide a place to gather with other students and build a sense of community;
- Provide a safe, more enjoyable campus environment for students to live, work, and study;
- Provide a seven-day-a-week service to students;
- Create a “cool” recreational atmosphere that does not rely on alcohol as the main draw; and
Sirk (1999) states that the Princeton Review had long recognized WVU as a party school. Since the development of WVUp All Night, hospital and public safety incidents have been reduced, and WVU has been able to downplay this discouraging image. Programs are drawing up to two to four thousand students a night, and the amount of beer sold is down in both the pub and game room areas. “Up All Night is not a completely dry activity. Students of legal drinking age are allowed to buy beer, but the number of drinks must be capped,” remarks Dr. Kenneth Gray, Vice President for Student Affairs at WVU (Sirk, p. 23). Overall, the program has created an environment where students feel less pressure to abuse alcohol. Instead, they are allowed to interact socially in a positive environment.

Financially, Dr. Gray states that funding for WVUp All Night came from “eliminating duplicate and inefficient programs, and establishing new priorities that continue to put students first” (Lofstead, 1998, p. 1). Parents and community members have proven to be advocates of the program. Letters of encouragement have flooded the Vice President for Student Affairs office, and WVUp All Night was recently highlighted on ABC’s Good Morning America because of its efforts to provide alternative programming initiatives to students, thus reducing abusive alcohol consumption.

Pennsylvania State University: Late Night Penn State

Pennsylvania State University (PSU) has implemented a similar program called Late Night Penn State (LNPS). “The program offers students multiple forms of free entertainment as a means of curbing high-risk drinking and building meaningful relationships outside the context of alcohol” (Maney, Caldwell, & Mortensen, 2001, p. 2). After conducting a survey of 415 volunteers in 1999, student affairs officers were pleased with some of the LNPS results:

- Approximately two-thirds (65.4%) of on-site respondents believe that LNPS results in less drinking among peers;
- Over half (51.7%) of on-site respondents believe that LNPS results in less drinking among themselves; and
- Nearly all (85.4%) of on-site respondents agreed or strongly agreed that LNPS programs were good examples of having fun without alcohol. (Maney, Caldwell, & Mortensen, 2001, p. 7)

Essentially, LNPS provides alcohol-free alternatives aimed at changing social drinking norms and fostering identity with peer groups. In 1998, 1,150 students participated in a survey conducted in an Introduction to Psychology class, revealing promising trends of alcohol consumption at PSU:

- Nearly half (44.9%) of the in-class respondents believed that LNPS programs result in less drinking among peer attendees;
Almost two-thirds (63.3%) said that they agreed or strongly agreed that LNPS is a good example of having fun without alcohol use; An equal number said they had three to four drinks (22.2%) or five to six drinks (22.5%) when partying; The overwhelming majority did not drink either prior to LNPS (86.6%) or following LNPS (81.9%); and A nearly equal proportion of respondents said they consumed zero drinks per week (28.5%), as did those who consumed one to five drinks per week (28%). (Maney, Caldwell, & Mortensen, 2001, p. 8)

LNPS is designed to provide an alcohol-free environment with opportunities for students “to gain experiences in programming, leadership development, and responsible social interaction” (Maney, Caldwell, & Mortensen, 2001, p. 2). Since 1999, the program has been successful in changing students’ attitudes about alcohol consumption while creating an atmosphere that encourages civility.

PSU had 24,000 students attend alternative program opportunities in the 1999-2000 academic year (Wilson, 2000). This has prompted the University to renovate existing venues in the student union and cultural center, and increase funding of the LNPS program. The renovations allow for more programs like ballroom dancing, free movies, and creative crafts, some of the most popular programs. According to Harlow, director of LPNS “Painting, stained glass, flowerpots, and coffee mugs accompanied by a background of jazz music draws a diverse crowd of men and women from freshmen to graduate students” (Wilson, p. 2).

