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Dear Readers:

Welcome to the first edition of Growth: The Journal of the Association for Christians in Student Development.

The purposes of this new journal are to:
• Promote scholarly activity within the field of Christian student affairs and amongst the members of ACSD.
• Provide a valuable scholarly resource to Christian student affairs practitioners.
• Promote the ideals of ACSD and Christian student affairs.

This issue is presented in three sections. The first is dedicated to the theme of "The State of Christian Student Affairs." In it are three applied research articles that address this theme and several responses to these articles. The second consists of two original research articles. One addresses the multicultural competence of resident assistants and the other concerns the effects of short-term missions trips on the faith development of college students. The third section is a collection of book reviews.

We are excited to be able to provide you with this collection of articles and reviews and want to thank all of those who submitted manuscripts for consideration. We also want to thank Norris Friesen and Ginny Carpenter for their work on the Editorial Board and LaTonya Taylor, our Chief Editorial Assistant. Without their very valuable assistance this publication would not have been possible.

We also want to encourage you to consider submitting manuscripts for the next issue of Growth, which will be published in the spring of 2002. We are particularly interested in receiving manuscripts presenting original or basic research and encourage anyone who has recently completed a graduate thesis or dissertation to submit an article from your work. The theme for the applied section for the next issue is "Building Community on The Christian College Campus." If you are interested in submitting a manuscript, please refer to the publication policies and submission guidelines found at the end of this edition or contact us and we will send you the pertinent information.

Thank you for your support for Growth: The Journal of the Association for Christians in Student Development. We trust that you will enjoy and be stretched by what you find in its pages.

Sincerely,

Skip Trudeau, Co-Editor
Tim Herrmann, Co-Editor
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The State of Christian Student Development

By Skip Trudeau, Ed.D., Ginny Carpenter, Norris Friesen, Ph.D., and Tim Hermann

Introduction

To provide a framework for the discussion of "The State of Christian Student Development," the editorial staff of *Growth: The Journal of the Association for Christians in Student Development* conducted an informal Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats (SWOT) analysis, presenting the results here as a means of beginning the discussion of where we are and where we are going as a profession. The analysis presented is meant to be generally applicable to Christian colleges and therefore may or may not be descriptive of specific campuses.

It seems appropriate to develop a working definition of Christian student development prior to presenting our SWOT analysis. The term “student development” by definition has come to embody three meanings. First, it describes the process and content of what students experience as they interact in various environmental settings during the college years. Secondly, it is used by many colleges to define the administrative area which focuses on the development of college students through policies, activities, and interpersonal relationships. Lastly, it is used to define the influences that help students to develop and integrate skills learned in the classroom and in the non-classroom environment. These skills include leadership, interpersonal skills and time management skills, to name a few. Christian student development therefore refers to how persons of faith and campuses pursuing specific Christian agendas address these concepts. In this context we present our SWOT analysis of Christian student development.
Student development has emerged as an integral aspect of the Christian college and university and has effectively played a major role in creating environments that emphasize the building of living and learning communities. The shift from a remedial, "student services" concept to an educational concept has helped student development programs to reassess its purpose and mission. In this process several strengths have emerged, namely, an emphasis on student-centeredness, the positive effect that student involvement has on learning, and values/character building that results from student engagement with society and culture.

Colleges and universities have placed major emphasis on student-centeredness. This has been influenced in part by the Total Quality Management (TQM) movement, but has been very evident in student development programs from the beginning. The 1987 National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA) Point of View Statement asserts that students are unique and bring valuable experiences to the campus milieu. These unique and different experiences add to the diversity of the campus and should be celebrated as well as challenged. That is, students should be encouraged to share personal and cultural experiences in a safe and accepting environment, yet these experiences should also be subjected to examination and reflection. In such a developmental process students must examine beliefs and values to determine ownership.

The assessment initiative has also influenced this notion of student-centeredness. Campuses today are very interested in student retention as well as in student satisfaction. Initiatives have been launched to encourage retention. Assessment tools such as the Student Satisfaction Inventory (Schreiner & Juillerat, 1993) and the College Student Experience Questionnaire (Pace, 1990) measure both student satisfaction and the importance of specific issues to college student populations. Focus groups are often used to determine the significance of the issues and how best to address them.

Educators acknowledge the importance of hands-on learning, and correspondingly, student development educators recognize the value that co-curricular involvement has on learning. Astin (1987) identifies co-curricular involvement as critical to personal development. Astin feels that students who invest a significant amount of time in an activity assume more responsibility for their growth and development. Obviously, too much involvement can lead to failure and too little involvement can result in a limited perspective with no or very little applied experience. Students who volunteer or become involved in organizations or athletics tend to be more satisfied. They tend to take more ownership for their own learning, and also tend to support institutional values. These students also learn important skills that translate into lifelong abilities.

A recent experience at a Christian college illustrates this point. The student senate president at this particular college invited his father, an investment banker, to visit a senate meeting. It was not a particularly exciting meeting, but a funding request was debated and a parking proposal was discussed. Students used appropriate parliamentary procedures to discuss the items on the agenda. After considerable debate, a
vote was taken, a decision was made to fund the request, and a parking resolution was passed. After the meeting, the student's father spoke with the adviser about the meeting expressing appreciation for his leadership. The father commented that this was one of the most enlightening events he had attended at his son's college. He went on to say that he wished every one of his executives could visit a student senate meeting like this. He was obviously impressed that his son, an economics/finance major, could apply what he learned in a meaningful co-curricular experience. The father's comments affirmed the educational value of this experience.

Student development, like other college departments, has been enhanced by technology. Students are more technologically experienced than ever before and come to campus expecting technological support to be provided. In response, our campuses have provided everything from laptop computers to extensive computer laboratories to computer connections in individual rooms. Student development educators have had the opportunity to be involved in discussions that challenge administrators and faculty alike to think about the positive and negative implications of technology. Examples of these discussions include the impact computer overuse or dependency has on community; pornography concerns; ethical use of copyrighted materials; academic dishonesty; and plagiarism. Technology adds much to the educational environment, yet we are all too aware that it can also be a detriment. When it is not carefully considered and thoughtfully applied, it can have a negative or debilitating impact on the environment.

Other technology issues include student use of cable television, videos, and telephones. All of these forms of technology heighten the student's experience, but each facet also provides concerns and must be carefully considered in light of institutional values. Student development has had the unique opportunity to help shape student responsibility and institutional response regarding these issues.

Another development is that student affairs educators have been given the opportunity to expand leadership and service learning programs. These programs are sometimes maintained as retention initiatives, but are also potentially meaningful vehicles for both supporting and challenging students. Leadership development programs are highly varied and may include activities ranging from extensive outdoor challenge/ropes courses to curricular offerings on leadership development. Career development, vocation and topics related to one's calling are often included in first year seminars and senior capstone courses. Some Christian colleges and universities have supported service learning by developing offices and providing personnel that focus specifically on service learning. While these programs may compete with other departments and initiatives for funding, they are funded because of the recognized potential they have to enhance the educational experience.

As enrollments have increased, campus facilities have been updated and expanded. Residence life is an area in which student development educators have had considerable influence. Specifically, on numerous campuses residence halls have been built to either accommodate increased enrollments or to replace outdated, inadequate residence halls. Student development professionals are working with architects and planning teams to develop facilities that heighten community and accentuate learning. Computer labs, computer connectivity, cable television, phone connections, lounges,
kitchens, recreation and study space have been included in many new residence halls specifically for the purpose of enhancing the student experience. In other words, student development educators have been able to reflect the research on community development in the construction of new residence halls.

Weaknesses

Despite the encouraging signs referenced, several areas within Christian student development can be considered limitations. These are not mentioned as an indictment against our efforts but rather as an attempt to begin to identify areas of anticipated future challenge. To be sure, some of our campuses are making significant strides in addressing these issues, but in general, these are areas where many of our programs struggle. Four areas have been identified as being particularly significant. These areas consist of the gap between academic affairs and student affairs; the lack of collaboration between student affairs and other functional areas; a lack of attention to multicultural issues; and the lack of assessment in student development.

There is little doubt that a gap exists between academic affairs and student affairs on many campuses, Christian colleges notwithstanding. This gap is evidenced in many ways such as "cultural" differences between faculty and student affairs staff, differences in educational preparation, values, goals, purposes and the longstanding separation between the curriculum and co-curriculum (Kuh, 1997; Schroeder, 1999; Whitt, 1996). This gap has been described as "a bifurcated existence where academic and student affairs have little in common" (Guthrie, 1997, p. 47). A frequent manifestation of this gap is the familiar faculty perception of student development professionals as focused on "hand-holding" and frivolous social programming. While there may be some merit to these criticisms, for instance, over-involvement in extra-curricular activity has been negatively associated with academic success (Pascerella, Terenzini, & Blimling, 1994), this perception clearly dismisses our cherished view of student development professionals as educators (Komives, 1999). Whether born of malice or ignorance, this perception is indicative of a general lack of understanding of the primary purposes of student development. Simply put, many academic faculty members do not view student affairs practitioners as contributors to the educational missions of our institutions. Christian student affairs personnel should recognize this and seek to understand why such views are so widely held and what can and should be done to change this view.

The second area of weakness, a lack of collaboration between student affairs and other functional areas across campus, may be closely related to the gap between student and academic affairs. However, this issue appears more complex. Even if the two groups disagree on the educational role of student affairs, this does not necessarily imply that the two cannot work collaboratively. It also does not speak to the lack of collaboration between student affairs and departments other than academic departments. The call for collaboration has been heard from several authors, both from higher education in general (Blimling & Whit, 1999; Kuh, Branch Douglas, Lund, & Ramin-Gyurnck, 1994; Schroeder, 1999a, 1999b; Student Learning Initiative, 1997), as
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well as from those writing specifically about Christian higher education (Guthrie, 1997; Painter & Loy, 1997). There have even been calls from within ACSD itself for the pursuit of collaborative efforts by student affairs practitioners at Christian colleges (Loy & Trudeau, 2000; Trudeau & Johnson, 1998). The espoused goal of such collaboration is usually the creation of a "seamless curriculum," where in-class and out-of-class experiences are both integrated into a total or "whole-person" education (SLI, 1997). Student affairs workers should be encouraged to focus on student learning or active learning (Blimling & Whitt, 1999; SLI, 1997). In Christian higher education "wisdom development" (Guthrie, 1997) has been offered as a working metaphor. Despite this call to arms, so to speak, it appears that many Christian student affairs programs have been unsuccessful in achieving a sense of collaboration with academic affairs and other areas within the academy. As stated earlier, this lack of collaboration is likely contributed to by the way faculty and others view student affairs. It is also likely that student affairs personnel may be focusing more on the student services they provide as opposed to the educational role they can and should fill. It is not clear whether this scarcity of collaboration is a product of the lack of appreciation for student affairs, an overemphasis on the part of student affairs on the service aspect of their function, or a combination of these and other factors. It is clear, however, that student affairs practitioners need to strongly consider how to create and maintain venues for collaboration with academic affairs and other areas (Schroeder, 1999). This may be even more critical in the Christian college setting where we seek not only to integrate the "in" and "out" of classroom learning experience but the integration of faith and learning as well.

The third area of weakness is the lack of diversity on Christian college campuses. While it may be comforting to acknowledge that this is not exclusively a student affairs concern, we cannot afford to ignore our role in addressing issues of diversity on our campuses. This is not a new issue but is one that requires renewed attention. While populations of minority groups such as Asians, African-Americans, Hispanics and Native Americans has risen dramatically in the United States in the last 15 years (Blimling & Whitt, 1999a; Pascerella & Terenzini, 1998), a number of race-related concerns still exists on college campuses. (Blimling & Whitt, 1999b; Hughes, 1994). The picture is much the same for Christian colleges. Though our student populations may reflect an increase in diversity and more services are provided specifically for these students, we still face needs for meaningful and effective programs related to multicultural awareness and appreciation, as well as racial reconciliation. While understanding and appreciation of cultural differences is an oft espoused goal within the entire realm of liberal education (Blimling & Whitt, 1999b; Hughes, 1994 ), it has special significance in Christian education. Student affairs personnel need to be intimately involved in the process of addressing diversity issues. One area of particular concern is the lack of professionals from underrepresented groups. A second area of concern is the lack of student leaders from the same groups. Student affairs personnel need to provide strong, effective leadership in this area.

A final fault relates to our efforts in the area of assessment. Simply stated, student affairs programs in general and Christian student affairs programs in particular
have been slow to engage in meaningful assessment activities. Higher education as a whole is under fire from a variety of internal and external sources (Baxter Magolda, Terenzini & Hutchings, 1999; Blimling, 1999; Blimling & Whitt, 1999). The criticism of higher education results from a combination of several factors including escalating costs, constrained revenue sources, and a general erosion of confidence in existing educational practices (Blimling, 1999; Blimling & Whitt, 1999; Upcraft, 1999). While the whole academy is under scrutiny, student affairs programs may be particularly vulnerable. Certainly we are accountable to the same external examination and internal criticism as our colleagues (Blimling, 1999; Blimling & Whitt, 1999). In response to the calls for accountability, higher education has turned to assessment as a viable means of measuring and documenting programmatic success (Blimling, 1999). Student affairs programs, including those in the Christian college sector, have not been significantly involved in this process. This is a situation that needs to change if we are to maintain and improve our roles within the academy.

**Opportunities**

Several areas of particular opportunity seem to be present at this time. Here again, some campuses may already be capitalizing on these opportunities while others may need to consider new initiatives to benefit from them. The opportunities identified are the current emphasis placed on whole person and character-enhancing education, the increasing level of professionalism within the ranks of Christian student development practitioners, and new opportunities to collaborate with academic affairs in the areas of assessment and student learning.

Much evidence seems to indicate that this is truly an unprecedented point in the history of Christian student affairs. While most of the institutions within the realm of Christian higher education have articulated longstanding commitments to "whole-person education," the substantive emphasis has never been greater. Student development is being placed at the philosophical heart of the educational endeavor. Many Christian college presidents expend more efforts extolling the virtues of the co-curricular enterprise than they do the traditional academic program. Closely related to the emphasis on the whole person is the call to envision higher education as a character-enhancing experience (King, 1997; Kuh, 1998). Christian colleges and universities are uniquely equipped to respond to this call to fashion higher learning in a such a way as to nurture the development of people who are not only intellectually superior but who are also morally superior. In other words, Christian colleges and universities are producing graduates who are both educationally and morally equipped to contribute significantly to their chosen vocational fields. One need only look at the recent attention afforded college student values to see that Christian institutions are extraordinarily well-positioned to provide leadership in this realm. Many Christian colleges and universities are being recognized as pioneers and guides in the realm of values education.

Another area of clear promise is found in the higher levels of professional training of Christian student development personnel. A cursory comparison of practitioners today to those of twenty-five years ago reveals a greatly enhanced level of train-
ing and career commitment. In the past, many Christian college and university personnel found their way into student development "by accident" and had little related experience, preparation or vision for the field. Currently, most of those coming into student affairs have intentionally chosen this as a career path and have sought educational and practical experiences which have helped to prepare them for their given responsibilities. This enhanced level of intentionality and preparation gives Christian student development professionals a much stronger platform from which to articulate their positions as educators; clearly, student affairs professionals are "educators whose classrooms are the residence halls, student government offices, small groups, cross-cultural settings, etc." If this is the case, there is both the opportunity and the responsibility to establish and proclaim the Christian student development curricula. It is our duty to explain exactly what it is Christian student development educators are attempting to teach in their "classrooms" and how it is known that students are learning what is intended.

Finally, even though the lack of collaboration between student affairs and academic affairs has been identified as a weakness, the need for collaboration presents itself as a unique opportunity for student development professionals. There are at least two areas in which collaboration between student and academic affairs seems to be desirable and attainable, namely assessment and student learning. First is the area of assessment. Because the area of student development strives to be "value added," a nebulous concept at best, virtually all institutions of higher education struggle with measuring and assessing what student development does. The opportunities have never been greater for collaboration between student affairs and academic affairs professionals (Blimling, 1999; Blimling & Whitt, 1999; Schroeder, 1999; Upcraft, 1999). There is rich opportunity for student affairs to provide leadership in navigating the difficult waters of institutional assessment. Assistance in measuring efforts and outcomes related to the development of critical academic, life, and citizenship skills will be welcomed.

A second prospect for mutual effort is the emphasis that many institutions are placing on student learning (Dalton, 1997; SLI, 1997). The shift in pedagogy from a more traditional lecture-based delivery system to a more student-centered approach has increased the need for expertise on how students learn. As student affairs professionals we can and should be guides to and sojourners with our brothers and sisters in the classrooms as we seek to better understand and better serve students. There is widespread acceptance of the truism that, "in order to teach we must first understand." The current emphasis on experiential and service learning opportunities is familiar territory to the student affairs professional. Student affairs has much to offer to this discussion and it seems that at greater levels than ever before student development professionals are being asked to assist and are being given the opportunity to co-labor. Again, the need and opportunity for this collaboration is even more vital on the Christian college campus as the integration of faith and learning is sought in and out of the classroom.

Threats
Four areas are identified as significant threats to Christian student development practice. They are an uneasy tension between *in loco parentis* and *en loco amicis* as a guiding metaphor for our work with students, an unhealthy emphasis on student service at the expense of implementing pertinent theory, the difficult nature of assessing student affairs work, and the "bottleneck" effect.

Willamon and Naylor (1995) chronicled the end of *in loco parentis* as the preeminent metaphor for describing the relationship of college to student and suggested in its place *in loco amicis*, where the college was to play the role of a wise friend or advisor. Student affairs practitioners are most likely more comfortable with latter as they tend to consider students as adults and active partners in whole-person education. This is especially true for those in the Christian sector. Indeed, one of the major transitions Christian student development personnel hope to see in their students is an examination of the faith assumptions handed down by parents and others in an integrative process that results in the development of their own beliefs and faith practices based on those beliefs. However, there is a definite tension between this process and the desire of significant constituents (parents, some students, faculty and staff) for student development staff to adopt a more *in loco parentis* approach. One reason that enrollments at Christian colleges has risen is that parents and some students want the protection and even the comfort of a small and nurturing environment (Winston, 2000). These same parents and students are often dismayed to find that one of Christian student development's major goals is to challenge them to move out of the very comfort zones they are seeking when they come to our campuses. The resulting tension is often manifested by the phone call from the-less-than-happy parent who questions the Christian integrity of the student development staff member for exposing their student to a controversial film or requiring their student to read a non-Christian book. This tension is a threat to whole-person education and student development must play a major role in mediating it.

The second threat is that many Christian student development staffs are forced, due to a lack of resources and other contributing factors, to overemphasize service to students at the expense of implementing good theory. Student development practitioners in general, and those in the Christian sector in particular, are prone to verbalize a reliance on emergent and pertinent theory while practice may not resemble the same theories (Guthrie et al. 1997 and Trudeau & Johnson, 1998). The problem isn't that there are no good theories, and it isn't that existing theories are misunderstood. Rather, it is that in light of restrained resources, many student development offices are forced to focus more on providing the basic services than on the more esoteric application of theory. There are no easy solutions to this dilemma, but it is an area that must be addressed. Christian student development personnel must continue to meet basic student needs while finding the resources to infuse student learning into day-to-day student development practice. Failure to do so will eliminate the possibility of full partnership in the educational enterprise.

The third area of threat lies in the difficult nature of assessing what it is that student development does. In many ways, the programs and services provided by stu-
Student development are difficult to measure because they are values-based. It is difficult to calculate whether a student, after four years on campus, merits a six or an eight in civility, or whether a student deserves an A, B, C, D or F in the integration of faith and learning. The temptation for already-overworked student affairs practitioners is to either refrain from assessment activities or to rely on outmoded, ineffective approaches that are unreliable and unhelpful. Data obtained from such efforts is unlikely to produce useful answers to the serious assessment questions being asked of all areas within higher education. The current literature provides a chilly forecast for those who fail to engage in meaningful assessment (Blimling, 1999 and Blimling & Whitt, 1999). Failure to properly assess student development practice will negatively impact the effectiveness of this practice within higher education and will seriously hamper the efforts of student development to influence the academy.

The final threat is the "bottleneck effect" within the student development profession. This refers to the fact that there are a limited number of opportunities for entry-level staff, such as resident directors, to advance into mid-level posts such as director, assistant, and associate dean positions. The bottleneck doesn't stop there. The squeeze is also felt by mid-level professionals desiring to move to senior-level spots. The bottom line is that the limited number of advancement opportunities is pushing many gifted persons out of the student development profession. To illustrate, a typical student affairs staff may have six hall directors (entry level), three mid-level administrators, and one senior-level administrator. What are the chances that one of the entry level staff persons will find his or her way to a mid-level post or to the senior level over his or her career? The odds become worse as the professional tries to move "up the ladder." Exacerbating this phenomenon in Christian higher education is that the entry-level position most common and plentiful, that of resident director, is one with a high turnover rate. This higher level of burnout, coupled with a typically longer-than-average tenure for mid-level professionals and satisfied senior level persons, results in the bottleneck. Bright, educated, experienced young professionals are exiting the field of student development prematurely. What will be the long-term effects that this bottleneck-induced attrition has within the student development profession?

Conclusion

By presenting this informal SWOT analysis, the editors of this journal hope to "prime the pump" for the more in-depth treatment of "The State of Christian Student Development" that is presented in the next two articles. We are cognizant that this analysis is far too general to be descriptive of any single campus. However, we are hopeful that it has raised some questions for consideration as the analyses provided by David Guthrie and Jay Barnes and the accompanying responses from several ACSD members are read. We offer encouragement to our readers to find points of agreement and divergence between what is presented and your own practices and experiences.


A Report Card for Christian College Student Affairs

By David S. Guthrie, Ph.D.

Introduction

I am deeply honored to be writing an essay for the inaugural issue of the ACSD Journal. Over the last two decades, I am convinced that the scope, expertise, and stature of Christian college student affairs has expanded and matured due, at least in part, to the efforts of the Association for Christians in Student Development. This new journal portends yet another ACSD-related initiative to support and encourage what is already underway, namely, helping Christian student affairs practitioners to understand and to enact their tasks in ways that honor Jesus Christ. To the extent that this essay and the responses to it (including the ones included in this issue) may further this cause, soli dei gloria.

In this essay, I attempt to evaluate what might be called "Christian college student affairs." While I affirm that Christians can, do, and should work in institutional settings that do not function with Christian mission statements, I focus this essay on the student affairs operations of Christian colleges. I do so for pragmatic reasons alone, not the least of which is that the vast majority of ACSD members are employees of Christian colleges. Thus, I thought it most instructive to address my comments to Christian student affairs professionals at Christian colleges.

With a term such as "report card" in the title, it may be reasonable to believe
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that I "pass out grades" in the pages that follow. I don't. I am certain that such an approach would be wrongheaded from the start, particularly since I have no data, I have no direct experience with the student affairs efforts of virtually every Christian college, and I have not held a position in student affairs for four years! Rather, I use the seven "Principles of Good Practice in Student Affairs" (1999) as possible "subjects" around which Christian college student affairs practitioners might pursue a thoughtful evaluation of their respective programs. Stated another way, in the same way that a fifth grader's report card might include subjects such as reading, mathematics, history, and the like, I submit the seven principles as the subjects for which "good" practice in student affairs -- including the student affairs practices of Christian colleges -- may be judged. Although I include my own brief, impressionistic remarks regarding the efforts of Christian college student affairs on each of the seven principles, I am most interested in urging Christian college student affairs programs to utilize the seven principles to conduct their own evaluative analyses.

Seven Principles of Good Practice in Student Affairs

The American College Personnel Association (ACPA) and the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA) appointed a study group almost five years ago for the purpose of developing a statement that would define the contours of effective student affairs programs. In March 1998, the study group's work entitled "Principles of Good Practice for Student Affairs" was adopted as a joint statement by ACPA and NASPA. One year later, the study group published a book -- Good Practice in Student Affairs (Blimling, Whitt, & Associates, 1999) -- that offered further explanation of each of the seven principles of good practice.

This essay highlights the seven principles of good practice in student affairs as they were discussed in this very insightful book. More specifically, I briefly discuss each principle below, followed by my own reflections regarding Christian college student affairs vis-à-vis each of the principles of good practice. As I stated earlier, my hope is that this essay will encourage Christian college student affairs personnel to evaluate their respective programs based on appropriate interpretations of the seven principles of good practice. As such, the seven principles function as the "subjects" for which we should not only assign "grades" based on thoughtful analysis, but about which new practices should be developed and existing practices modified intentionally. To the extent that purchasing and perusing Good Practice in Student Affairs (Blimling, Whitt, & Associates, 1999) may be useful to these ends, I encourage readers to do that as well.

Principle One: Good practice in student affairs engages students in active learning.

The first principle highlights at least two important aspects of student affairs professionals' work. First, it must be engaging. This suggests that student affairs personnel anticipate, create and plan for opportunities for students to learn particular things. In contrast to a "whatever happens" approach, the implication of an engaging
approach is that student affairs practitioners have various outcomes in mind towards which they desire students to make progress. In addition, "engag[ing] students" implies an eager desire and subsequent, intentional efforts to help students "get it," or not to miss something important, or to "see it" a different way. In contrast to a serendipity approach (e.g., "they'll find me if they need me"), the nature of an engaging approach is that student affairs professionals are proactive in helping students become more self-conscious about and interested in making sense of all that is happening.

Second, this principle clearly articulates the purpose of student affairs personnel: helping students to become and to be active learners. I suspect that this is no longer a novel idea. NASPA (1987), ACPA (1994), and Kuh, Lyons, Miller, & Trow (1994), to name several, have all made similar arguments. However, in her elaboration of the first principle, Baxter Magolda (1999) effectively utilizes Kegan's (1994) bridge metaphor in making a case for active learning. The bridge metaphor refers to a process by which linkages are developed among students and educators. Educators must understand "where the bridge begins [for students] and help students take the journey to the other side" (Baxter Magolda, 1999, p. 24). Likewise, students must acknowledge that educators have purposes in mind for what and how they will learn. Active learning or bridge-building, then, is the ongoing project in which educators acknowledge and respect students' current understandings yet challenge them to develop new understandings, behaviors, and attitudes. Needless to say, "challenge and support" metaphors (such as Kegan's bridge metaphor) are quite familiar to student affairs professionals. In fact, Baxter Magolda intimates that student affairs practitioners have an integral role to play in supporting and enhancing an institution's commitment to active learning simply because "situating learning in students' experience . . ., validating students as knowers . . ., [and] mutually constructing meaning" (Baxter Magolda, 1999, p. 26-27) have long been standard modes of operation in their work.

Principle Two: Good practice in student affairs helps students develop coherent values and ethical standards.

This principle has unequivocal support at Christian colleges. In fact, many would effectively argue that developing coherent values and ethical standards is a distinctive characteristic of Christian colleges and universities, particularly in relation to large, public universities. A recent study supports such a claim, concluding that "the campus culture of religious institutions provide a setting in which character-enhancing activities are valued . . .," especially when compared to other types of institutions (Astin & Antonio, 2000, p. 6).

Although this perception may be generally true, the conversation must not end with "the comparison." Rather, Christian student affairs personnel must strive to define the particular values and ethical standards that they wish to see developed in students, clarify the reasons why these values and standards are worthy of pursuit, and labor to create innovative and useful means of seeing such values and standards come to fruition in students. In character-building terms, Christian college student affairs personnel must articulate what they mean by character (rather than tacitly believing that

---
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everyone simply means the same thing when they use the word), why their resolve is to work towards cultivating it within students, and how they will do so.

Jon Dalton's (1999) chapter elucidating this principle offers some good advice in this regard. He offers an educational framework consisting of five, interrelated strategies to foster the development of coherent values and ethical standards: transmission, clarification, moral reasoning, moral commitment, and moral action. Christian college student affairs administrators are still obliged to identify the specific content of these strategies (e.g., What should be transmitted and how? What beliefs, attitudes, behaviors, and so on must be clarified and how? How are the contours of moral reasoning from a Christian point of view and how can these skills be generated in students?), but they do provide an excellent grid for shaping good practice. Dalton also posits an ambitious list of activities and practices that may be instrumental in creating campus climates in which values and standards are best enhanced:

1. A mission statement that articulates core values and virtues
2. A general education curriculum that includes core values and virtues as educational outcomes.
3. An academic honor code
4. A student conduct code that defines student rights, duties, and responsible citizenship
5. A student compact, creed, or statement that articulates the institution's core values and virtues and that students are expected to affirm as part of their membership in the campus community
6. Formal incentives and structured opportunities for community service and community-building activities
7. A campus ethos of welcoming and caring for students
8. New student programs that orient and introduce new students to campus resources, traditions, core values, role models, and help establish friendships and affiliation with the institution
9. Campus governance structures that provide for active student participation and responsibility
10. Consistent role-modeling by university leaders to affirm the core values and virtues of the institution
11. A visible and effective program of rewards and recognition for exemplary students who model core values and virtues
12. Recognition and support for students' spiritual and religious expression and development

Principle Three: Good practice in student affairs sets and communicates high expectations for learning.

Most would agree that high expectations can be motivational and affirming. Within the field of American higher education, various reports (Chickering & Gamson,
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1987; Education Commission of the States, 1995; The Wingspread Group on Higher Education, 1993) champion the importance of establishing and communicating ambitious expectations. In the student affairs context, one of the ways this occurs is through "giving [students] responsibility" (Blimling & Whitt, 1999a, p. 16). On one hand, student affairs staff must use wisdom in selecting the students in whom great trust and responsibility will be given; not just any student will do. On the other hand, "setting the bar high motivates people to achieve their potential and surpass their self-perceived limits" (Kuh, 1999, p. 67). More specifically, Kuh suggests that student affairs practitioners utilize a five-fold agenda to make progress towards good practice in the area of high expectations:

1. Determine what the institution wants to expect of its students.
2. Discover what expectations for student performance the institution actually communicates.
3. Examine gaps between the expectations that institution desires and those that are actually implemented.
4. Develop strategies for addressing gaps between desired institutional expectations and student performance.

Principle Four: Good practice in student affairs uses systematic inquiry to improve student and institutional performance.

In the midst of responding to the unexpected and/or putting out fires figuratively or literally, many student affairs professionals are doing well simply to pursue some of what they hoped to accomplish at the beginning of the academic year. Good practice, however, necessitates that student affairs professionals build in feedback mechanisms that will supply them with timely and constructive information. In turn, good practice suggests that this information not only is collected, but used to consider improvement in student learning. Blimling and Whitt say it clearly:

"It is difficult to manage what you cannot measure. If student affairs is in the business of student learning, it should be engaged in trying to measure what contributes positively to that process and what interferes with it" (1999a, p.17).

Pascarella and Whitt (1999, p. 108-111) provide the following recommendations for student affairs staff who are interested in pursuing good practice in this regard: 1) Develop an "ethos of inquiry" with the student affairs organization; 2) Commit resources to systematic inquiry; 3) Develop and implement a comprehensive plan for assessment of student learning and the role of student affairs in that learning; 4) Designate responsibility for student affairs inquiry; and 5) Start somewhere. In short, if student affairs practitioners desire to fashion themselves as experts on students, they must commit themselves to the ongoing task of gathering feedback about students and their environments. Moreover, their efforts in contributing to the improvement of students' learning experiences in and out of the classroom will be enriched to the extent
that they use acquired data to modify existing programs and create responsive ones.

**Principle Five: Good practice in student affairs uses resources effectively to achieve institutional missions and goals.**

Since stewardship is a word that makes sense within a Christian worldview, this principle is one with which Christian college student affairs professionals will easily resonate. At its heart it concerns making wise decision about expenditures. More specifically, good practice requires that student affairs practitioners spend monies in ways that correspond with institutional and departmental priorities. Not only should all of the initiatives undertaken by a student affairs division make sense within the institution's educational agenda, but its most important or central initiatives should command the most attention from a fiscal point of view. Conversely, programs that are not as essential to institutional and divisional priorities should be reflected as such in the budgeting process.

In addition to responsible and sensible fiscal management, Reisser and Roper (1999) suggest that other considerations are essential in the effort to use resources appropriately. For example, they suggest that resources will be utilized best when student affairs leadership clearly understands institutional and divisional culture; articulates a clear vision and goals for the division; communicates often and meaningfully with colleagues; implements regular planning and evaluation procedures; takes risks as a matter of course; portrays a sense of urgency in the tasks at hand; demands competence among divisional comrades and stresses the ongoing growth of the college and its constituents. In short, Reisser and Roper (1999, p. 116) argue that student affairs leadership has the "dual challenge of being effective, responsible managers while also functioning as inspired, visionary leaders in the achievement of [their] institutional missions."

**Principle Six: Good practice in student affairs forges educational partnerships that advance student learning.**

Although collaboration is generally assumed to mean something positive, it is also fair to say that it does not seem to occur effortlessly among the participants of colleges and universities. Blimling and Whitt (1999 a, p. 18), with partial tongue-in-cheek, offer that it may be "remarkable" that collaboration occurs at all! The difficulties in accomplishing it notwithstanding, good practice in student affairs necessitates that student affairs staff members seek partnerships with their colleagues elsewhere in the institution, particularly with academic administrators and faculty members. I have argued this point elsewhere as follows:

... Student affairs practitioners and faculty members should not only communicate regularly regarding their respective efforts, but should also plan and enact learning initiatives -- both in-class and out-of-class -- conjointly, involve each other in consulting and strategizing, collaborate on research projects pertinent to student learning, and exhort one another to do their work... on behalf of students (Guthrie, 1997 b, p. 72).
After Schroeder (1999) identifies several potential obstacles to collaboration, he offers some examples of successful educational partnerships that can bring together student affairs and academic affairs operations. These include: Freshman Interest Groups (FIGs); restructuring student governments into learning communities; service learning partnerships; collaborative planning conferences; cross-functional curricula; and summer institute programs. All of these, as explained by Schroeder, are examples of programs that attempt to forge partnerships across existing boundaries. They point to the leadership role that student affairs professionals can and should have in the reform of undergraduate education as well. And yet, there appears to be considerably more room for efforts in this regard, to the end that Terenzini's and Pascarella's challenge may be enjoined:

If undergraduate education is to be enhanced, faculty members, joined by academic and student affairs administrators, must devise ways to deliver undergraduate education that are as comprehensive and integrated as the ways that students actually learn. A whole new mindset is needed to capitalize on the interrelatedness of the in-and-out-of-class influences on student learning and the functional interconnectedness of academic and student affairs divisions (Terenzini & Pascarella, 1994, p. 32).

**Principle Seven: Good practice in student affairs builds supportive and inclusive communities.**

Community is a word often used by those within the walls of academe to describe "life on campus." Needless to say, community means different things to different people, including those who are constituents of colleges and universities. At the very least, and given current realities, community often refers to a campus environment that is hospitable to its participants and promotes values such as civility, honesty, and comfortability. One wonders, however, whether campus size is a prerequisite to achieve community effectively. Perhaps this is why Blimling and Whitt (1999a, p. 19) are willing to say that "Smaller, private, particularly religiously affiliated, colleges usually have a much easier time of defining exactly what they mean by community and exactly how they hope to fulfill it."