University of Maryland at College Park: Weekends at Maryland

The University of Maryland at College Park (UMCP) has a different approach to their alternative programming. The Weekends at Maryland (WAM) program was implemented to make information about weekend programs readily available, thus maximizing students’ choices for on-campus options (Duhaime, 2000) and dispelling the myth that the University was a commuter campus. In the 1999-2000 academic year alone, WAM had 88,894 students attend programs, which was an average of 3,163 students per weekend (Duhaime, p. l). In fact, the annual percentage of students who said they did not stay for weekends at UMCP because they disliked it dropped from 3% to 1% (Duhaime, p. 3).

A recent survey of 490 UMCP students showed interesting results about the campus and perceptions of WAM:

29% of commuter students listed social activities as the reason they come back to campus, with an additional 29% stating special events as the reason; 33% of resident students leave campus because of sightseeing opportunities, shopping, recreation, entertainment, etc.; When asked what students like to do on campus on a weekend, 56% stated they like to attend events, whether it is all-nighters or student organization events; and
When asked why they do not attend WAM events, 51% stated their friends were not interested in going and they did not want to go alone, while 38% said they did not know where the program was or how to register. (Duhaime, 2000, p. 7)

UMCP has used this information to modify their program, enabling them to offer bus excursions, provide free food, and alter marketing to reach more on and off campus students. UMCP has now started to offer consistent programming on Friday afternoons and focused on continuous updates of their website.

*Other University Alternative Programming Initiatives*

Indiana University (IU) and Ohio State University (OSU) have modeled their programs after the ones at PSU and WVU because of the recent successes (Shindell, Guthier, & Gerritsen, 1999; Ohio State University, 2001). In 2001, the Ohio College Initiative to Reduce High Risk Drinking reports that 79% of the colleges and universities are promoting non-alcoholic events or alternatives to offset weekday party nights and weekends in Ohio (Ryan). While alternative programming has not gained national prominence, student newspaper articles at prominent institutions like the University of Wisconsin, the University of Michigan, the University of Georgia, the University of Arkansas, and the University of Virginia have voiced their support for this initiative. Overwhelmingly, the newspapers advocate for programs that will provide choices to students and offer safe havens for social interaction (Kennedy, 2001; Sober Alternative, 2000; Basinger, 2001; Marberry, 2001; Edwards & Sheperd, 1998).

**Conclusion**

Alternative program initiatives are late night or weekend activities that support the absence of or downplay the use of alcohol, build community, or enhance student involvement. Alternative programming initiatives are linked to popular social norm approaches battling high risk drinking at institutions of higher education. A connection exists because a college or university must change both the perceptions of high risk drinking and impact students' social culture options.

Since the social norm approach involves understanding the high level of peer influence, providing alternative events allows peers to interact in a social environment where high risk drinking is eliminated or reduced and changes are made to the campus culture (Berkowitz & Perkins, 1986). While it does not appear conclusive that alternative programs reach the population of high-risk drinkers, it does appear that social culture can be adjusted to make alcohol-free or alcohol-reduced events more acceptable.

This significant research conducted on high-risk drinking, social norms and social cultures, and alternative programming initiatives. It provides a basis for understanding the use of alternative programming initiatives and the need for additional research and assessment. Finally, it links all of the information in a way that illustrates current alternative programming initiatives as a social norm approach to battle high-risk drinking.
This research did not intend to determine whether alternative programming initiatives will continue to be effective; rather, it proposes questions and arguments for both sides as to whether or not it is a worthy venture for college or university campuses at the present time. The effectiveness of alternative programming initiatives will have to be assessed in the future as institutions of higher education are continually asked to determine whether it is socially and financially feasible to pursue or continue such endeavors.
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The Effects of Work on Students' Academic Persistence and Overall Collegiate Experiences

Haley N. Richards

Working full-time, particularly working full-time off-campus, impacts students' academic success and overall college experience in several ways. Jobs demanding more than 25 hours a week impede students' academic persistence and degree attainment, decrease opportunities for interaction between students and faculty, and hinder students' involvement in co-curricular and extra-curricular activities. Consequently, colleges and universities must make adjustments in student services to counteract these negative implications. Recommendations are offered to student affairs professionals to assist students regarding higher education decision-making.