The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (1990) offered more specific ideas regarding the characteristics of community that colleges should embrace:

- A purposeful community, where faculty and students share intellectual goals and values
- An open community, where freedom of expression is protected but which has a civility that respects the dignity of all
- A just community with a commitment to heterogeneity and diverse opportunities in the curriculum and social activities, and an honoring of the individual person
• A disciplined community in which the individuals are guided by standards of conduct for academic and social behavior and governance procedures that work for the benefit of all
• A caring community that supports individual well-being through positive relationships, sensitivity, and service to others
• A celebrative community, which unites the campus through rituals that affirm both tradition and change and instill a sense of belonging.

More recently, Brazzell and Reisser (1999, p. 161) offer an "inventory" of strong and weak communities that is instructive for measuring progress as well as setting standards:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRONG COMMUNITIES</th>
<th>WEAK COMMUNITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plan ways to welcome, orient, and invite involvement</td>
<td>Provide minimal information; hope newcomers will adapt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generate a climate of pride, excitement, and enjoyment</td>
<td>Tolerate a climate of apathy, disengagement, and stress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer a variety of activities with good attendance</td>
<td>Offer few activities, or generally have low attendance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students easily find groups where they can feel comfortable</td>
<td>Students feel alone or marginalized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity is visible</td>
<td>Population looks homogeneous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual differences are respected; equality prevails</td>
<td>Inequality, stereotyping, or discrimination exists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open discussion of controversial issues is valued</td>
<td>There are few forums for debates or differing opinions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socially responsible behavior is modeled, promoted, and reinforced</td>
<td>Irresponsible actions are overlooked; little emphasis on service or ethics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accomplishments are publically honored</td>
<td>Little recognition is provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A sense of community is explicitly valued and promoted</td>
<td>No intentional strategies are used to reinforce a sense of belonging and pride</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morale and self-esteem are high</td>
<td>Cynicism, hostility, and dissatisfaction recur</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Both of these lists provide helpful insight into the kind of community that student affairs practitioners work towards cultivating and sustaining. Although neither is intended to be exhaustive and neither can account for all of the variables that characterize institutional distinctives, they provide a provocative grid from which to discuss the extent to which community is valued on campus.

In the preceding pages, I have attempted to recap, albeit briefly, the principles of good practice for student affairs that are highlighted in Blimling's and Whitt's important book. I even spent some time describing more particular features of each principle in the interest of helping Christian college student affairs professionals do some preliminary reflection about the extent to which they currently pursue good practice (as defined by ACPA/NASPA). I do not mean to suggest that Christian college student affairs should adopt these seven principles willy-nilly, nor do I believe that Christian college student affairs leaders would be ill-advised to consider additional (or substitute) principles of good practice that have specific relevance to the Christian higher education context. Rather, I simply wanted to provide several baselines for good practice that are widely accepted within the larger profession and about which I think it wise to consider as potential benchmarks.

In the next section, I offer my impressions regarding how Christian college student affairs personnel are "doing" vis-à-vis the seven principles. Let me reiterate that what follows are my impressions. They are prone to error based on the limitations that I mentioned at the outset of the essay. However, to the extent that they evidence a reflection on the principles just summarized, I hope that it will spur on my colleagues at Christian institutions to engage in similar reflections of how they are currently "doing" in relation to the seven principles.

I think it is important to mention one additional limitation before I proceed with my impressions. What follows are generalizations. Generalizations, by definition, downplay specificity. As a result, I miss the variations in student affairs practices that exist among Christian colleges. Stated more explicitly, some Christian college student affairs offices do better on a particular principle than other Christian college student affairs offices. Rather than allowing this reality to become a source of self-righteousness or despair, however, may I suggest that it be used as a starting point for constructive engagement. For example, would it be possible for an ACSD conference to be framed around "exemplary practices" on each of the seven principles of good practice in student affairs? Or, would it be possible for the new ACSD Journal or the existing Koinonia publication to include regular features on noteworthy examples on each of the seven principles of good practice? In either case, I am interested in improving collaboration and collegiality among Christian college student affairs professionals, to the end that current good practices do not remain under bushels and, simultaneously, that those practitioners who desire insight and improvement will receive them.
How We Are Doing: My Impressions

Regarding Principle One (Engages students in active learning) AND Principle Three (Sets and communicates high expectations for student learning).

My impression is that Christian college student affairs practitioners, on the one hand, have made important strides towards these principles. In the interest of connecting with the larger educational goals of their respective institutions, it appears that many Christian college student affairs programs have thoughtfully revamped orientation programs, career counseling initiatives, disciplinary models, and student activity programs. In addition, more and more Christian college student affairs departments are playing a key role in developing theme floors, Freshman Interest Groups (FIGs), service-learning programs, and leadership experiences (not the least of which are ones that include a classroom component).

On the other hand, I believe that most would agree that room for improvement exists. My impression is that Christian college student affairs programs are still wrestling with what it means to undertake their efforts under the banner of student learning. Ministry approaches to the profession, which probably should not be abandoned completely, are difficult to concede. "Fun and games" initiatives -- which also should not be completely eliminated -- are usually easier to implement. And, given the demands of the job, it continues to be tempting simply to take care of the daily issues than to conceive an effort that is linked to the educational outcomes of the institution. The pressures to do otherwise notwithstanding, I continue to believe firmly that:

... Student learning must be the purpose around which student affairs staff construct and implement their efforts. Residence life programs, student organizations and activities, disciplinary proceedings, orientation programs, volunteer projects -- in short, all those initiatives typically administered by student affairs professionals -- must have student learning as their goal (Guthrie, 1997 a, p. 40).

Regarding Principle Two (Helps student develop coherent values and ethical standards).

My impression is that Christian college student affairs professionals have viewed this as a fundamental and necessary aspect of their work for many years. Behavioral contracts, dorm bible studies, honor codes, chapel programs, community-living policies, developmental disciplinary procedures, and various other initiatives that emphasize and encourage morality and character are virtually synonymous with the Christian college experience and most frequently occur under the auspices of student affairs departments.

While it is apparent that Christian college student affairs staff view this principle as a defining characteristic of their work, the actual impact in the lives of students is less clear. What are the particular values and ethical standards that Christian college students are developing as a result of the efforts of Christian college student affairs
practitioners? What are Christian college student affairs professionals doing to effect such development? How do the "results" in this regard and/or the strategies that produced them differ, if at all, from what occurs on non-Christian college campuses? To what extent should they?

The good news is that there are data that may help to address these questions. Both the Collaborative Assessment Project and the Quality Retention Project (both conducted in collaboration with the Council for Christian Colleges and Universities) generated relevant data -- and much of it! The not-so-good news is that many Christian college student affairs offices do not collect or analyze information that may help them to assess their efforts in this or other regards. Christian college student affairs staff should place significant emphasis on this particular principle. Simply stating a commitment, however, is insufficient. Christian college student affairs professionals must also develop appropriate strategies and programs that give practical expression to their commitments and, at the same time, assess their efforts to monitor the extent to which their efforts are effective.

Regarding Principle Four (Uses systematic inquiry to improve student and institutional performance).

My impression is that Christian college student affairs practitioners have substantial room for improvement regarding this principle. The reason may be attributable to the relative slowness with which Christian colleges in general have embraced the outcomes assessment movement. The dearth of activity among Christian college student affairs programs in assessing their efforts may be a byproduct of the sparse activity among Christian colleges in outcomes assessment in general.

I am not suggesting that Christian college student affairs departments (or Christian colleges) do not conduct evaluations of any kind. Clearly, many departments collect evaluative feedback on residence life, orientation, counseling, and service learning programs. What is missing in many cases, however, is data that indicates that students are making progress towards the intended outcomes that Christian college student affairs practitioners desire, and around which they have based all of their initiatives. And, data may not be the only thing that is missing. Some -- maybe many -- Christian college student affairs departments are functioning without a mission/vision statement or clear objectives/outcomes. Likewise, some -- maybe many -- Christian college student affairs departments have not considered the roles that they should play in the larger learning efforts of the college.

If true, perhaps my impressions provide some direction for the efforts of Christian college student affairs programs in the future. If they do not exist already, develop a compelling mission/vision statement and construct several outcomes statements that correspond with the institution's mission and culture, and that will focus the nature of all of the department's work. Then, conduct an audit of departmental efforts to determine how what you are currently doing matches with your intentions for students' learning. Deleting or modifying existing programs may be necessary; creating new programs may be advisable, too. In either case, the goal is to develop initiatives, interventions, and programs that complement the mission of the institution and, at the
same time, make sense given the stated mission and outcomes of the student affairs department. Finally, ongoing systematic inquiry provides a way of examining the extent to which departmental initiatives, interventions, and programs are helping students make progress towards the department's intended outcomes. The relatively recent book, *Assessment in Student Affairs* (Upcraft & Schuh, 1996) may be a useful tool in making progress towards this principle of good practice.

**Regarding Principle Five (Uses resources effectively to achieve institutional missions and goals).**

My impression is that Christian college student affairs professionals do well with respect to this principle. As I stated earlier in the essay, Christian college student affairs staff professionals are interested in stewardship as a matter of course. Although some may not be excellent budget officers and most may not have the expertise of the chief financial administrator, I believe that Christian college student affairs practitioners attempt to use resources wisely as a matter of personal and professional faithfulness.

Another aspect of this principle, however, is contributing visionary institutional leadership. In this way, Principle Five overlaps with **Principle Six (Forges educational partnerships that advance student learning)**. My impression is that some Christian college student affairs staff are more gifted than others in this regard. That is, some are more cognizant than others about the ways in which the efforts of student affairs practitioners contribute to student learning. Some are more predisposed to develop thoughtfully collaborative programs with others within the institution. And, some are more concerned and articulate about other dimensions of institutional life including curricular issues, admissions policies, faculty hiring procedures, strategic planning processes, and development campaigns. While it is true that roles and contributions differ from institution to institution, I believe that Christian college student affairs professionals must redouble their efforts to resist the temptation to "do their own thing," as if the larger institution is incidental to their work. Christian institutions will improve to the extent that departments -- including student affairs departments -- see their work to help students learn in conjunction with rather than in isolation from other aspects of institutional life.

**Regarding Principle Seven (Builds supportive and inclusive communities).**

My impression is mixed with respect to the efforts of Christian college student affairs professionals in reference to this principle. On one hand, many of the characteristics of community mentioned earlier in the essay seem to be true of Christian colleges in general and of the efforts of Christian college student affairs staff in particular. Many would agree that Christian colleges are among the most purposeful communities in postsecondary education. Likewise, few would argue with the assertion that Christian college student affairs professionals embrace an ethic of caring and concern for students.

On the other hand, I am aware that some view Christian colleges as hostile to
"alternative" viewpoints (i.e., ones other than the viewpoint of the particular institution). And, at times, perhaps such a view is warranted. To what extent are Christian college student affairs professionals helping students to develop a spirit of civility? An awareness and appreciation of other views? An understanding that different may not equate with wrong? An acknowledging that, this side of the Christ's return, all is not known? I am not necessarily suggesting that Christian college student affairs practitioners are doing poorly with respect to this principle. I simply want to draw attention to the idea that, at times, the enclave character of Christian institutions can hinder the necessary, faithful attention to viewing people and ideas with the respect and courtesy due those made in God's image (McMinn, 1998).

Conclusion

I began this essay by acknowledging that Christian college student affairs professionals have made important strides in understanding and enacting their work during the last two decades. Let me conclude by stating the obvious. More is yet to be done. Student learning must be more central in framing departmental efforts; the telos of student learning must be articulated more clearly; mission and outcomes statements must be drafted and revised; greater harmony between programs and intended outcomes must be achieved; more and better insight into institutional issues must be cultivated; an insightful and convincing institutional voice must be better trained; collaboration efforts must be diligently pursued; the evaluation and assessment of departmental efforts must become commonplace and instrumental in making improvements and the list goes on. My interest in reviewing Good Practice in Student Affairs in this essay is an effort to provide a resource towards making progress in at least some of these areas.

More is yet to be done to understand the contours of a [Christian] faith-informed student affairs profession and practice as critical. The last 20 years have taught Christian college student affairs practitioners that they cannot ignore or reject the theories, statements, and practices that emerge from the larger profession and make some sense from a Christian point of view. Conversely, Christian college student affairs staff have also learned during this time that uncritically baptizing the larger world of professional theory and practice as gospel truth is not a vocationally faithful response. The future of the Association for Christians in Student Development must take shape around helping student affairs personnel -- Christian and otherwise -- understand and navigate these issues more thoroughly.

Departmental discussions around Good Practice in Student Affairs may be a good place to engage further discussions in this regard. How does each of the seven principles resonate with a Christian view of student affairs? How does each of the seven principles distort a Christian view of student affairs? What are appropriate and inappropriate applications of each of the seven principles, given a Christian view of reality? Are there other principles of good practice that should be added based on a Christian view of reality? If so, what would they be? These are some of the questions that could frame departmental discussions.
In closing, I thought it would be useful to rely on *Good Practice in Student Affairs* one more time. The final chapter of the book briefly offers 17 strategies for implementing the seven principles of good practice. Although these strategies should be modified based on particular institutional objectives and cultures and evaluated from a Christian point of view, I believe they provide helpful tips for making progress towards improving the efforts of Christian college student affairs professionals:

1. Employ ongoing assessment of student outcomes.
2. Communicate institutional values and expectations through policies, decisions, processes, and interactions.
3. Link the classroom with out-of-classroom activities.
4. Provide high-quality services and programs that support student learning.
5. Establish coherent purposes and learning outcomes appropriate to the backgrounds and aspirations of students and consistent with the institution's mission.
6. Communicate to students what is expected of them.
7. Develop in students a sense of belonging, community, pride, and loyalty to the institution.
8. Encourage student involvement.
9. Value diversity, accept differences among students, and work to overcome prejudice on campus.
10. Involve students in institutional governance, policies, and decisions.
11. Promote civility on campus.
12. Create formal and informal opportunities to engage faculty, staff, and students in ways that contribute to the greater good of the institution.
13. Develop a student-centered focus.
14. Create flexible networks of resources.
15. Use a systemic approach.
16. Increase the intellectual content of student affairs activities.
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A Look at the Bigger Picture: In Response to Guthrie

By Carolyn Arthur, Ph.D.

David Guthrie has done an excellent job of examining how Christian colleges are doing when measured against the yardstick of the seven "Principles of Good Practice in Student Affairs" as outlined by Blimling and Whitt (1999). While agreeing, for the most part, with his evaluation of how Christian colleges measure up on each of the seven principles, I could not help but ask the larger question: Upon what underlying philosophy are these principles based? Thus I find myself responding more strongly to the underlying principles upon which the article is based than to Guthrie's assessment of how Christian colleges are doing.

Before addressing the larger question raised in my own mind, though, I want to outline some responses to Guthrie's "report card" which I believe would be representative of those in the ACSD constituency.

The Pessimist's Response

For "seasoned" student affairs professionals in Christian colleges, there may be the temptation to respond to Guthrie's assessment rather pessimistically. They may argue that Blimling and Whitt's principles are far too idealistic to put into practice on Christian college campuses, given current staffing, budget and time constraints. One might be tempted to say, "Yeah, right. Why don't they come to MY campus and see what it is really like day in and day out? We don't have time to step back and exam-
ine why we do what we do. We're too busy doing it!" Thus, some may conclude that it is appropriate to pat themselves on the back for doing as well as they are under the circumstances.

The pitfall of this response, of course, is that unexamined practice is doomed to be repeated and "business as usual" continues. While it is short-sighted, I believe it is nonetheless a realistic response for some.

The Philosopher's Response

Still others may agree whole-heartedly with Blimling and Whitt's principles and Guthrie's assessment of their state in Christian colleges. The more philosophical among us may set about further examination of their own campuses to see how they compare principle by principle. They may vow to do a better job in each of the seven "good practices" in the months and years to come.

For this group, pitfalls may lie either in "paralysis by analysis" or in attempting too much too soon. The temptation to analyze further is very real for some, which can prevent them from dealing with praxis. On the flip side of the coin, I'm reminded of the old adage, "How do you eat an elephant? One spoonful at a time." When faced with the "elephant" of massive change in student affairs practice, it may seem too difficult to "eat" a spoonful at a time, so one may opt instead to stick with the traditional diet of "business as usual."

The Pragmatist's Response

Many who are drawn to the field of student affairs are pragmatists at heart, feeling out of place in the midst of philosophical debate in the academy. As Christians, inherent pragmatism may be buttressed by the concept of stewardship, how to make the best use of the resources we may have. The pragmatist might respond by thinking, "O.K., you've convinced me of the necessity of examining principles in good practice. Our staff needs to look at why we do what we do in student affairs at our particular Christian college. And we do want to be a good stewards for the Lord." But for this group among us, the primary question in life is "how?" "Just tell us how we can do our jobs more effectively and we'll do it for you."

The pitfall of the pragmatist's response, of course, lies in its passive nature.

The Practitioner's Response

My definition of practitioners includes those professionals who understand the principles behind praxis and strive to improve on both. This group would respond to Guthrie's assessment by saying, "We can't afford not to look at how we're doing on these principles of good practice, whether we think we have time to do so or not." My hope, of course, is that most respondents would fall into this category.

As Guthrie noted in response to Principle Five, student affairs professionals have the dual challenge of both effective management and visionary leadership. I
believe that the teamwork of a student affairs staff tackling these principles together would create a synergy that not only answers the philosophical questions but the pragmatic ones too. Such a discussion could become the main topic for a staff development retreat over the summer. The challenge then becomes to implement the results of such a discussion once an academic year begins.

A Look at the Bigger Picture

While an examination of principles of good practice is a necessary thing, I do not believe it is sufficient to create lasting change. For that to happen, we must look at the bigger picture: first and foremost, we must agree upon our *raison de existence*, the philosophy behind the principles which guide good practice.

I would offer the following underlying beliefs are those which should define our existence as student affairs professionals, particularly in Christian colleges. None are new. They are drawn from foundational documents and books in the profession and only synthesized here.

- As a profession, student affairs exists to support the larger academic enterprise of higher education.
- Learning takes place outside the classroom as well as inside it. Students deserve a "seamless" curriculum in which student affairs professionals are viewed as educators.
- We must be about the business of educating the whole person. Luke 2:52 says Jesus grew in wisdom and stature and in favor with God and man. We should be providing ways our students can do the same.
- We must educate others in the academy, particularly faculty, about the importance of the role student affairs plays in a student's educational experience. Just as there is more to college than the classroom, there is more to student affairs than discipline.
- Christian institutions of higher education exist to advance the Kingdom of Christ by affecting the culture; first on campus, then in the community, then the nation and around the world.

Elaborating on the scope of these beliefs is a subject for another article. However, they are offered here as additional "grist for the mill."

Conclusion

I believe Guthrie's assessment of how Christian colleges are doing on the seven principles of good practice deserves discussion on every Christian college campus represented in ACSD. Whether one sees oneself in the response of the pessimist, the philosopher, the pragmatist or the practitioner, there is always room for improvement in praxis. However, I believe in order to effect any permanent, long-term changes in practice, the professional needs to take a look at the bigger picture of
philosophy. Deciding on the foundational issues of why we do what we do in student affairs, and the role Christian faith plays any part in it, is a vital first step in the process.
A Response to David Guthrie’s *Report Card for Christian College Student Affairs*

By Barry Loy

Just as Dr. Guthrie is honored to be asked to write an inaugural article for the ACSD journal, I am honored to have the opportunity to respond to his thoughtfully prepared essay. I have much admiration and respect for David's leadership in student affairs. I had the opportunity to work with him on the book, *Student Affairs Revisited: A Christian View of the Profession and Its Contexts* (Guthrie, 1997), and quickly grew to appreciate the depth of his knowledge of student affairs and his passion to "do" student affairs work out of a Biblical framework.

David has prepared a document that concisely covers some of the most current and important issues in student affairs today. He has produced for many of us, from the experienced practitioner to the new professional, a summary of important guiding principles very useful for strategic planning and assessment in our individual schools. Even though David says his article is geared more for those working in Christian institutions, I see its value for faith-affirming and non-faith based-institutions. His explanatory comments and inclusion of supporting and complementary works of other writers has clarified and elucidated the "Principles of Good Practices" in such a way that they are more accessible and employable. For those who take the time to use it, his work will be very helpful in conducting the evaluative analysis that David suggests we undertake in our student affairs' departments.

An attempt to respond to every aspect of David's treatise would result in a work at least as long as his if not longer. Therefore, I will selectively respond to certain aspects of the article as my experience and knowledge allow. My analysis deals...
with the first six of the seven principles Dr. Guthrie discusses.

To aid the reader, I have organized my remarks below according to the "Seven Principles of Good Practice." My primary goal is to add to David's comments on the implications of these seven principles for Christians working in student affairs.

**Principle One: Good practice in student affairs engages students in active learning.**

David encourages us to have student learning as the goal of all our efforts in student affairs. What is student learning? The "Student Learning Imperative" (ACPA, 1994) tends to use "student learning" as synonymous with "personal development" and "growth." I've been associated with Christians doing student affairs work for 22 years now and I believe that holistic growth or learning has been a hallmark of our efforts. Student affairs professionals have understood the importance of the total learning environment far more than our faculty colleagues. We have also championed the need for experiential learning -- the connection of knowing with doing and being. The recent literature on student learning has added an important dimension to our work, but Christians have practiced the core of this imperative for many years. For one thing, whether out of a "ministry" or "student affairs" perspective, we have encouraged students to connect what they know with who they are and what they do. We have made it our business to be deeply concerned about "conduct" and matters of the "heart" while maintaining that behavior should be tied to belief and knowledge. We have not taken the easy approach of dispensing great truths without expecting action to follow.

Another area where Christians have excelled is in mentoring. Christian student affairs professionals have been mentoring (e.g. discipling) students long before the term was popular. We have believed in the importance of incarnational ministry as modeled by our Savior. We know that close, authentic and highly personal relationships promote character development and student learning.

**Principle Two: Good practice in student affairs helps students develop coherent values and ethical standards.**

As David states, Christian colleges have viewed the development of values and ethical standards as a defining characteristic of their work. He also says that the actual impact of our efforts in student's lives is less clear. While it is true that the outcome of our work lacks good documentation, I think our approach to character development is more advantageous than others who approach the matter from a more secularized and relativistic point of view. For example, David extensively quotes the work of John Dalton with regards to the development of values and ethical standards. While I see value in much of Dalton's work, he has stated that student affairs professionals must avoid moralization and the transmission of religious values (Dalton, 1993). It may be difficult for Christians working in non-faith based institutions, but for those of us working in Christian settings our approach differs from those who advocate a more pluralistic or postmodern standard. To complement John Dalton's five strategies for values development offered by David, I would like to introduce the work of Arthur Holmes, professor of philosophy at Wheaton College. Dr. Holmes offers a framework
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that is solidly based in a biblical worldview. Holmes presents the following eleven objectives for moral education.

1. Consciousness Raising - Things in this world are not ideal.
2. Consciousness Sensitizing - Compassion coupled with indignation.
3. Values Analysis - Understanding values of decision makers.
4. Values Clarification - Understanding personal values.
5. Values Criticism - Are the operative values what they ought to be?
8. Moral Decision Making - Having wisdom to make good moral decisions.
9. Responsible Agents - Doing something about ethical issues in society.
11. Moral Identity - Becoming a person of Christian character (Holmes, 1991.)

Perhaps another way to assess how all of us are doing (both faith-affirming and non-faith-based institutions) is to use the results of Astin's and Antonio's study that David also referenced. Astin and Antonio (1999) found that the following experiences/activities have the greatest impact on character formation and student learning.

- Performing volunteer work
- Participation in leadership education or training
- Exposure to interdisciplinary studies, ethnic studies, and women's studies
- Participation in religious services
- Social activities with students from a variety of racial and ethnic backgrounds
- Faculty members who provide emotional support

As I examine this list with regard to Christian colleges, I think it fair to say that most Christian Colleges have done fairly well with numbers 1, 2, 4 and 6. In fact, Astin and Antonio themselves state that Catholic and Protestant Colleges appear to provide students with activities that increase civic values, volunteerism, and religious beliefs/convictions while academically selective institutions appear to negatively effect the development of civic values, religious beliefs, and cultural awareness.

**Principle Three: Good practice in student affairs sets and communicates high expectations for learning.**

The greatest commandment as defined by Jesus is to "Love the Lord your God with all your heart and with all your soul and with all your mind" (Matt. 22:37). We may not be doing it, but those of us working with Christian students have a good platform from which to raise the bar and ask great things of our students. Christian academics believe in the importance of the life of the mind as well as the heart and soul and for that reason, I think we do ask our students to be faithful as God's stewards with
the learning enterprise. However, I’d like to offer a word of caution. More and more I hear Christian colleges stressing the importance of institutional excellence and individual excellence of faculty, staff, and students. This may be another way to raise the standard but I prefer an argument which encourages us to be more "faithful" instead of more "excellent." For me, the idea of faithfulness connects better with the idea of Christian stewardship — the notion that God has blessed us with resources and gifts that we need to use as good stewards for His glory. In my opinion, the excellence argument appears to be tied to "arrogance" and "competition" and less tied to promoting God's kingdom through responsible stewardship.

Principle Four: Good practice in student affairs uses systematic inquiry to improve student and institutional performance.

David mentions the Collaborative Assessment Project and the Quality Retention Project data that is available to CCCU colleges for analysis to help us improve our performance. Another very helpful research project now underway is the National Survey of Student Engagement, led by Dr. George Kuh of the University of Indiana. This survey attempts to measure the extent to which colleges and universities encourage actual learning. Learning is measured by questions clustered around five benchmarks of effective educational practice: level of academic challenge; the amount of active and collaborative learning; student interaction with faculty members; access to enriching educational experiences; and level of campus support. A recent report in the Chronicle of Higher Education (2000) lists schools with exemplary scores on the National Survey of Student Engagement. Of those, I only recognize one that belongs to the Council for Christian Colleges and Universities. The meager showing of Christian schools might be a function of the actual number taking part in the survey. Nonetheless, as far as I know, this is one of the few studies being conducted that tries to measure how well schools are doing at promoting student learning. That being the case, for those of us serious about student learning, this is something we should seriously consider. More information can be found at http://www.indiana.edu/~nsse/.

Principle Five: Good practice in student affairs uses resources effectively to achieve institutional missions and goals and Principle Six: Good practice in student affairs forges educational partnerships that advance student learning

What we want students to learn and how we accomplish this learning must be an institutional discussion and decision. Unfortunately, faculty members and student affairs professionals have traditionally completed this exercise separately. For the sake of stewardship and for what makes sense educationally this is of paramount importance. We need to make peace and end the turf wars between faculty members and student affairs professionals. A true partnership with faculty will only occur if we can come to very similar conclusions about what learning is all about. If we can do this we can maximize our efforts and resources toward what we want students to learn.

The idea of collaboration and partnership with faculty has received a great deal of attention during the past 10 years. In 1989, desiring to reexamine the historic "Student Personnel Point of View," NASPA published a statement entitled "A
Perspective on Student Affairs" (NASPA, 1989). One of the first assumptions expressed in the document is that "The Academic Mission of the Institution is Preeminent." Ever since this declaration, writers in student affairs have been busy making the case that we should partner with the faculty. My experience tells me that this desire comes primarily from professionals in student affairs, not from faculty members. We (student affairs professionals) have a felt need, while they (faculty members) do not. Perhaps it comes from our vision of a holistic approach to students and our desire to connect knowing with being and doing. We will have a difficult time building partnerships until provosts, academic deans and faculty members truly believe that student learning takes place inside and outside the classroom. I offer the following as suggestions for colleges and universities wanting to bridge the gap between knowing and doing.

- Develop a set of learning outcomes that flow from the institution's mission statement. Hopefully, these outcomes will address the total learning environment.

- Both curriculums, the "formal" curriculum and the "co" curriculum, should be evaluated using the learning outcomes with the goal of fashioning a seamless curriculum which promotes congruence, harmony and clarity.

- Once the new curriculum is in place, faculty and student affairs staff should be held accountable for implementing the learning outcomes in their respective domains. For example, let's assume Ideal College has adopted the following as one of their learning outcomes: Ideal College endeavors to prepare graduates who grow in their intellectual curiosity, with an enduring desire for knowledge that will motivate life-long learning. With this goal in mind, faculty and student affairs professionals at Ideal College should be thinking about how to develop learning strategies and experiences that will help students realize this outcome - in class and out of class. All other outcomes could be approached in a similar manner.

- Student affairs professionals should make connections with the general education or core curriculum since historically this aspect of the academic program is most closely in line with student affairs' concern for wholistic education.

- Student affairs professionals should support and collaborate with faculty in developing service learning initiatives in and out of the classroom.

As I have mentioned, I have chosen to address the first six of the seven principles. In closing, for those seriously interested in utilizing the "Seven Principles of Good Practice" I recommend the online inventory sponsored by ACPA and available at http://www.acpa.nche.edu/pgp/principle.htm.
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In Search of the Seamless Curriculum

By Jay Barnes, Ed.D.

It was fall 1976. I was in my first graduate course in a doctoral program in College Student Personnel Work. One of our first assignments was an article from the Personnel and Guidance Journal (September 1976, pp. 26-29) written by the late Burns Crookston and published shortly after his death. "Student Personnel -- All Hail and Farewell!" the title proclaimed. Crookston complained that varied terminology used in our field was "symptomatic of the confusion that has been rampant in our field for many years" (Crookston, 1979, p. 26). He felt that the terminology mattered because the various terms (student personnel, student affairs, personnel work, student development, and human development) suggested different things about the nature of our work. Agreeing on uniform terminology would not only help us, but also those we work with beyond our field to better understand what the profession is all about. He suggested "that student personnel work as historically defined is no longer a viable concept; . . . that student affairs should be used to describe an area, sector, or administrative subdivision; . . . that student development should be used to describe the underlying philosophy of the field" (Crookston, 1979, p. 26). He went on to make the case that student development, "the application of the philosophy and principles of human development in the educational setting" (Crookston, 1979, p. 28), is our guiding paradigm, that it was the bridge over that "chasm that has so long separated 'teaching' in the classroom and 'educating' outside the classroom" (Crookston, 1979, p. 28).
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The Problem

Twenty-five years later, not much has changed. Not only are we unsure of what to call our field, we are still arguing about which paradigm will prevail. If the broader field of student affairs is in flux, the world of student affairs in Christian higher education both mirrors and lags behind our professional counterpart. The problem before us is multi-dimensional. Its components relate to the search for a paradigm, the need for adequate research, the concern for professional preparation and credentialing, and the ongoing struggle with territoriality.

The paradigm problem is significant. While we will never be like physics, we have attached ourselves to the field of developmental psychology with all of its strengths and weaknesses. Since psychology also lacks a dominant paradigm, we are at the mercy of the elder sibling as it attempts to find its way. In a sense, we are stuck in scientific adolescence. Our field is observational, descriptive, and functional in its orientation. One might even ask, have we attached to the right field? Should our search for a paradigm take us more into theology than psychology? If we have fundamentally different worldview assumptions from our professional colleagues and from the underlying discipline, are we building on the right foundation? While Guthrie et al. (1997) started us down a path of exploring these questions in Student Affairs Reconsidered: A Christian View of the Profession and its Contexts (Lanham, MD: University Press of America), it was only a beginning. The response to the book has been more silence than action. Have we adequately answered questions such as, "What difference does it make that we are Christian? What difference does it make that we believe that truth is revealed to us in Scripture? What difference does it make that we are created in God's image?"

While there is much to applaud in the Student Learning Imperative: Implications for Student Affairs (Alexandria, VA: American College Personnel Association, 1994), a cynic might say that this is just our latest attempt to gain respectability. When our profession emerged in the late 1800s, we began a process of differentiation from the faculty. We picked up the roles that they gladly cast off. The initial sighs of relief and thankfulness from the faculty gave way to the development of a second-class status for our field. Yes, we were doing something important, but it was of importance to the faculty primarily in that they no longer had to do it. The guiding paradigm of in loco parentis resulted in our being seen as police or babysitters, hardly the status we envisioned for ourselves. The Student Personnel Point of View (American Council on Education, 1938) was an early attempt at professional respectability. It was a critical step forward and still provides background for our profession. The challenges of the free speech movement in the 1960's and the arrival of Title IX in the early 1970's pointed out the inadequacy of our working paradigm. The work of Sanford, Chickering, and others moved us toward the student development paradigm. It still did not provide us with credibility with the faculty, but it gave us the basis for a curriculum for students in the world beyond the classroom. Residence life, leadership development, campus citizenship and diversity initiatives took on new dimensions with the desire to promote development in students. But this, too, has passed. As
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pressure mounted through the late 1980's and early 1990's to control costs in higher education, administrative overhead became a target. We found ourselves in a budget category scheduled for reduction. *Involving Colleges: Successful Approaches to Fostering Student Learning and Development Outside the Classroom* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1991) gave us hope that the seamless curriculum made a difference when it was valued across the campus. However, it was still the student affairs professionals who pushed that agenda. The student learning paradigm that followed reminded us and our colleagues that we, too, contributed to the education of students.

In addition to the paradigm problem, we face a research problem. We have been inadequate in doing systematic assessment and research in areas related to student affairs at our institutions. In spite of the national accrediting pressure to do assessment, this area of student affairs tends to be the last area of campus to undergo scrutiny of the claims we make about our effectiveness. While we benefit from the work done on a national level by people like Astin or Kuh, our schools are underrepresented in their sample populations. The CCCU Quality Retention Project reinforces some of the contributions we make to the student experience. Building on the cooperative work done in the CCCU gives hope that our individual campuses will take a next step toward important outcome assessment in the area of student affairs.

A third problem for Christian student affairs is the problem of professional preparation. While we have made strides over the past two decades, we still lag behind our counterparts in higher education in our level of professional preparation. Comparisons with faculty preparation show the gap more clearly. While the pathway from tired coach or faculty member to dean is not as well worn as it used to be, we lack a clear pattern of what prepares us best for major leadership roles in student affairs. It is harder to imagine a student affairs professional gaining an appointment as an associate professor of psychology than it is to imagine an associate professor of psychology gaining an appointment as a dean of students. We're still not sure that there is a primary path leading to senior leadership or that a terminal degree is a necessary credential.

A fourth problem is territoriality. Academic affairs will be the 900-pound gorilla for the foreseeable future. If that is the reality we live with, how can we move toward meaningful partnerships? What initiatives are we willing to take in order for those partnerships to occur? What will we have to change about ourselves to build bridges? While the territorial issue with academic affairs occurs between unequal partners, there is a territorial issue that occurs on many of our campuses with a department more our size: our relationship with the campus ministry professionals too often displays the dynamics of a sibling rivalry. What would it take to develop a true partnership there? In terms of campus roles, professional preparation, and research issues, they are much more like us. Is there a way that we could work together with synergy? Do we really believe in a seamless curriculum? When "push comes to shove," are we the only ones who do?
The worlds of Christian higher education and private higher education have discovered a new model. Provosts are popping up everywhere. What distinguishes them as much as anything is variation in their job descriptions.