Investing in a college education and earning a college degree significantly increases an individual’s earning potential and career opportunities in his or her lifetime (King & Bannon, 2002). Despite the increasing importance for higher education, it is becoming increasingly difficult for students to finance their post-secondary education (King & Bannon). Due to budget shortfalls at the state and federal level, the trends across the nation reflect rising tuition costs at public and private institutions. In the past, the federal government subsidized costs for a large percentage of college students through federal need-based aid programs. However, based upon estimations calculated in relation to average tuition and fee costs paid by students to attend public four-year institutions, the amount of federal money received by students has dropped nearly one-third in the last twenty years (King & Bannon).

When dependent students apply for financial aid the family’s finances are evaluated. Once the students’ dependence status is determined, then the expected family contribution (EFC), grants, loans, and other forms of financial aid are provisionally applied to the selected institution’s costs of attendance (King, 2002). Frequently, a discrepancy exists between the amount of federal aid awarded and the cost for students to attend their institution of choice (King). Unmet need consists of the EFC, grants, loans, and other assistance deducted from the calculated student budget of tuition, fees, housing, insurance, and books (King). A 2002 report found that the amount of unmet need for all entering freshmen averaged more than $3,000 (King). The situation worsens for low-income students, as their EFC’s are more than three times lower than that of middle- and upper-income students (King).

Due to the large amounts of money required to finance their college education, increasing numbers of students choose to work while they pursue their undergraduate degrees. Students have the option to apply for financial aid, work while enrolled in school, attend school part-time, live at home, and take out loans to pay for their education. Sixty-seven percent of students entering college in 1995 worked while enrolled in school, making work the second most popular choice behind applying for financial aid as an option for financing education (King, 2002). While students work to pay for their tuition expenses, books, or monthly rent, they...
must also budget money spent for food, entertainment, and travel (Beeson & Wessel, 2002). Depending on a student's lifestyle, the need for discretionary funds varies from student to student.

According to most financial aid sources, full-time work constitutes working more than 25 hours per week. According to the 1997 United States Census Bureau report, 72% of all full-time, post-secondary students worked while attending school, and almost half of those students worked full-time while taking classes (Boggess & Ryan, 2002). As a result, retention rates and a lack of student involvement have emerged as issues facing colleges and universities today.

King & Bannon (2002) estimate that full-time students working 25 hours per week outside of the classroom spend between 60 and 80 hours per week participating in either work-related or class-related activities. This commitment leaves little time to obtain academic assistance, interact with faculty members, participate in extracurricular activities, and develop peer relationships. Consequently, students who work full-time jobs, and especially those who work full-time off-campus, have a lower rate of degree attainment and a decreased feeling of connection to the college or university than students who work part-time or not at all (King, 2002).

It is important to explore the rising trends based on the studies representing the detrimental effects of full-time work on the academic success of college students. Students working full-time while attending classes full-time face negative ramifications regarding their academic persistence and success, and the effects become more extreme within different racial and ethnic groups. Student-faculty interactions and organizational participation also decrease among full-time working students. Colleges and universities across the country are attempting to counteract the negative implications of work on students' collegiate experience through various interventions, which aim to impact students' financial decisions and allow them to succeed in college.

**Description of the Trend**

Working students may claim that holding a job helps them gain professional experience and make connections in their professional field. However, for most students, working has a negative effect on their grades and overall academic experience. In a study measuring the effects of employment on grades among full-time students who work and the number of hours worked per week, results showed that the more hours students work, the greater the detriment to their grades (King & Bannon, 2002). King and Bannon reported that 42% of students working 25 or more hours per week admitted that working had a negative impact on their grades. Only 22% of the students who worked less than 25 hours per week reported similar academic struggles (King & Bannon). If students work less than 15 hours a week, then working has fewer negative effects on academic progress, and it often improves grades (King & Bannon).

The number of hours students' work affects their academic success and their persistence in pursuing a degree. Successful college graduates began their undergraduate degree at four-year institutions, studied full-time, lived on campus,
and worked part-time (King, 2002). Despite what students believe they can handle, they simply cannot devote 25 or more hours a week to a job without sacrificing some time and commitment to their academic responsibilities. Many students who choose to work long hours rather than taking out large student loans begin their academic careers with the intent to enroll in classes full-time (King). Nonetheless, the non-academic demands in their lives eventually take precedence. In most cases, these students end up reducing their classes to part-time in order to accommodate their heavy work schedules (King).

Not all students have the same dependence on work to finance their education. Many of today's students of color who come from a lower socioeconomic status are first-generation college students with an even greater need to work (Elling & Furr, 2002). However, while first-generation college students may have a greater need for financial assistance, research indicates that students from diverse racial and ethnic backgrounds are more likely to receive greater sums of financial aid than White, middle- and upper-class students (King, 1999). Therefore, first generation students of color frequently do not have to work as many hours while attending school (King).

As reflected in a study conducted by the American Council on Education, the number of students working full-time or more than 35 hours per week was broken down as follows: 39% African American, 38% Hispanic, 33% White, 20% Native American, and 17% Asian American, (King, 1999). Working patterns among African American, Hispanic, and White students strongly resemble each other; however, fewer White students chose to work full-time. Asian American and American Indian students were both less likely to work full-time. Asian American students often chose to forgo work in order to dedicate more time to studies (Kim, 2001). In contrast, many Native American students attended tribal colleges in economically depressed areas with few job opportunities (Horse, 2001). When communities that support tribal colleges experience economic growth more Native American students will have the opportunity to find employment (King, 1999). Across all racial and ethnic groups, 80% of the students studied worked, and one-third of the participants worked full-time (King).

Without discounting the importance of academic persistence and the impact of race, ethnicity, or socioeconomic status, other factors, such as students’ involvement on campus, can contribute to students’ success. In 1993, Astin longitudinally tracked the factors influencing the collegiate experience on a large sample of undergraduate students. The results "showed a strong support of the importance of involvement as a powerful means of enhancing almost all aspects of the undergraduate student’s cognitive and affective development" (Astin, 1996, p. 126). Astin defined involvement as a behavioral component of investing physical and psychological energy in various objects (Astin, 1999). Astin identified three important factors in creating a positive collegiate experience: academic involvement, relationships with faculty members, and participation in student peer group activities (Astin).

Faculty interactions contribute significantly to increasing students’ academic success and overall college experience, and the number of hours students work can impact, positively or negatively, opportunities for interaction. Elling and Furr (2002) found
that 70% of students persisting in college attribute a student-faculty relationship throughout their undergraduate career as a significant part of their experience. Students working less than 15 hours a week, or not at all, participated more in class and had the best student-faculty relationships. These students had more time to complete assignments, ask questions about coursework, discuss career plans, and obtain advice in planning their academic schedules with faculty members and advisors (Elling & Furr). Students working off campus had difficulty scheduling meeting times with faculty members, thus decreasing their opportunities for interaction.

Working long hours not only affects opportunities for student-faculty relationships, it also detracts from involvement with peer groups, which strongly contributes to academic and developmental progress. Time allocation, specific learning experiences, courses taken, and pedagogical experiences equally influence the extent of students involvement in extra- and co-curricular activities (Astin, 1993). Elling & Furr (2002) found a direct correlation between the number of hours worked by students at off-campus job sites and the number of student organizations in which the students participated. Thirty-three percent of students working less than 20 hours a week belong to more than one organization on campus, as opposed to 17% of students who worked off campus full-time (Elling & Furr). Student who work off-campus, full-time, participate less in extra-curricular activities, and 67% of students who worked full-time were not involved in extra-curricular activities of any kind (Elling & Furr). Working off campus full-time not only compromises students' academic career, it also compromises their availability to participate in campus activities or community service.

Not all work proves to be detrimental to students' academic persistence and success. On-campus jobs frequently have positive effects on students' grades and persistence for several reasons. Students working on campus frequently work for their academic department. This allows more opportunities for student-faculty interactions and student involvement opportunities (Elling & Furr, 2002). Pam Sampson, Assistant Director for Student Involvement at Colorado State University, states, "Students working on campus are expected by their supervisors to be students first and workers second, rather than the other way around. There is a much higher priority on education in on-campus work environments" (personal communication, September 12, 2003). Working on campus is not only very convenient for students, but it also generates a feeling of belonging, which is very important in the students' connection to the university for retention purposes. Astin (1993) states, "Apparently, this greater degree of immersion in the collegiate environment and culture more than compensates, in terms of student outcomes, for the time students must devote to a part-time job on campus. Similar trade-offs are simply not available to the student whose part-time job is located off-campus" (p. 389). Off-campus internships, like on-campus work, also positively impact students' involvement and academic persistence. Students who serve as interns while obtaining academic credit report feeling more confident and hopeful about their future career prospects, and they may seek more one-on-one faculty interaction due to their work experiences (Wonacott, 2002).
Prescriptions