Upon introduction a provost is most likely to hear the question, "So, what is a provost?" Most provosts come out of an academic affairs background. There are at least two driving forces in the development of these positions, both of which have implications for student affairs. First, a president's attention is increasingly focused on off-campus concerns. None of our campuses would survive without the president's attention to fundraising and lobbying of important external constituencies. The provost has become the internal campus leader at many colleges, guiding day-to-day operation. Second, there has been a deliberate attempt to bring together all the program areas that affect students. Academic affairs, student affairs, and campus ministries are finding themselves aligned under the provost. While it may not guarantee the desired outcome of closer working relationships, it can be an important help. The implications for student affairs professionals are obvious. Does this further subordinate student affairs to academic affairs? Will academic affairs influence student affairs or will the reverse be true? Will this bring student affairs and campus ministries closer to the models of preparation and programming practiced in academic affairs?

A second trend in our institutions is the demise of in loco parentis. While our colleagues in state universities celebrated its demise 30 years ago, we did not. While Christian higher education is still more rule-oriented than much of higher education, we are not the schools we were in the 1970s. Even though many families think of safety more than challenge for their sons (and especially) daughters when they send in the tuition check, our approach has changed dramatically. Perhaps the more appropriate model is in loco pastoris. The mentoring/modeling role suggested by Steve Garber in The Fabric of Faithfulness: Weaving Together Belief & Behavior During the University Years (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1996) takes us in the right direction, providing guidance for student affairs, academic affairs, and campus ministries.

Issues Ahead

The problems identified above suggest an agenda for us. Perhaps the most important is the development of a guiding paradigm for Christian student affairs. While there is much to commend in the developmental models that guided us or the learning imperative that currently focuses our discussion, we have yet to address the meta-problem of adequately identifying and integrating the core assumptions of Christian faith into Christian higher education. Both the learning imperative and the developmental models are naïve in assuming that movement is always in the direction of the good. It is important to ask, "What is the purpose of higher education?" as we try to identify our role. "Learning" may be a good or necessary answer to the question, but it may not be a sufficient answer. If, as Garber suggests, the years between adolescence and adulthood are a crucible in which moral meaning is formed, that has implications for our
agenda. If, as Willimon and Naylor suggest in *The Abandoned Generation: Rethinking Higher Education* (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 1995), two of the key questions to be addressed in college are "How do people become good?" and "Why are we here?" our answers may be found more in theology and philosophy than in psychology. Our guiding paradigm ought to be rooted in our theology if it is to adequately address the issues before us.

A second issue has to do with our sense of professional self-worth. What will it take for us to embrace our role without resorting to comparisons? Will we ever be able to say with the apostle Paul, "I have learned to be content" (Philippians 4:11)? Our role is valuable, essential, but different. Let us not resort to making ourselves in the image of the faculty.

A third issue has to do with career paths. What do we do with all the entry-level professionals for whom there are so few opportunities to advance? How many residence directors become deans? How many stay in the profession? What does this suggest about the nature of our preparation programs, recruiting, and professional development programs?

**Conclusion**

Our friend and fellow traveler, Russ Rogers, has been asking us good questions for years. One of his favorites is, "Is this as good as it gets?" While much of what we do in student affairs is good, I hope this is not as good as it gets. Higher education needs us. Christian higher education needs us. The seamless curriculum beckons us. What would it take for us to lead the way?
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In Search of a Seamless Partnership: a Response to Barnes

By Tom Emigh

My esteemed colleague ends his essay with the challenging, yet inviting, question: "What would it take for us to lead the way?" I agree with the various parts of "the problem" and believe that they assemble to present a formidable barrier to our effectiveness. The basic premise of my response is that student development professionals have the opportunity to serve higher education by not following the discipline-focused culture, but instead moving to a learning-focused culture that clearly exists in the context of higher education. This can have an impact on each of the areas noted: paradigm, research, professional preparation, and territoriality.

It seems that much of our energy is spent trying to be like the faculty and trying to be liked by the faculty. Without diminishing the essential role of the faculty in student learning, I am wondering if our efforts to be affirmed or accepted by the faculty are of value. In many ways, we are different, yet we pursue the same outcome: student learning. For example, faculty are socialized in their training to focus on their discipline (Fairweather, 1996), which leads to specialization. In addition, faculty members expect a high degree of autonomy, and the "outcomes" and contexts for their practice are structurally different than many of the student development staff (Blackburn & Lawrence, 1995). However, it is not necessarily a part of a terminal degree program in many disciplines to focus on the process of learning, or to fully understand the workings of an institution of higher education (Birnbaum, 1988.)

So, then, as we search for a paradigm, is it possible that the desire to attach to a specific discipline is limiting? Should the contribution of the student development
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staff be that of becoming experts on student learning and the administration of higher education? Just as a physicist is prepared to understand physics, should student development professionals contribute by becoming scholars and practitioners of higher education? I would suggest that in order to be of significant service to higher education, we must be different from our faculty colleagues.

The issues of paradigm, research, and professional preparation seem, then, to be closely related. Is there a "right" field to which we should attach? This question must be answered in order for us to prepare professionally and conduct research in our field. It seems that our professional preparation must consist of training in the great diversity of issues that will have an impact on higher education, while also exposing us to the major theories and literature of various disciplines so we have a proper conceptual framework to address the challenges we will face. We should remain on the cutting edge of understanding student learning in a variety of contexts. We should seek to understand and interpret for the rest of the campus the dynamics, trends, and needs of each new generation of students. We should develop a challenging and relevant co-curriculum which will further student learning. We must significantly improve our ability to assess all of these areas and have that assessment inform our planning and budgeting processes.

Why is this important? For one reason, there is a significant amount of evidence suggesting that higher education is on the brink of transformational change, as are some of the forces driving this change (Dolence & Norris, 1995; Levine, 1999). Two of these forces -- diversity and technology -- have implications for many areas of our practice and scholarship.

A significant increase in the ethnic and cultural diversity of our students, the adult learner population and the population of students with varying degrees of learning and physical abilities each create challenges in preparing a meaningful and relevant co-curriculum, as well as planning, budgeting and evaluation. These trends are impacting the academy because they are existent and growing trends in society. For example, ethnic and cultural groups who were once referred to as minorities are now considered emergent majorities in many large, metropolitan areas. Demographic projections suggest that this ethnic diversity will only increase with time. Cohen & Brawer (1996) note that the adult learner now comprises more than forty percent of the undergraduate population. As more women continue to enter the workforce, moving away from past roles, their presence will continue to be felt in the academy. (Blackmore, 1989). The Americans with Disabilities Act is a legislative solution to opening the doors of the academy for students with physical and learning disabilities. In fact, the burgeoning diversity of our society, defined partially above, is creating a climate of growing opportunity for many groups of people that heretofore have been denied access to higher education. The physicist is still teaching physics, so who will assist in helping both higher education and the incoming students meet these transformational changes?

Dolence and Norris (1995) characterize the changes caused by technology as a shift from the industrial age to the information age and suggest that anything less than transformational change in higher education will simply not suffice. They note that this shift significantly loosens the hold of higher education on the reins of teaching and
learning because it challenges the notion of teaching and learning needing to take place in a specific location at a specific time. In essence, learning becomes boundaryless, and higher education begins to lose the franchise rights. Learners increase their control over how, when, and what they learn. Are student development professionals prepared to co-lead, with faculty, the efforts necessary to respond to these changes? Dolence and Norris state frankly that incremental change won't cut it: higher education transforms or stagnates. How will student development professionals be involved in this level of change?

It seems that transformation -- at its strongest and most profound level -- must permeate all levels, activities, and sectors of higher education if we are to remain relevant. By this I mean that organizations as well as individuals must engage in a process of deep and profound consideration of mission and purpose, and be willing to let go of those practices, ways of thinking, and strategies which will lead to stagnation -- on a personal and organizational level. For if we cannot change to accommodate the needs of society, we cannot serve that society -- which is our act of stewardship and leadership.

So, what would it take for us to lead the way in higher education? I think we must prepare ourselves to think broadly about higher education. Where we serve the academic mission, let us serve faithfully and with excellence. Where we lead, let us lead with vision and passion. Somewhere along the way of our faithfulness, excellence, vision, and passion, we may very well realize that the difference between serving and leading is not so very great -- and we, our institutions, colleagues, and students will have benefited mightily in the process.
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The Multicultural Competence of Resident Assistants in Christian Colleges and Universities

By Dennis A. Sheridan, Ed.D. and Ph.D.; and Hilma Anderson

During the past twenty years America's colleges and universities have widely, if not always enthusiastically, embraced diversity and multiculturalism as desired goals of higher education. The creation of diverse student bodies, diverse faculties, and a more diverse intellectual canon (that incorporates heretofore excluded contributions of historically marginalized peoples) has been viewed as both ends and means in higher education. Diversity has been seen as an end in the sense that historical barriers (erected to exclude persons and their creative work from an equal place in higher education and American society) have continued to collapse, thus providing greater access and opportunity for the historically excluded. Diversity has been seen as a means in the sense that it provides a powerful educational dynamic that benefits everyone -- even the historically included. Considering diverse perspectives, opinions, cultural assumptions, and even approaches to truth requires learners (and teachers) to resolve underlying tensions and contradictions in a way that helps them become better prepared for a complex and diverse world.

Those of us in Christian colleges and universities appear to have a divided mind when it comes to issues of diversity and multiculturalism. Many of us find the ideas of discrimination, isolation, and exclusion to be abhorrent and contradictory to the teachings of Jesus while, at the same time, we cling to an Anglo, western, middle-class, and conservative view of truth and life. On the one hand, we eagerly desire to
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diversify our student bodies and our faculties to demonstrate greater openness and acceptance but, on the other hand, we are often unwilling to change the way we think or behave in relation to those who join our communities of higher education displaying differences in culture, ethnicity, religious tradition, age, sexual orientation, gender, social class, or disability.

In spite of this divided mind, however, Christian colleges and universities continue to seek greater diversity on their campuses. Sometimes the pursuit of diversity is driven by accreditation standards or the competition for prestige. Sometimes the push toward greater diversity is seen as a means to increase enrollment and improve the bottom line. Sometimes the motivation for increased diversity comes from a genuine desire to better serve historically excluded populations in the higher education enterprise. And sometimes, the leaders of our institutions pursue diversity because they see the benefits of diversity for all members of the educational community.

Whatever the motivations may be, the fact that Christian colleges and universities are becoming increasingly diverse is a reality of the new century. At issue is not the presence of diversity but the preparation for diversity. Are Christian colleges and universities prepared to make the necessary changes in attitudes, campus climates, educational practices, and co-curricular programming that will communicate hospitality and inclusion to historically underrepresented populations? The alternative is to preserve a kind of cultural homogeneity within our Christian institutions that views difference as a threat.

The purpose of this article is to explore the issue of multicultural competence in the co-curricular environment of Christian higher education. Of particular interest are the multicultural knowledge, attitudes, and skills of student leaders who are in key positions to work with diverse kinds of students. The multicultural competence of nearly 700 resident assistants from 33 Christian colleges and universities was recently assessed using a new instrument designed specifically for this purpose. The results of that assessment are reported in this article.

Resident assistants (RAs) are typically recognized as key student leaders on most college campuses, and their work is directly related to serving and interacting with residential college students (Winston & Fitch, 1993). Their competence in working successfully with multiple student populations is a reflection of their personal backgrounds, the culture of their college or university, and their preparation and training to serve as resident assistants. On most Christian college and university campuses, resident assistants are particularly important to the implementation of a successful co-curricular program and thus have tremendous influence among their fellow students.

Review of Literature

During the past 30 years there has been growing recognition and concern among those in the helping professions that skilled helpers must be prepared to work with culturally diverse clients. Those in the counseling field led the way with calls for counselors to develop their cross-cultural communication skills (Pedersen, 1988), their own self-awareness of attitudes toward ethnic minorities (Parker & McDavis, 1979),
and their need for increased knowledge about minority populations (Mio, 1989).

In 1993 the American Psychological Association established new ethical guidelines that strongly encouraged psychological professionals to become multiculturally competent (Pope-Davis & Dings, 1994). The multicultural competence encouraged by those guidelines was envisioned as a tripartite construct comprised of multicultural attitudes, knowledge, and skills (Sue, et al., 1982). However, recent empirical research raises questions about the validity of this tripartite construct (Pope & Mueller, 2000). Obviously, much more research is needed in order to develop a stronger theoretical framework for understanding multicultural competence.

In the area of college student affairs there is a growing recognition that student affairs professionals must be prepared and skilled in multicultural issues. Several leaders in the profession have acknowledged the need for the development of these skills and have called for their inclusion in graduate preparation programs (Barr, 1993; Howard-Hamilton & King, 2000; Pope & Reynolds, 1997). Pope and Reynolds (1997) identified multicultural competence as one of the seven general areas of competence for student affairs professionals and went so far as to identify 29 specific characteristics of a multiculturally competent student affairs practitioner.

It is assumed that the development of multicultural competence among student affairs professionals will translate into positive benefits for the diverse undergraduate student bodies we encounter on today's college campuses. Developing multicultural competence should be a goal of both the formal curriculum and the less formal co-curriculum in American higher education. Howard-Hamilton, Richardson, and Shuford (1999) have identified 18 attributes of a culturally competent student that are very helpful in clarifying the desired outcomes of multicultural education with undergraduates. Their model includes three progressive levels of competence (awareness, understanding, and appreciation/valuing) across the three domains of multicultural knowledge, skills, and attitudes (Howard-Hamilton, Richardson, and Shuford, 1999). Hopefully, a multiculturally competent student affairs educator is better prepared to assist undergraduate students in the process of becoming multiculturally competent.

Resident assistants are neither professional staff nor typical students. They are paraprofessionals who are selected for their leadership qualities and are typically given pre-service and in-service training to assist them in being effective in their work with students (Ender & Carranza, 1991). Leaders in the student affairs field have continually called for effective programs to prepare RAs for their work in residence halls (Bowman & Bowman, 1995; Sandeen & Rhatigan, 1990). Twale and Muse (1996) found that the most common elements of RA training programs in liberal arts colleges were crisis intervention, conflict resolution, confrontation skills, safety and security issues, team building, policies and procedures, administrative duties, emergency responses, health topics, interpersonal relations, communication skills, programming, maintenance, knowledge of campus resources, and time and stress management. None of the liberal arts colleges in their study included diversity or multicultural issues in their RA training programs (Twale & Muse, 1996). It appears that multicultural education has not yet emerged as an area of concern for student affairs professionals in liberal arts institutions responsible for training resident assistants.
The Instrument

The Social Response Inventory (SRI) is a 48-item paper and pencil questionnaire designed to measure multicultural competence in American college students. The SRI was developed by Sheridan, Anderson, and Sheridan (2000) in response to the lack of available and meaningful instrumentation to measure multicultural knowledge, attitudes, and skills in undergraduate college students. Each of the 48 items in the inventory poses a social situation to which participants are asked to respond using a seven-point semantic differential scale. The responses offered at the ends of each seven-point scale are designed to provide extreme and opposite possible reactions in that situation. One of the answers is considered to be the "competent" answer and the other is not.

The SRI examines three domains of multicultural competence consistent with the tripartite model proposed by Pope and Reynolds (1997) -- knowledge, attitudes, and skills. There are 16 questions for each of these domains among the 48 items of the instrument. Eight types of diversity are also explored by the instrument, including ethnicity, nationality, religion, gender, age, sexual orientation, disability, and social class. There are six questions related to each of these types of diversity.

As an example of the kinds of situations posed on the SRI, the following item is taken from the inventory and examines students' attitudes about gender:

If a female voice announced on your airplane, 'This is your captain speaking,' you are likely to react with a feeling of ...

Confidence 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Anxiety

By choosing a "1" on the scale a student indicates a positive attitude toward a woman in a typically male-dominated career (airline pilots). A "7" would be an indication of a negative or stereotypical attitude toward women in this career field. By using a seven-point scale, students are given the opportunity to place themselves somewhere between the two extreme answers. This particular item is an example of one of the 16 items that measures multicultural attitudes. It is also one of the six items related to gender.

Initial field-testing of the SRI with approximately 1500 college students produced a Cronbach's alpha of .82 for the 48-item scale indicating rather strong internal reliability for the total scale. It was hoped that the subscales of the SRI (the three domains of knowledge, attitudes, and skills or the eight types of diversity) would be discreet enough and strong enough to be used as scores in their own right. However, internal reliability analysis and factor analysis do not support the use of subscales at this time. In the current research, the SRI has been used as a global measure of multicultural competence.

Given the socially sensitive or "politically correct" nature of the topic of multicultural competence, steps were taken to minimize the potential effects of social desirability. First, half of the items on the SRI are written so that the lowest number on the
scale ("1") reflected the multicultural competent answer (as in the example above). For the other 24 items, the highest number on the scale ("7") is the multicultural competent answer. Second, neither the title of the instrument nor the instructions for completing it explicitly reveal that the instrument is designed to measure multicultural competence. Students are told only that the instrument examines the many possible responses people have when faced with social situations involving those who are different from themselves in some way. Third, 20 items from the Crowne-Marlowe Social Desirability Scale (1960) are included on the instrument. The 20 true-false questions of this scale provide an indicator of a student’s inclination to answer questions in a socially desirable fashion. The Crowne-Marlowe scale is a widely accepted measure of social desirability.

For reporting purposes, the scores for the Social Response Inventory and the Crowne-Marlowe Social Desirability Scale have been standardized. For the SRI, the national mean (based on nearly 1500 cases) has been normed at 100 with a standard deviation of 10. For the Crowne-Marlowe Social Desirability Scale, the national mean has been normed at 50 with a standard deviation of 10.

The Sample

In November 2000 an invitation was sent through the email listserve of the Association of Christians in Student Development (ACSD) inviting members to participate in this survey of resident assistants. Individuals from 44 institutions expressed an interest in the study and asked for questionnaires. Completed questionnaires were received from 33 of the 44 institutions. Collectively, these 33 institutions had 1,038 resident assistants. A total of 695 completed questionnaires were returned for a response rate of 67%. Roughly half of the institutions (17) had response rates above 75%. Only eight institutions had response rates under 50%.