In response to the changing financial needs of students entering college today, institutions of higher education have made adjustments within recent years to address the issue of helping students balance academics and work. Following Astin's *Involvement in Learning* study conducted in 1984, an explosion of classes such as "Freshman 101" have been incorporated into institutions' curriculum in an attempt to bridge student affairs and academic affairs (Astin, 1996). Many of these courses, required for all entering first-year students, emphasize basic educational, social, psychological, financial, and physiological needs of college students. Time and stress management, drug and alcohol abuse, effective study habits, depression and anxiety, and money management might be topics included in these types of courses (Astin). Institutions are introducing more teaching modules and learning communities as method of creating a supportive community and peer connections early in the student's collegiate experience (Astin).

Recommendations

The federal government's policies and decisions weigh heavily on the problem of students working long hours to finance their education. Rising tuition costs have outpaced the availability of federal financial aid, forcing many students to work a number of hours, which may impact their education (King & Bannon, 2002). Lawmakers should strive to increase the need-based grant aid to make a college education more affordable for students and their families. Student affairs professions can support and advocate for students' financial interests by engaging in lobbying efforts at the state and federal government levels. The more grants and scholarships students receive, the fewer hours they have to work to make up for the unmet need, thus positively impacting academics and overall college experience. King (1999) stated the following:

> Academic success and degree completion are goals that students and institutions of higher education share. Working together, we must find a way to encourage students to work less and to study more, even if it means increased reliance on student loans. (King, 1999, p. 56)

From an institutional perspective, student affairs professionals can embrace several additional tactics to positively impact students' collegiate experiences. More time and attention must be given to teaching students about making wise decisions about financing options, academic success, and involvement. During visitation days or pre-registration information should be distributed to students and their parents about the strong correlation between academic success and living in the residence halls. Elling and Furr (2002) found that 91% of students working full-time live off campus, while 59% of students living on campus do not work at all. Living close to campus resources and interacting with peers in a living-learning environment can significantly impact students' academic success and overall collegiate experience.

Student affairs professionals should also note that students have less time for participation in extra-curricular activities the longer they attend the university due to more strenuous academic demands. Therefore, institutions need to do a better job of
front loading, or designing campus activities and services for first-year students to involve them from the beginning, rather than waiting until they are upper-class students (Elling & Furr, 2002; Astin, 1996). In addition, student affairs professionals who support extra-curricular activities need to market organizational involvement to students as something that can benefit them in their career pursuits, rather than providing them with social opportunities. Students today are hesitant to join an organization, and because they "evaluate the benefits of membership critically" (P. Sampson, personal communication, September 12, 2003). Campus clubs and organizations often become less of a priority to working students unless the club or organization can provide benefits or marketable skills. Student affairs professionals can influence students to make campus involvement a priority and improve students’ academic success by helping students cultivate and obtain active relationships with on-campus personnel or organizations early in their academic careers.

Conclusion

As tuition costs increase and financial aid availability decreases, more students opt to work to finance their post-secondary education. Many students work more in order to earn extra spending money or to prevent future debt. The number of hours students work while attending college, and whether or not they choose to work on- or off-campus, directly affects their academic success and involvement on campus. The previous studies have revealed how students working full-time, or more than 25 hours per week, have a tendency to encounter trouble in the classroom and difficulty attaining a degree. Students who work full-time are less involved with faculty and participate less in extra-curricular activities. Students who work off campus face increased challenges with academics and overall campus involvements. In contrast, working part-time on campus increases students’ feelings of connection to the institution, and contributes to greater academic success and campus involvement.

Astin (1996) concluded that involvement enhances students’ overall development. After understanding how students’ financial choices affect their academic persistence and campus involvement, university faculty and administrators should take a more active role in educating students and their families about the detriments of working full-time to pay for college. Institutions of higher education can no longer afford to ignore students who work full-time to pay for their education. Working students’ needs must be addressed. These students need to be embraced by the campus community in order to further their development and give them a more meaningful collegiate experience.
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The Evolution of *In Loco Parentis*

Nick Sweeton Jeremy Davis

The doctrine of *in loco parentis* is often taught in history courses in student affairs master’s degree programs, which may lead student affairs practitioners to frame their thoughts and perspective of this doctrine in a historical context. The authors, however, believe that *in loco parentis* is not a relic of the past; it has a strong presence in modern day student affairs practice. This article will briefly examine the history of *in loco parentis* and explore its influence on American student affairs practice. Recent legal decisions and as current policy at institutions of higher education will be analyzed. The article will conclude with recommendations on how institutions of higher education can respond to the recent shift in public perception and institutional policy that seems to support the doctrine of *in loco parentis*.

The Latin phrase *in loco parentis* translates as “in the place of a parent”. When viewed in a student affairs context, this concept is understood to mean that the university stands in place of the parent or guardian (Nuss, 1996). Debate may rage about the degree of parental involvement in university affairs, however *in loco parentis* has historically been an element of student affairs practice.

The roots of *in loco parentis* lie deeper than the American educational system. The newly created American universities intentionally modeled themselves after institutions such as Oxford and Cambridge. At the time, these English institutions were revolutionary for combining residential and learning environments (Edwards & Sweeton, 2000). Residential dormitories implemented strict supervision by faculty to ensure the general well being of their students. This focus on academics and character development was imitated in the newly formed American universities establishing the foundations for *in loco parentis* (Nuss, 1996).

*In loco parentis* officially entered the student affairs lexicon during the 1960s when turbulent social changes caused a shift in policy (Pollet, 2002). Students, often the catalyst for change, became engulfed in social movements for civil rights and liberties. Their progressive outlook occurred on both national and institutional levels, and questions were raised about the validity of *in loco parentis*. Legal and political methods were used to induce shifts in university policy. This shift was marked by changes in the relationship between the institution and the student. Many institutions began appointing students to influential committees and governing boards (Nuss, 1996). Additionally, this is the era where student government bodies gained prominence. The role of student affairs professionals, once consisting of discipline and authority, now focused on education and coordination of campus life (Nuss, 1996).

*In loco parentis* was further modified in 1972 when 18-year-olds obtained suffrage (Pollet, 2002). The nascent empowerment of students resulted in even more autonomy and, consequently, altered the college landscape. Vibrant student activism
reached new levels during this period, epitomized by involvement in anti-war movements and the struggle for civil rights for minorities and women. Numerous clubs and campus organizations sprouted during this time that reflected desire for independence in personal and public matters.

Many historical perspectives label these modifications during the 1960s and 1970s as the downfall of *in loco parentis* (Nuss, 1996). While the concept dramatically changed, this perception of demise is untrue. Today's college students and their parents have explicit expectations of what role the university should play, which illustrates the fluid nature of *in loco parentis*. *In loco parentis* is not the trademark of a defunct era; it is an evolving notion. For many generations of college students, this notion has, in one degree or another, been a factor of their college experience.

**Factoring in the Millennials**

As components of society develop, they augment the roles of students, parents, and the nature of student affairs. The examples exhibited in the 1960s and early 1970s illustrate how societal climate can impact *in loco parentis*. Political movements, legal decisions, and demographic characteristics have also contributed to the development of the concept. Millennials, the current generation to enter college, are profoundly impacting student affairs and *in loco parentis* (Howe & Strauss, 2003).

According to Howe and Strauss (2003), the millennial generation is characterized as closely tied to their parents, positive and progressive in thought, team-orientated and community-focused, and consistent of a secure and regulated environment. The demographic direction of this generation will undoubtedly influence *in loco parentis*. With stronger parent-child relationships, it is reasonable to conclude that parental participation in a student's university experience will increase. The previously autonomous lifestyle of the average student may transition into a partnership. Furthermore, the expectations for a secure and regulated environment may heighten parental concerns and involvement.