The SRIs were distributed and completed in a variety of settings. Some were completed during a weekly staff meeting or a classroom setting; others were distributed to resident assistants for return at a later time. All students were given (or had read to them) an explanation of the study, the associated benefits and risks of participating, a statement of the voluntary nature of the study, and contact information for any questions about this research.

Of the 695 students in the sample, the majority were female (57%) and white (89%). Only 7.5% of the participating resident assistants reported having a disability. The group is clearly middle-class with roughly one-fourth of the resident assistants falling in each of these family income categories: under $40,000 per year (27%), $40,000 to $60,000 per year (26%), $60,000 to $80,000 per year (22%), and above $80,000 per year (25%). The mean reported family income was interpolated to be about $62,000 per year.

These RAs are fairly typical of resident assistants in Christian colleges and universities. The average age was 20.9 years, and 80% were junior and seniors. Politically, the participants are decidedly conservative with nearly three-fourths (73%) identifying themselves as either "conservative" or "far right." The remaining quarter
(27%) of the students preferred the designation of "middle of the road." Fewer than 1% of the students described themselves as "liberal."

Although these RAs attend Christian colleges and universities, many of which are denominationally affiliated, the majority of the RAs in the study identify their religious tradition as either "Nondenominational" (27%) or "Other Christian" (27%). Of the denominational affiliations provided, the largest group of students identified themselves as Baptist (22%). The remaining students were widely distributed among many denominations with meaningful numbers found only among those who identified themselves as Methodists (8%), Presbyterians (5%), and Roman Catholics (4%).

**Major Findings**

Among the 695 RAs in this study, the mean standardized SRI score was 97.9 with a standard deviation of 8.63. This is slightly below the normative mean of 100, based on a larger national sample of nearly 1500 college students from many different kinds of institutions. Scores ranged from a low of 72 to a high of 122 among the RAs. The distribution of scores is displayed in Table 1.
Comparisons with National Norms. The SRI scores from the sample of 695 RAs were compared with national normative data using a one-sample t-test. This comparison shows that the RAs scored slightly lower (though statistically significant) than the national norm of 100 on multicultural competence. Social Desirability scores were also compared with the national norm of 50 using a one-sample t-test. This comparison revealed that the RAs scored significantly lower than the national average on social desirability. While the first comparison may indicate that the RAs are less multicultural competent than those in the national normative group, the second comparison indicates that they are also less likely to answer questions on the questionnaire in a socially desirable way. In other words, they are more likely to be honest when answering questions on the questionnaire. These comparisons are displayed in Table Two.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>RA Mean</th>
<th>RA SD</th>
<th>National Mean</th>
<th>National SD</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>t-Score</th>
<th>p-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SRI Scores</td>
<td>97.86</td>
<td>8.63</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>-2.14</td>
<td>-6.55</td>
<td>&lt;.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Desir.</td>
<td>49.01</td>
<td>9.79</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>-.99</td>
<td>-2.64</td>
<td>.008*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparisons Among Resident Assistants. Differences were found among the 695 RAs on SRI scores based on sex and political orientation. Female RAs scored slightly higher than males (t = 4.42; p < .001) and politically middle-of-the-road RAs score higher than those who consider themselves politically conservative (t = 7.25; p <.001). No significant differences were found in mean SRI scores among RAs based on their class in school, their family income, or their age. These findings are found in Table Three:
Table Three
Comparison of SRI Scores Among Resident Assistants
(N = 695)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>t-Score</th>
<th>p-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>By Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males (N = 291)</td>
<td>96.24</td>
<td>8.39</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>&lt;.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females (N = 379)</td>
<td>99.16</td>
<td>8.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>By Political Orientation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle of the Road (N = 168)</td>
<td>101.90</td>
<td>9.22</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>&lt;.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative (N = 458)</td>
<td>96.46</td>
<td>7.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*statistically significant

Predictors of Multicultural Competence. A hierarchical stepwise multiple regression analysis was performed to identify the significant predictors of multicultural competence for the resident assistants in the sample. Social desirability was entered into the equation in the first block in order to control for its effects in subsequent steps of the analysis. The second block of variables included sex, ethnicity (white and non-white), classification (freshman through senior), family income, disability status, age, and political orientation. Social desirability was shown to be a significant predictor of SRI scores (\(b = .22\)), indicating that the total scores are somewhat affected by the inclination of some participants to provide what they may perceive to be socially desirable answers. Once social desirability is controlled, however, three additional variables entered the stepwise multiple regression equation as significant predictors of multicultural competence. These predictors include political orientation (\(b = -.27\)), sex (\(b = .16\)), and family income (\(b = -.11\)).

As was described earlier, politically conservative students are less likely to score as high on the SRI as are students who classify themselves as politically middle-of-the-road. Female students are likely to score higher on the SRI than males. Family income appears to be negatively correlated with multicultural competence, meaning that SRI scores tend to decline as family income increases. Collectively, these four predictor variables account for approximately 15% of the total variance in SRI scores. Age, ethnicity, disability status, and classification in school were not significantly related to SRI scores. The findings of the stepwise multiple regression analysis are shown in Table Four.
## Table Four

**Predictors of Multicultural Competence in Resident Assistants in Christian Colleges and Universities**

\((N = 695)\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables Entering at Step</th>
<th>Beta(^1) After Step</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Social Desirability</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Political Orientation</td>
<td>-.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Sex</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Family Income</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables Not in the Equation</th>
<th>(r)</th>
<th>(R^2)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity = white</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classification</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Beta is the term used in multiple regression analysis for a standardized regression coefficient. The reader may think of these scores as correlations.

### Comparisons Among Schools

SRI scores were compared among the RAs in 17 of the participating Christian colleges and universities. The schools used in this comparison had a minimum of 10 participating RAs and at least a 75% participation rate in the survey. A one-way analysis of variance indicated that there are significant differences among these 17 institutions \((F = 3.61; p < .001)\). However, comparisons between individual schools will not be reported here. The results are shown in Table Five with schools grouped by region and mean SRI scores given in descending order.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College or University</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>East (2 Institutions)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College A</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>100.6</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College B</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>96.8</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South (4 Institutions)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College A</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>102.6</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College B</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College C</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>96.1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College D</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>94.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Midwest (9 Institutions)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College A</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>106.2</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College B</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>100.1</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College C</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>98.3</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College D</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>97.6</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College E</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>97.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College F</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>97.5</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College G</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>96.3</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College H</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>94.9</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College J</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>94.4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>West (2 Institutions)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College A</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>99.2</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College B</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>98.2</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (17 Institutions)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAs in 17 Selected Schools</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>98.3</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Sample</td>
<td>1489</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAs in 17 Sel. Schools</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>98.3</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Sample</td>
<td>1489</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comparison with Social Work Majors. Since the SRI is still being field-tested, there are few identifiable undergraduate populations with whom to compare these Christian college resident assistants. However, one sample of approximately 200 social work majors in public and private secular colleges and universities provides an opportunity for comparing the resident assistant SRI scores. An independent-samples t-test was performed comparing the SRI scores of these two groups revealing that social work majors scored significantly higher on the SRI than did the RAs in Christian colleges. This comparison is displayed in Table Six.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table Six</th>
<th>Comparison of RAs and Social Work Majors on SRI Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA SRI Scores (N=695)</td>
<td>97.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work SRI Scores (N = 212)</td>
<td>107.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*statistically significant

Qualitative Data. The SRI contains a single open-ended question that produced limited qualitative data for analysis. This question simply asks students to share any thoughts, feelings, or reactions they had while completing the questionnaire. Approximately 25% of the participants wrote something in the space that was provided, though most of the comments were very brief. These comments were transcribed into a separate data file and analyzed for themes. This analysis of qualitative data produced four distinct themes.

First, many students were highly critical of the Social Desirability Scale. To many students, these 20 true-false items appeared to be out of place and unrelated to the rest of the study. This was typical of the comments about these items:

*The true-false statements were quite absolute and I had a hard time answering them. I felt uncomfortable answering them because they were very negative.*

From the perspective of the students, it is easy to understand their suspicion and concern about these items. In fact, one student very blatantly wrote in the margins, "What is this, an honesty test?" While he was pretty close to the truth, such a disclo-
sure on the instrument would invalidate its usefulness. Since the Crowne-Marlowe Social Desirability Scale (1960) has been widely and successfully used for 40 years, it serves a very useful measure of social desirability and is very relevant to the purpose in this particular research.

Secondly, a number of comments could be categorized as criticisms of the SRI itself. Some students were critical of a particular item; others were critical of the entire framework of the questionnaire. For example, one student wrote:

*I don't really understand what methods are being used to measure here.*  
*Most of the question responses will vary greatly in differing situations, so it is hard to answer them positively.*

Another student wrote:

*This is very controversial; I would rather explain my reasonings.*

And another said:

*I think these questions are very vague. There are too many factors involved in many of the questions to answer decisively. Number 40 is completely disgusting. My thoughts on most of these questions are why should I care?*

Some of the critical comments about the construction of the SRI are simply the result of not understanding the process of social research methodology. Comments from students implying that they simply "don't care" about these issues are discouraging. All of the feedback provided by these students, however, will be very useful in future revisions of the SRI.

Thirdly, students had very strong reactions to the items on the questionnaire related to homosexuality. Though some students expressed concern that there was an "overemphasis on homosexuality," there were, in fact, an equal number of items devoted to each of the eight types of diversity included in the instrument. As conservative Christians, most of the RAs who commented on the issue of homosexuality wanted to express their desire to be accepting of people while not accepting of their behavior. As one student expressed:

*Several questions about gays were difficult to answer. Due to my religious beliefs, I think it is not an acceptable lifestyle. However, I treat all people with the respect they deserve and do not discriminate.*

Another wrote:

*Homosexuality issues are quite different than ethnic, racial, gender, handicapped and age issues. Certain groups believe that whereas no specific*
'good' or 'bad' value should be attributed to say, male or female, homosexuality is an immoral, disruptive, and hurtful lifestyle.

Another student tried to express the tension between her views of homosexuality and her desire to relate positively to those who are homosexual:

There are a lot of questions about homosexuality. I believe it is wrong and don't support it but I also will not be prejudiced, ignore, or not relate with these people in a positive way.

There is no question that issues of homosexuality on a Christian college campus are controversial. These students obviously struggle with the difficulty of reconciling competing theological and biblical understandings of loving others on the one hand without supporting and promoting a lifestyle they consider sinful on the other.

Finally, there were many students who felt challenged by the questionnaire to explore these issues more thoroughly and to examine their own multicultural competence. As one student admitted:

I do not dislike other cultures, but in many ways I am very ethnically ignorant. I do not have problems with people who are disabled, but again I am ignorant. Ignorant may not be as good a word as unexposed. I think I would laugh at an ethnic joke just to be part of the group. I know that's horrible.

Another shared these thoughts:

Unfortunately, I hated to answer some of these the way I did. But that's the way I've been brought up. Maybe it's time to start seeing and learning for myself. It's hard to realize that the world I live in is sometimes existed in blindly.

One student was particularly complimentary of the SRI:

It was good to be able to meditate and reflect on my knowledge, understandings, and views. This well-rounded group of questions helped me to do that.

It is very encouraging to see that the instrument has a potential benefit in helping students ask important questions about themselves, their values, and their cultural assumptions. Many of these participants are traditional-aged students who are deeply involved in the process of identity formation. The varied comments on the questionnaire are a reflection of students who are in many different phases of this process. Many are simply not yet developmentally and emotionally ready to examine themselves on these issues. Others find participating in this experience is enriching and gives voice to their views on issues that are becoming increasingly important to them.
Conclusions and Recommendations

Since the Social Response Inventory is still undergoing development and revision, care must be given in interpreting these findings. While the evidence is growing that the SRI is a meaningful tool for measuring multicultural competence, the conclusions reached as a result of this research should be measured and considered somewhat tentative. There is evidence, however, to suggest that resident assistants in Christian colleges and universities are less prepared for dealing with differences than are other students who comprise the national sample of 1500 students who have taken the SRI to date, particularly when they are compared with social work majors. Since social work majors are exposed to a formal curriculum that specifically prepares them for work with many client populations, it may be helpful to consider elements of the social work curriculum in pre-service and in-service RA training programs.

As an assessment tool, the Social Response Inventory holds great promise for the future. First, the instrument could be used as a pre-test and post-test measure for evaluating the effectiveness of educational programs designed to enhance students' multicultural competence. Second, the SRI could be useful as a teaching tool to generate discussion about multicultural issues. Rarely do students complete the instrument without having their thoughts and emotions engaged with the subject of multiculturalism. If well managed, these feelings could be channeled into a rich dialogue as students and student affairs professionals engage one another in meaningful interaction about the Christian response to difference, both interpersonally and institutionally. Finally, the SRI could be used in program evaluation to compare the multicultural competence of RAs in one institution with those in other institutions or with national data, much as has been done in this study. As the national SRI database grows, multiple kinds of comparisons will be available.

Those responsible for RA training programs should seriously consider the inclusion of multicultural education as an element of both pre-service and in-service training programs. There is evidence from this research to suggest that male RAs are less prepared for working with diverse kinds of students than are female RAs and that more affluent RAs are less prepared for diversity than are less affluent RAs. Collectively, these findings suggest that most, if not all, RAs could benefit from a training curriculum that specifically addresses the knowledge base, the values and attitudes, and the skills necessary to work with students of diverse backgrounds.

Increasingly, those in the student affairs profession are coming to recognize that multicultural competence is an essential skill for those who desire to be effective co-curricular educators. Likewise, resident assistants, as paraprofessional staff, need enhanced skills in working with individual students and student groups who are culturally different in some way. Everyone will not agree on the content of such multicultural education; the topic is filled with potential conflict. Rarely do people engage in serious dialogue about multicultural knowledge, attitudes, and skills without emo-
The Multicultural Competence of Resident Assistants

...tions becoming aroused. However, there are marginalized students in our Christian colleges and universities who will never feel that they are truly a part of the community until the leadership of the institutions, both professional and paraprofessional, demonstrates the hospitality that results from multicultural competence. This topic must be added to our common agenda. May the conversations begin.
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The Effects of a Study Abroad/Mission Trip on the Faith Development of College Students

By Stephen T. Beers, Ed.D.

College frames the critical years of development within a person's life span (Astin, 1978; Chickering, 1969). There are transformational changes that occur within the college student during the college experience (Astin, 1978). These changes are illustrated by the evolutionary and revolutionary adaptations taking place among the diverse and unique facets of each individual.

There are more than 4,000 higher educational institutions in the United States of America. Approximately 100 of them are members of a non-profit organization called the Council for Christian Colleges and Universities (CCCU), formerly known as the Coalition for Christian Colleges and Universities. A CCCU college or university is similar in many ways to the other 4,000-plus higher education institutions in the United States of America. A major outcome goal of these 100-plus institutions is the integration of the students' faith and learning.

Membership criteria for colleges and universities in the CCCU include "an institutional mission based upon the centrality of Jesus Christ and evidence of how faith is integrated with the institutions' academic and student life programs" (CCCU, 1998, p.6). This focus on faith development integration is also evident from a list of "common reasons" why students attend a CCCU institution (CCCU, 1998, p.7). The way each institution incorporates faith development opportunities into the students' experience and the specific Christian tradition with which these faith development opportunities are aligned are as unique as the institutions themselves.

The interest in and importance of faith development is seen in the prominent

*Stephen T. Beers, Ed.D., is the Vice President for Student Development at John Brown University in Siloam Springs, Arkansas.*
roles that the supernatural, organized religion, and theology play in recorded history. However, not until the last thirty years has the scientific research community begun to examine faith development as a serious research topic. Faith development theorists and researchers focused their studies on three major areas: 1) the description of faith in a stage development paradigm; 2) the developmental transitions of faith; and 3) the core dimensions of faith development.

One of the most prominent faith development stage theorists is James Fowler. Fowler states that the development of faith is linear and can be categorized in six stages. Fowler’s six stages culminate in a “universalizing faith” (Fowler, 1984). Sharon Parks, another faith development stage theorist, utilizes the theoretical framework of Fowler’s stages. She focuses her attention on the faith development of college students (Parks, 1986).

A less-prominent but important stage theorist is V. Bailey Gillespie. He suggests a model that roughly correlates with the person’s life cycle: 1) borrowed faith (early childhood); 2) reflected faith (middle childhood); 3) personalized faith (early adolescence); 4) established faith (later youth); 5) reordered faith (young adults); 6) reflective faith (middle adults); and 7) resolute faith (older adults) (Gillespie, 1988).

John Westerhoff proposes four general faith stages: 1) experienced; 2) affiliated; 3) searching; and 4) owned (Litchfield, 1995). Westerhoff’s model provides a simple outline for the faith development process. This stage model can be utilized to describe faith development in its micro movements (changes within each stage) and macro movements (changes from stage to stage within a lifetime).

Taking a different approach to faith development theory is James Loder. His research focus is on the transitions within faith rather than on the actual stages that a person might grow through. Loder (1982) believes that an individual’s faith develops during a crisis situation. He titles his theory as the "Transforming moment." The "Transforming moment" consists of five steps: 1) contradiction; 2) interlude for scanning; 3) constructive act of imagination; 4) opening; and 5) reinterpretation (Loder & Fowler, 1982). An example of this "Transforming moment" might occur when a college student finds out that her father has died of cancer. She may experience a contradiction in faith as she attempts to understand how a "loving God" could allow her father to die so early in life. It is through both this mental wrestling process and the reinterpretation process that her faith is eventually transformed.