Involvement of parents reaches a critical point when the offspring ventures to college. Previous generations, such as Baby Boomers and Generation X, were less affected by this transition (Howe & Strauss, 2000). Often labeled as neglected or independent, these generations were able to thrive in a less structured environment. The transition for Millennials is not as smooth. Millennial parents, often branded as sheltering, are grappling with ways to remain actively involved in the life of their children (Howe & Strauss, 2000).

**In Loco Parentis in the Legal and Political Arena**

A search of on-line databases produced hundreds of court cases in the last several years relating to the doctrine of *in loco parentis*. Indicative of a recent trend, these cases illustrate an alteration of parental expectations of the college environment. A well-known example of this trend is the case of Scott Krueger, a freshman at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) in the fall of 1997. Krueger was found unconscious in a room at his fraternity after a night of drinking and apparent hazing. The hazing incident allegedly involved members of the fraternity forcing Krueger to
consume excessive amounts of alcohol. When he was discovered, his blood alcohol level was 0.40. He later died at Massachusetts General Hospital. Shortly after his death, Krueger’s parents sued MIT, alleging that the institution’s inadequate alcohol and housing policies played a role in their son’s death (Healy, 2000). For several years after Krueger’s death, his parents fought against MIT over where the responsibility for Scott’s death lay (Sontag, 2002). In the fall of 2000, after extensive legal maneuvering and negative publicity, the president of MIT personally apologized to the Kruegers and the University paid a $6 million settlement, thereby ending the lawsuit (Healy, 2000). During his apology, President Charles M. Vest said to Krueger’s parents, “Despite your trust in MIT, things went terribly awry. At a very personal level, I feel that we at MIT failed you and Scott” (Healy, 2000, A1).

As a direct result of the Krueger case, MIT changed its housing and fraternity policies; beginning in the fall of 2002, MIT required all freshmen to live in an on-campus residence hall for the first time in its 137-year history (Russell, 2002). The institution also provided more intense training for its residence hall staff, and they now pay live-in advisors to monitor fraternity and sorority housing. In the authors’ opinion, the Krueger case is important because, it marked the beginning of a new era of in loco parentis on the college campus. In the Krueger case, the family sought to “…make the university – and by extension, higher education institutions nationwide – accountable for alcohol related deaths of students” (Healy, 2000, A1.).

Parents have not only sued for alcohol related deaths; they have also held universities responsible for student suicide. For example, MIT is currently involved in a lawsuit brought by parents of a student who burned herself to death in her residence hall room after receiving months of counseling from university counseling services (Campbell, 2002). Ferrum College recently settled a case out of court where it accepted partial responsibility for a student suicide (Hoover, 2003). A student, Michael Frentzel, had what were apparently self-inflicted scratches and bruises on his neck. A dean and counselor at Ferrum College had Frentzel sign a statement stating that he would not harm himself or anyone else, and then left him alone in his room. While alone in his room, Frentzel hung himself. As part of the settlement with Frentzel’s family, the college agreed to improve its counseling and support services (Hoover, 2003).

Regardless of which party prevailed, recent litigation clearly illustrates what parents of college students, and society-at-large, expect of institutions of higher education. Parents of today’s college students, “…have begun to fight for the right of control of their children. Parents demand to be fully informed of students’ grades, living situations, university policies, counseling received and whether their children have received any drug or alcohol violations” (Minnesota Daily, 2002, n.p.). Administrators have dubbed this phenomenon “helicopter parenting” because the parents are “always hovering” (Young, 2003, A37). Colleges and universities are realizing this trend and have begun marketing to both prospective students and their parents. The nature of the university-parent-student relationship is changing rapidly, and the parent role is clearly hands-on in terms of their expectations of the institution. Some institutions have even “…started parent orientation programs and [have] begun to engage mothers and fathers in a kind of co-parenting alongside the university” (Sontag, 2003, n.p.).
Recommendations and Conclusion

The doctrine of *in loco parentis* still has a strong influence on institutions of higher education. Parents of traditionally-aged college students maintain a strong influence on the lives of their children and seem to view the institution of higher education as a surrogate parent. Many parents are involved in nearly every aspect of their child’s college life, from course and housing selection to their child’s judicial record (Howe & Strauss, 2003). They have sued colleges and universities for choices their sons and daughters have made in regard to alcohol, drugs, and suicide. It seems clear that parents, and society at large, expect institutions of higher education to maintain what can be construed as a parental level of control over students. Colleges and universities are held to a high standard with regard to the extent of counseling and other services that are provided. Parents also seem to expect a high level of control over the amount of alcohol or illegal drug use present in student social gatherings.

Regardless of one’s opinion of the doctrine of *in loco parentis*, it is evident that, in one form or another, it is here to stay. As such, the authors recommend the following steps be taken to incorporate this idea into institutional policies and practice:

1. Develop a clear, cohesive, and comprehensive definition of the institution-student-parent relationship.

When formulating institutional or departmental policies and practices, define the level of involvement the institution will have in the student-parent relationship. For example, when a parent calls a housing department and asks for someone to have his or her child call them, how will the institution respond? Will university staff talk to the student, or tell the parent that it is not the institution’s role to get involved in the parent’s relationship with the student? How will the institution respond if a parent calls to complain about a grade, or a professor? It is important that the role of the institution in the institution-student-parent relationship be defined on an institutional level and then on a departmental level.

It is also important that this role is consistent across all campus units. Colleges and universities often send mixed messages to parents. Under the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), an institution of higher education can choose to contact a parent if their son or daughter is involved in an incident in which drugs, alcohol, or violence are present (Kaplan & Lee, 1997). That same institution, however, probably does not contact parents when their child develops a psychological problem or fails a class. This dichotomy is undoubtedly influenced by federal privacy laws which make most academic, health, and judicial records confidential, but parents are often not explicitly made aware of this fact. Colleges and universities should, therefore, educate parents on the limitations of the institution in the parent-child relationship.

The University of Puget Sound (UPS) in Tacoma, Washington, stands out as an institution that does an exemplary job in defining the institutional-parent relationship. Each year, UPS produces a *Parent Resource Guide* which unequivocally defines the role of the institution in its relationship with both students...
and parents. The opening paragraph of the Parent Resource Guide states, “The University of Puget Sound’s policy regarding disclosure of information...is based on the principle that students must take direct responsibility for their learning experience” (University of Puget Sound, 2003, p. 9). The Guide then goes on to state UPS’ policy on grade disclosure, medical records, and judicial records. After reading the Guide, parents and guardians know not to expect UPS to release academic or personal information about their son or daughter to them. It also lists resources and support networks available to parents, such as a parent listserv. In short, the Guide makes it clear to parents that UPS views parents as partners in the education of their children, but places clear parameters on the role that the institution will play in that partnership.

2. Develop a parent orientation program that addresses the role of the parents in the life of their college student.

Most institutions have both student and parent orientation programs, and some have a program that specifically addresses the role of the parents in their child’s time as a college student. This program might include portions on teaching parents how to let go of their child and allow the student to learn to become a full-fledged adult. It should also include a section that specifically details the institution’s role in their relationship with their child. Parents should be educated on aspects of the institution such as grading policy, the judicial system, and procedures for choosing housing. Their role in these aspects of the institution should also be explicitly stated. For example, if the institutional philosophy is such that it does not allow for parental involvement in the judicial process, parents should be specifically made aware of this.

3. Make sure that the language used in orientation and publications such as informational pamphlets and brochures matches the institutional philosophy on in loco parentis.

The extent to which a student is expected to control her or his own college experience should not be vague. For example, if the purpose of student staff in the residence halls is not to resolve every problem, but rather to teach residents how to take care of their own problems, make sure this is stated in all communication about on-campus housing. Parents should not be given the impression that the environment in the residence halls, in sororities and fraternities, or at college-related functions is completely controlled. Parents should know that resources are available to help students deal with problems, but that the ultimate choice on whether or not to utilize those resources is up to the student.

Conclusion

In conclusion, it is clear that in loco parentis is not a relic of the past, but rather a powerful force in the present. The research conducted by Howe and Strauss (2003) illustrates that parents of today’s traditionally-aged college student view themselves as equal partners in the education of their children. This places institutions of higher education in what can be an awkward position of trying to balance the expectations of parents, the boundaries of various federal privacy laws, and the institution’s own
philosophy of student development. It is critical that institutions of higher education understand the dynamic nature of the concept of *in loco parentis* and develop practices and policies to address it.
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