A third focus in faith development research, the study of the core dimensions of faith development, is seen in Peter Benson and Carolyn Eklin’s research. They state that based on interviews with theological scholars and denominational executives, open-ended surveys of several hundred adults from the six participating denominations, and reviews of the literature in psychology and religion, we posited that a person of mature faith integrates eight core dimensions of faith (Benson & Eklin, 1990, p. 10).
Benson and Eklin then collapse the eight core dimensions into two overall themes: 1) *vertical* and 2) *horizontal*. The eight core dimensions were studied and representative indicators of a maturing faith were developed for each.

Cutting across the three areas of study listed above, and of particular interest to the present study, is the research project titled *Faith Development in the Adult Life Cycle*. In this project, Kenneth Stokes (Stokes, 1986, as cited in Vanlue, 1996) provides insight into the development of faith among adults. The study found that:

- Crisis experiences, both positive and negative, appear to be the major factor in the stimulation of faith development.
- The young adult years and middle-life are times of particular ferment and often rethinking of one's faith structures.
- Involvement with social issues and concerns appears to enhance faith development.
- A balance between the "cognitive" and the "affective" dimensions of one's faith development is highly important.
- Non-traditional forms of education often lead to greater maturity in one's faith development (Stokes, 1986, as cited in Vanlue, 1996, p. 133).

In summary, Stoke's findings include: 1) appropriately managed "crisis experience;" 2) sensitivity to a balance between the "cognitive" and "affective" dimensions of one's faith; 3) opportunities for involvement with social issues; and 4) utilization of non-traditional forms of education. These aspects are critical aspects of the development of faith.

Additional support for Stoke's findings comes from Gillespie's work. Gillespie suggests that Christian faith development programs for individuals in the college-age period need to include at least six areas of focus. The first focus is to develop in the student an understanding and acceptance of religious values and attitudes.

The second focus involves the student grappling with the nature of the church (defined as the Christian community). The third focus involves connecting the secular world's prominent issues with the student's faith. Fourth, there needs to be an invitation for the student to participate in the kingdom of God (the kingdom of God is defined as the spiritual or supernatural aspects of reality that is in concert with God's volitional will). The last two areas are the need for the program to be permeated by the "spiritual" and the need for the program to nurture the student's ability to grasp abstract religious concepts (Gillespie, 1988).

One example of a non-traditional educational program which focuses on the students' faith development and that utilizes the principle components of the research cited is a Study Abroad/Mission (SAM) Trip. A SAM trip consists of a student's exposure to the host culture (geography, climate, economics), and also includes instrumental exposure and participation in a ministry experience such as community development, labor with or for the poor, acts of mercy, evangelism, and/or discipleship. The SAM experience combines the student's engagement or participation in service to the
world with intentional spiritual reflection. As well as providing the student the time and the tools to reflect and process the specific SAM experiences in terms of social and faith development. Many of the CCCU institutions utilize this educational format. One particular SAM program, titled "Lighthouse," operates out of Taylor University, a Christian university and a member of the CCCU. The stated objectives of the "Lighthouse" program are to:

- Expose students to cultures outside of their own backgrounds
- Provide global orientation
- Help students see the individual subject matter from the perspective of the host culture
- Help students become accepting of cultures other than their own
- Provide exposure to the host culture's perception of world issues
- Help students recognize the interdependence of human beings despite cultural differences
- Provide students the opportunity to test experientially the truth claims of their Christian worldview
- Provide students the opportunity for servant-learning by submitting to host missionaries and national leaders
- Help students develop a hands-on awareness of the host country's economic, social, educational, geographical, governmental, and religious distinctive
- Provide students with an exposure to mission organizations for possible future involvement

The program utilizes traditional and non-traditional forms of education. One non-traditional method of education used by the Lighthouse program is placing students into a foreign culture and requiring specific interaction with the local community. This exposure consists of living and working within the host community. A specific example of this is living in or near a remote African village (on a Non-government Organization [NGO] compound). In this location the students might work with nationals in building an orphanage, aiding in a local medical clinic, or teaching local children at the elementary school. This "experience" (e.g., involvement with local people concerning specific social issues) coupled with regular times of related reading, reflection, and discussion, provides the opportunity for a balance of "cognitive" and "affective."

An article published in the December 12, 1997 issue of The Chronicle of Higher Education stated that during the 1995-96 academic year, almost 90,000 U.S. students participated in international study abroad programs (an increase of 5.7% over the previous year). There were 2,371 programs administered in 80 countries, more than double the number in the previous year, as recorded in The Institute of International Education Directory for 1996-97.

The proliferation of study abroad trips (and in particular, study abroad trips with a mission emphasis) has not been accompanied by indicative research evidence to support the underlying assumptions of the programs. This research problem is not
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unique to international educational mission experiences. This problem, lack of research concerning institutional stated goals, plagues all institutions of higher education (Gardiner, 1998).

Purpose of the Research

In the field of post-secondary education, there is a lack of research on matters of faith development. There are a number of studies on value and moral development (e.g., Terenzini, 1995; Colby, 1995) and character development (e.g., Kuh, 1997), but there remains a lack of research concerning college students' faith development. In particular, the author found only one research study on assessing Christian College students' faith development specific to such programs as SAM trips.

The purpose of this study was to provide reliable research findings concerning the relationship between the faith development of Christian college students and their involvement in a SAM program. This study was conducted with Christian college students who attended a one-month SAM trip in January 1999 during their college experience. The report also provides comparative information about the faith development of students who attended a SAM trip and the faith development of similar students who took a class "on campus" (OC) during the same time period.

Research Questions

This study answers the following questions: (1) What is the impact of a one-month study abroad mission trip sponsored by a Christian university on Christian college students' faith development as measured by the Faith Maturity Scale (FMS) (Benson, Donahue, & Erickson, 1993), the Growth in Mature Faith Index (GMFI) (Benson & Eklin, 1990), and a qualitative survey? (2) How does the study abroad/mission student's faith development compare with that of students who take classes on campus for the same time period?

METHODOLOGY

Population and Sample

The sample of students for this study came from the greater student population at Taylor University in Upland, Indiana. Established in 1846, Taylor now boasts an enrollment of more than 2,400 undergraduate students divided between its two campuses in northeastern Indiana. Taylor's mission indicates, as part of its institutional goal, a commitment to the development of the student's faith or spiritual development (Taylor University Catalogue, 1998).

There were a total of 171 students taking part in the study. All were involved in one of two Taylor sponsored educational experiences over the month of January 1999 (J-Term 1999): 1) a study abroad/mission (SAM) trip (total number of SAM students = 72 completed surveys of the 75 in attendance); 2) a class that met "on campus"
(OC) during the same January term (total number of OC students = 99). The instructors for the SAM trip as well as the OC classes were Taylor University faculty.

The SAM trips included all of the five trips sponsored by the university's "Lighthouse" program. The SAM students participated in a trip to Ghana West Africa, The Bahamas, India, Venezuela, or Australia. The total number of Taylor student participants in the Lighthouse SAM trips for 1999 was 75.

The OC classes surveyed met on campus during the January term with enrollment totaling 99 students. The OC courses included two psychology classes (Ethics in Psychology and Child Psychology) and one Bible class (Biblical Literature I).

The students who participate in SAM trips go through an application process and are chosen from an applicant pool of current Taylor students. Lighthouse trip acceptance criteria is based largely on age, gender equity of team, application references, and usability of the student's major in the field. Acceptance rates for all of the SAM trips are approximately 80%. The students who attend the SAM trip generally raise money from friends and family to participate in the program (trip costs ranged from $1,700 to $3,000).

Instrument Description

The Faith Maturity Scale (FMS) survey is a 38 item self-reporting survey developed to study faith maturity among six "mainline" Protestant denominations. Benson, Donahue, and Erickson (1993) posited that a person of mature faith integrates eight core dimensions of faith. They are:

1. Trusts in God's saving grace and believes firmly in the humanity and divinity of Jesus.
2. Experiences a sense of personal well-being, security, and peace.
3. Integrates faith and life, seeing work, family, social relationships, and political choices as part of one's religious life.
4. Seeks spiritual growth through study, reflection, prayer, and discussion with others.
5. Seeks to be a part of a community of believers in which people give witness to their faith and support and nourish one another.
6. Holds life-affirming values, including commitment to racial and gender equality, affirmation of cultural and religious diversity, and a personal sense of responsibility for the welfare of others.
7. Advocates social and global change to bring about greater social justice.
8. Serves humanity, consistently and passionately, through acts of love and justice (p. 6).

The eight core dimensions were studied and representative indicators of a
maturing faith were developed through the 38 questions. The researchers then collapsed the eight core dimensions into two overall themes: 1) *vertical* and 2) *horizontal*. The two scales taken together provide the researcher a pattern or "faith type" as defined by Benson, Donahue, and Erickson (1993). The four types of faith are *undeveloped, vertical faith, horizontal faith, and integrated faith*.

The questions in the inventory have been constructed to assess different aspects of spiritual maturity. The survey uses a seven-point Likert scale with the following values assigned to the response: 1= never true; 2= rarely true; 3= true once in a while; 4= sometimes true; 5= often true; 6= almost always true; and 7= always true.

The author also included eight demographic questions to provide additional insight into the research data. These eight questions reference the individual's gender, religious and denominational affiliation, religious commitment, and year in school.

The internal consistency reliability of the FMS survey ranges from .85 to .89 when testing specifically for faith maturity. When testing specifically for the *vertical* dimension, reliability ranges from .86 to .88. When testing specifically for the *horizontal* dimension, the reliability ranges from .82 to .85.

The *Growth in Mature Faith Index* is based upon the same foundational assumptions as the FMS, but its purpose is to collect self-assessment data for growth (maturation) in faith over the past two to three years. The students chose from weighted answers placed on a five-point Likert scale. The answers are: 1= much less than now; 2= somewhat less now; 3= about the same as 2 or 3 years ago; 4= somewhat greater than now; and 5= much greater than now. Internal consistency reliability data for the GMFI ranges from .85 to .88.

The students who participated in the SAM trip were also surveyed with a qualitative assessment tool. The survey asked the students to evaluate their experience. The survey included six questions with question number six comprised of three parts. The questions are:

1. The thing I liked best about my missions project was...
2. The thing that made my missions project most unpleasant was...
3. The most significant lesson God taught me was...
4. The area in my life where I saw the greatest change was...
5. My host country personnel helped me understand...
6. List three concise ways the Lighthouse objectives were realized:
   A. Interpersonal growth:
   B. Cross-cultural education:
   C. Mission outreach:

**Data Collection Methods**

The *Faith Questionnaire* (FQ) (a compilation of the *Faith Maturity Scale* [FMS] and the *Growth in Mature Faith Index* [GMFI]) was given was given to the SAM participants at the final team meeting during finals week of the fall semester, two
weeks prior to the SAM trip. For the students who were on campus, the first FQ was distributed during the second class period of the January term. The SAM participants were post-tested with the FQ questionnaire and the qualitative survey during a meeting within two weeks after the completion of the trip. The OC students were post-tested on the Wednesday of the last week of the January term.

The third assessment tool was a qualitative survey that was used to assess the students' perception of their own development. The survey was also utilized to evaluate the program. This survey was given only to the students who were engaged in the SAM trip. Most students made use of a short answer (one to three sentences) format when completing the questions.

Data Analysis

The research project was essentially a quasi-experimental research design, with experimental control attained by homogeneous selection (Merriam & Simpson, 1995). Over 90% of Taylor students are white, over 95% are in the traditional age (17-25). Over 75% come from the top 20% of their high school class and have a high school GPA of 3.5 or better. Taylor University states that 98% of their student body claim to be Christian (Taylor Internal Publication, 1998).

The statistical analyses for assessing change in pre- to post-survey results of the FMS and GMFI were calculated by using a matched pairs t-test analysis. The test compared the FMS mean difference and the GMFI mean difference (pre- to post-) for the SAM students. Testing was also completed with the two sample t-test to test for SAM student's gains against OC student's gains as measured in the FMS and GMFI. Last, specific survey questions that showed significant differences in gains between groups were studied for changes using both the two sample t-test and the matched pairs t-test. Sample sizes were considered large (72>40) and the level of statistical significance was set at \( \alpha = 0.05 \).

The two sample t-test was chosen over the 2X2 ANOVA because there were only two levels of the independent variable (SAM and OC)(Moore, 1995; Vokcell & Asher, 1995). The researcher chose to use a two-sample t-test on the mean differences instead of ANCOVA for two reasons: (1) ANCOVA has the added assumption of parallelism that the two-sample t-test does not have, and (2) there were only two levels of the independent variable (SAM and OC).

A statistical demographic description, using both pre- and post-scores, was provided for each of the sample groups. Additional statistical comparisons were done with pre- and post-scores for individual questions as calculated by the matched pairs t-test. The matched pairs t-test was used because the test provided for specific question to question assessment. The surveys were coded in such a way as to utilize the matched pairs t-test. For those question items that show a significant shift from the pre- to post-test, the researcher provided additional focus.
RESULTS

General Demographic

The return rate for both the pre- and post-survey for the SAM participants was 83.3% and the OC group return rate was 87.9%.

Age

The ages for the 147 respondents to this question ranged from 17 to 21 years, with the mean age at 19.4 and a mode age of 20. The mean and mode age for the SAM students was approximately 20 years old, while the OC students' mean and mode age was 19 years old.

Gender

The gender breakdown for the study population was 43% male and 57% female. The SAM group was a little more balanced with 45% male and 55% female, and the OC group gender ratio was 41% female and 59% male. The SAM group ratios were more consistent with the university's current population gender ratio at 46% male and 54% female for the 1998-99 school year. Gender equality for the SAM group was adjusted by the selection process because gender equality for each trip was a priority.

Religious Affiliation

There were 19 religious denominations listed from which students could choose to represent their religious preference. Twenty-nine percent listed "independent" and an additional 29% were a compilation of American Baptist, Methodist, and Presbyterian.

Faith Commitment

The first four questions of the survey dealt with the faith commitment of the student. A total of 96.4% of the students on the pre-survey stated that they were born again. Three percent stated that they were not, and one individual stated that he or she was not sure. All the "not" or "not sure" responses were within the OC group.

Question two asked students who were born again to list the length of time they had been born again. Forty-three percent of the born again students stated that they had been so for 11-15 years. Another 23% stated that they had become born again at least 16 years ago. Four percent of the students stated that they had become born again within the last three years.

Question five asked the students to describe their personal belief concerning a core orthodox Christian doctrine (i.e., the deity of Jesus Christ). The majority (98-100%) of the student responses fall in line with orthodox theology, evangelical theol-
ogy, and the accepted theology of Taylor University. These theologies define Jesus as God and personal savior of those individuals who respond to His invitation.

**Research Question Number One**

The first research question was, "What is the impact of a one-month study abroad/mission trip sponsored by a Christian university on a Christian college student's faith development as measured by the Faith Maturity Scale (FMS) and the Growth in Mature Faith Index (GMFI)?" Research question one assessed the growth in faith development of the SAM students from before they went on the SAM trip to after the trip.

**FMS Scores and Testing Results Related to Research Question One**

The SAM students' pre-trip score on the FMS was 5.06 with 59 students completing both pre- and post-surveys. The mean difference between the pre- and post-survey scores for the SAM students' FMS was 0.1056. The p-value was 0.07709 for the sample size of 59. There was an increase in the mean difference between the pre- and post-trip scores, but the increase was not significant at the $a = 0.05$ level.

**GMFI Scores and Testing Results Related to Research Question One**

The pre-trip SAM survey score for GMFI was 3.17 and the post-score was 3.20, with 58 students completing the survey. There was an increase in the pre- to post-GMFI test score with a mean difference of 0.028. Statistical analysis for the GMFI was calculated using the matched pairs t-test for mean differences. The p-value was 0.42637. This is not significant at the $a = 0.05$ level.

Also, while SAM students' GMFI survey scores did not significantly increase, the OC students' GMFI scores actually decreased, although not at the statistically significant level.

**Qualitative Survey Results for SAM Students**

In addition to the two quantitative surveys, the researcher surveyed the SAM students with a qualitative survey. The answers the 68 SAM students provided ranged from 10 to 40 different responses per question.

**Qualitative Question One**

Question one of the qualitative survey asked the students what they liked best on the trip. Twenty of the respondents (30%) stated that working with other team members was most enjoyable, followed by building relationships with people of a different culture with sixteen responses (24%). The third and fourth ranked responses were similar: working with children had eight responses, and building relationships with people and team members had six responses (total percentage for the third and
fourth responses was 21%). The next answer was "being able to reach out to the lost" with five responses. The top four answers (75%) are similar in that they have the core aspect of building relationships (horizontal aspect of faith).

**Qualitative Question Two**

The second question asked of the students was, "What was the thing that made my mission project most unpleasant?" The students stated that tensions and frustrations within the group were most prevalent (eleven responses or 17%). Five students stated that nothing was unpleasant and another five stated that they found health problems to be the most bothersome. The next two most frequent responses were lack of follow-up with the nationals with whom they came in contact, and that the students felt they were never sure what they were doing each day (each with four responses). Each of the next five responses was written by three students each: 1) seeing poverty and "unreached" people; 2) overcrowded vans; 3) having to leave; 4) trip was too short or inability to adapt to the local culture; and 5) fellow students' attitudes.

**Qualitative Question Three**

Question three was "The most significant lesson God taught me was . . . " Twelve students (18%) stated that they learned they must trust God for everything. Six students (9%) stated that they better understood their own significance and how they needed to be available to be used by God. Four students stated that they better understood that God has a plan for everything, and another four students felt they learned that ministry is not something that individuals are "called" into but instead ministry should be a part of everyday life. "Learning patience when I can't see the end results" was the response of four of the students.

**Qualitative Question Four**

Question four asked the students to report the area of their lives that saw the greatest change. Over 25% suggested that they saw the greatest change in their relationship to Christ (vertical development). From that 25%, ten students (14%) listed a new found boldness for Christ and seven students (11%) stated that the experience helped develop their personal relationship with Christ. There were additional responses related to the students' relationship with God, (e.g., learning not to limit God and the betterment of their own prayer life).

Eight students (11%) stated that they had a better understanding of the uselessness of material things. Six students (9%) stated that they learned how to understand and look for the good in others. Other responses related to the students' call to serve other people (e.g., perspective about missions and learning how to evangelize).

**Qualitative Question Five**
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Question five asks the student what their host country personnel helped them understand. Fifty-four percent of the students (thirty five responses) stated that the host personnel helped them understand the culture and the people of the country. The second most common response (4) was "I do not need much (in terms of material things) to be joyful in Christ."

Qualitative Question Six

The sixth and final question from the qualitative survey asked the student to list concisely the ways that the Lighthouse objectives were realized. The question was divided into three parts: interpersonal, cross-cultural, and mission outreach.

Interpersonal growth

In the interpersonal portion of the question, close to 40% of the students stated that the "team bonding" and the "development of relationships with the nationals and those on the trip" were critical parts of the experience. There were also eight students who listed that they had grown in their personal relationship with Christ, and another five indicated that they learned more of "who they are."

Cross-cultural education

The second part of this question related to the SAM trip objectives of "exposing the students to cross-cultural experiences" and helping "students become more accepting of cultures other than their own." The students overwhelmingly stated (75%) that the SAM trip goal was reached through the exposure to the host culture by the host nationals. The other responses also related to aspects of exposure to a different culture.

Mission outreach

The third part of the sixth question covered the students' response to how the SAM trip met the objective of a mission outreach. Close to 46% of the students (31 responses) suggested that the team's involvement with evangelism or evangelistic performance was critical in meeting the objectives. Another sixteen students (23%) felt that lifestyle or acts of kindness (e.g., construction) each day were the ways that they met the objectives for the mission aspect of the SAM trip.

Research Question Number Two

The second research question posed in the study was, "How does the SAM students' faith development compare with that of students who take classes on-campus for the same time period?" Analysis was done comparing (post- minus pre-) mean difference using a two sample t-test for the SAM group and the OC control group. This analysis compares the two student groups' change in faith development that occurred.
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FMS Scores and Testing Results Related to Research Question Two

The FMS mean difference for the SAM group was 0.1056 while the OC group's was 0.0220. The p-value was 0.2073, comparing these two groups' change in faith maturity. This p-value was not significant at the \( a = 0.05 \) level of significance. When looking at the (vertical and horizontal) sub-scales, one sees that the p-value for the difference between the two groups' change was also not significant at the \( a = 0.05 \) level (vertical = 0.4451, horizontal = 0.6278).

GMFI Scores and Testing Results Related to Research Question Two

The researcher found a p-value of 0.1824. The SAM groups' mean difference was 0.0282 while the OC's GMFI mean difference was -0.1230. The p-value was not significant at the \( a = 0.05 \) level of significance. Therefore, there is no significant statistical difference when comparing the mean difference, that is, the change that occurred in the students' faith from the pre-survey to the post-survey, between the SAM and OC students.

FMS and GMFI Individual Questions with Significant Comparative Changes

Some individual survey question's statistical analyses assisted in answering the two research questions. The researcher noted responses that showed a significant difference in change between the two groups when tested with the two sample t-test. There were seven out of 55 questions (13%) that showed significant differences in change between the two groups (as seem in Tables 1 and Table 2). The difference in

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quest.</th>
<th>OC mean(n)</th>
<th>SAM mean(n)</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>-0.43 (81)</td>
<td>0.24 (58)</td>
<td>-2.75</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>0.0034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>-0.32 (81)</td>
<td>0.29 (58)</td>
<td>-2.59</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>0.0053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>-0.25 (81)</td>
<td>0.47 (58)</td>
<td>-2.91</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>0.0021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>-0.43 (80)</td>
<td>0.14 (58)</td>
<td>-2.29</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>0.0118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>-0.20 (81)</td>
<td>0.52 (58)</td>
<td>-2.30</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>0.0113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>-0.21 (80)</td>
<td>0.22 (58)</td>
<td>-1.78</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>0.0387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>-0.36 (80)</td>
<td>0.05 (57)</td>
<td>-1.67</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>0.0456</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.
Matched Pairs t-test (one-tailed) Results for Seven Questions Comparing OC and SAM p-values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>P-values</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OC Group</td>
<td>SAM group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.9941</td>
<td>0.0817</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.9685</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.9360</td>
<td>0.0068</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.9956</td>
<td>0.2350</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.9257</td>
<td>0.0526</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>0.9339</td>
<td>0.1502</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>0.9840</td>
<td>0.3948</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

the faith maturity gains between the SAM students and the OC students for individual questions was of interest since each question tested for a specific characteristic of faith maturity (Benson, Donahue, & Erickson, 1993; Benson & Eldin, 1990). This additional testing can inflate the alpha and increases the probability of making a Type I error (the error of rejecting the Null Hypothesis when it is true). Therefore, the reader should be careful when interpreting the individual question analysis.

**FO Survey Question Sixteen (reverse scoring)**

For question 16, "I have a hard time accepting myself," the mean difference for the OC groups was negative while the mean difference for the SAM groups was positive. The two groups changed significantly compared to one another.

**FO Survey Question Twenty-three**

Question 23, "I accept people whose religious beliefs are different from mine," was analyzed using a one-tailed matched pairs t-test. The OC group's mean difference did not increase over the course of the month while the SAM group had a significant increase at the α = 0.05 level over the J-term.

**FO Survey Question Twenty-six (reverse scoring)**

Question 26 asked the student to rate themselves concerning the statement, "I
feel overwhelmed by all the responsibilities and obligations I have." Using a one-tailed matched pairs t-test, the OC group statistics did not increase while the SAM group statistics increased significantly at the \( a = 0.05 \) level over the J-term.

**FQ Survey Question Thirty-one (reverse scoring)**

Question 31 makes the statement, "I do not understand how a loving God can allow so much pain and suffering in the world." The OC students increased their questioning of God while the SAM students decreased in their questioning. The two groups changed significantly compared to one another.

**FQ Survey Question Thirty-eight (reverse scoring)**

Question 38 asked the students to respond to the statement, "My life is filled with stress and anxiety." The two groups changed significantly compared to one another. Using a one-tailed matched pairs t-test, one sees that the OC students' statistics did not increase over the course of the month while the SAM group statistics decreased slightly over the same time period.

**FQ Survey Question Fifty-two**

Question 52 asked the students to rate themselves concerning the query, "The amount of time I spend reading and studying the Bible." The OC students did not increase their time reading and studying the Bible during the month while the SAM students had an increase in their amount of time studying and reading the Bible. The two groups changed significantly compared to one another.

**FQ Survey Question Fifty-nine**

The students responded to Question 59's query "The degree to which I am convinced that God is active in the world." The OC students did not increase in their perception of God's activity within the world, while the SAM students had a slight increase in their perception of God's activity in the world. The two groups changed significantly compared to one another.

**FMS Results Compared to National Averages**

The analysis of the scores shows that the SAM group and the OC group scored higher on the FMS survey when compared to the national average for all adults and each of the specific age groups, as seen in Table 3. The SAM student's post-score was 5.16 and the OC students scored 4.90. These FMS results placed both groups on the edge of the "moderate" (scores between 3-5) to "high" (scores between 5-7) category for "mature faith." The SAM group's pre- and post-scores placed them
significantly higher, at the 95% confidence level, than the national norms for all groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Adults</td>
<td>4.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29 years old</td>
<td>4.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39 years old</td>
<td>4.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49 years old</td>
<td>4.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59 years old</td>
<td>4.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69 years old</td>
<td>4.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-+ years old</td>
<td>4.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>4.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>4.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAM</td>
<td>5.0557 (59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC</td>
<td>4.8761 (83)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

None of the specific age groups listed in the Benson and Eldin study scored in the "high" rank of faith maturity. The age group that was closest was seventy years old and older which scored a 4.96. The SAM students have scored well above the national average for all adults.

The vertical score for the SAM group (pre-trip 5.81, post-trip 5.91) was significantly higher than the national average for all adults (5.06) by at least .75 and higher by about 1.0 point for the 20-29 age group (4.82). This score placed the SAM trip participants in the "high" area of the Faith Maturity Vertical Scale, as seen in Table 4.

The pre-trip horizontal score for the SAM trip participants was 4.24, while the post-trip horizontal score for the SAM trip participants was 4.30. Both of these are higher than the national average for the students' age group (20-29 year olds) by approximately a half point (.53, .57), and higher than the national average for all adults by the slight margin of .13-.17. The pre- and post-scores place the SAM students in the upper half of the "moderate" category of the Faith Maturity Horizontal Scale, as seen in Table 4.
Table 4.
The Vertical and Horizontal Dimensions of FMS Compared to National Mainline Denominational Averages for Age and Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Vertical score</th>
<th>Horizontal score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Adults</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29 years old</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>3.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39 years old</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>3.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49 years old</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>4.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59 years old</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>4.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69 years old</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>4.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-+ years old</td>
<td>5.54</td>
<td>4.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>4.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>4.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-trip</td>
<td>5.81 (59)</td>
<td>4.24 (59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-trip</td>
<td>5.91 (59)</td>
<td>4.30 (59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-trip</td>
<td>5.61 (83)</td>
<td>3.93 (83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-trip</td>
<td>5.69 (83)</td>
<td>4.13 (83)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The SAM students' scores on the combined *vertical* and *horizontal* scales, categorized within the "faith types" developed by Benson and Eklin, fall at the top end of the "vertical faith" and close to the "integrated faith." Benson and Eklin's scale ranges from an "underdeveloped" faith to a "vertical" or "horizontal" faith with the most developed faith being the "integrated" faith. The national average for "all adults" who score within the "vertical faith" area is 10% and the "integrated faith" area is 34%. For the 20-29 year old group there is 12% "vertical" and 16% "integrated."

GENERAL DISCUSSION CONCERNING FINDINGS

Quantitative Findings

The overall FMS and GFMS quantitative survey findings showed that there was not any significant faith growth measured at the 0.05 level of significance for the SAM or the control group over the one-month time frame. There were, however, individual questions within each of the quantitative surveys that yielded specific findings helpful in understanding changes to the SAM students that occurred while on the trip. Within the individual question research analysis, the researcher found two main areas of faith growth with the SAM students when compared to the OC group's growth.
These areas were an increase in "sensitivity to cultural diversity" (core dimension six), and an increase of "a sense of personal well-being" (core dimension two). The core dimensions are listed in the introduction section.

One additional interesting note was that the SAM student's quantitative score for the FMS post-score (five plus on a seven point scale) was above the national norm for all ages. This aspect created a ceiling effect. This ceiling effect was consistent with Kathleen Tuttles' (1998) dissertation research findings on short-term missions and its effects on the faith development of college students.

Qualitative Findings

The qualitative analysis showed (self-reported) growth in six of the eight core dimensions of faith. The strongest development was in "sensitivity to cultural diversity," increased experiences of a "sense of well-being," and an increase in the "connection with a community of believers" as the major aspects of their development.

An interesting finding in the study that overlapped with Tuttles' (1998) qualitative findings is that when the SAM students were asked what was "the most significant lesson God has taught me," the answer trusting God concerning life experiences was related to three of the top five responses. In Tuttle's study, she found that 22% of the students surveyed from the short-term experience indicated "they have a better understanding of how they fit into God's plan" (p. 271). Additional discussions concerning each of these specific findings are listed as they relate to specific developmental theories and program recommendations.

Conclusions as Related to Different Areas of the Educational Program and Experience

This section is organized into specific conclusions as they relate specifically to six different areas of study. These six areas are: 1) Faith Development Theories; 2) Student Development Theorists; 3) Adult Education theory; 4) Experiential Education Theory; 5) Christian Education Theory; and 6) Mentoring and Discipleship.

Conclusions Related to Faith Development Theories

The SAM experience created stress and the opportunity for "crises" to be experienced by the students. The SAM experience also created opportunities for students to experience "contradiction" with their faith maturity development. These two aspects of the SAM experience connected with the central thesis of the faith developmental theories (e.g., Fowler, 1976; Parks, 1986; Westerhoff, 1995; and Loder & Fowler, 1982).

Loder specifically states that the student begins the faith developmental process with the advent of the faith "contradiction." As an example, the SAM students stated that a major unpleasant aspect of the trip was "not knowing" what was to happen next. Later in the study, the students stated that the primary lesson that God taught
them was to "trust in Him with their life plan." This aspect of inviting a natural faith issues crisis or contradiction, and coupling it with the opportunity for reflection, seems to be one of the most important aspects of the SAM experience.

Conclusions as Related to Student Development Theory

The SAM trip provides opportunity for students to develop in many of the seven vectors (areas of a student's development) as identified by Chickering (1969). As examples, the researcher has identified three specific vectors that are clearly connected to the SAM students' survey responses. The first is the "development of mature interpersonal relationships." The students on the SAM trip showed an increase in their acceptance of people who have different religious beliefs. The students also stated that the relationships they experienced and developed on the trip were what they liked most.

The SAM experience provided opportunities for the development of a second and third vector. When asked what God had taught the students during the SAM experience, they stated that they were learning to trust God with the plan of their life (Chickering's vectors - developing identity and purpose). They also felt that "evangelization" (Benson and Eklín's dimensions of faith - sharing their faith and providing acts of kindness) needed to be an important part of the remaining portion of their life (developing identity and purpose).

It is clear that the SAM trip experience is an important tool in the development of the Christian university student. It is also clear that much of the development that takes place is directly related to the student's maturing relationship, identity development, and the formation of one's purpose.

Conclusions Related to Adult Education Theory

Similar to student development theory, adult education theory provides methodology and philosophy that can assist the SAM programmers in providing a framework to build a powerful SAM experience. There are five assumptions espoused by Knowles, a prominent adult education theorist, for the adult learner. The author has listed aspects of the SAM trips that coincide with Knowles' assumptions:

1) Student's need for learning (SAM student involvement is self-initiated and program success depends on the students' actions); 2) learning is problem-centered (SAM students are engaged in acts of kindness that are directed by the student group within a foreign culture and lend themselves to a problem centered education); 3) experience should be used (SAM students engage in journaling and debriefing during the trip); 4) learning should be self-directed (SAM students immerse themselves into the host culture); and

5) learner is highly motivated (SAM students are self-supporting and self-initiated).

All of these adult education philosophical assumptions are integral to the SAM experience. In part, these aspects surface through the challenge of entering a foreign culture and working on specific problems related to the mission. The author believes that it would be advantageous to clearly integrate adult education philosophy
and methodology with the SAM experience.

Conclusions Related to Experiential Education Theory

A major key to the experiential educational learning/developmental process is the reflective-processing time. This "processing" time is consistent with the importance given the "preparation and debriefing" time which Tuttle (1998) and others suggest is critical to faith development experiences.

The SAM experience coincides with the "five phase" experiential education model provided by Joplin (1995). The five phases of the model are: 1) the experience; 2) the challenge; 3) support; 4) feedback; and 5) reflection. For example, during the SAM experience each team member is engaged in and challenged by the experiences of the trip. All challenges are diverse yet integrated. During the experience, the students are supported by the SAM community. The team members receive constant feedback from the staff, students, and host community. And last, the students take time to debrief and reflect upon the experience. This experiential learning paradigm provides direction and help for the educator to create opportunities for faith education, faith development, and faith maturation.

The author believes that experiential education philosophy fits well with the experiential learning aspect of the SAM trip. The role and influence of experiential education philosophy and methodology should be expanded.

Conclusions Related to Christian Education Theory

The author believes that the connection between the SAM experience outcomes and the underlying objectives of a Christian education ("developing connections between fellows and God" as expressed by Coe, (1911) and the Council for Christian Colleges, (1998), shows the necessity of utilizing the SAM experience as a major tool in the educational process of the Christian college student.

When the SAM students were asked what was the greatest change they saw in themselves, they responded that it was in their relationship to God. When asked what they "liked best" and how they were challenged "interpersonally," they wrote about their relationships among the SAM group participants as well as those individuals with whom they came in contact on the trip.

Conclusions Related to Mentoring and Discipleship

The students' SAM experience can be seen as a journey experience. This experiential journey, (including the crisis) as M. Scott Peck and others suggest, if reflected upon, is a powerful tool in the maturing process. The SAM program should capitalize on the mentoring relationship available within the experience.

The author believes that the role of mentoring or discipleship within the SAM experience will become more pronounced as the research continues. The SAM students surveyed spoke highly of their connection with peers, the people they met in the
The Effects of a Study Abroad/ Mission Trip on the Faith Development... country, and the students' country host as major aspects of the SAM educational experience. The role of mentoring as it relates to faith development can be seen in the research of Hauerwas (1991), Janssen (1990), and Williams (1993).

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR COLLEGE PRACTITIONERS AND PROGRAMS

The research suggested that the methods of instruction on a SAM trip experience should include the methods used in adult education, experiential education, and student development programs. The need to provide experiences that utilize stress and crisis, while providing support and a time of reflection and processing, seems to be important.

Second, the ability for the SAM experience to provide opportunities to affect more than the faith development of the student should be capitalized. The segregation of Chickering's seven vectors of development from the specific development of the students' faith will be difficult. Instead, the researcher should look at a systemic developmental process that is inclusive of the faith and the personal development of the student.

Third, the students' interaction with the host culture is a critical part of the SAM program. It would seem that the more direct the interaction is with the host culture and the more the student is challenged to reflect upon their own faith issues, the more successful the program is likely to become. The students commented positively on the critical role the host personnel are playing in providing a more complete understanding of the host country and culture.

Fourth, the preparation, reflection, and debriefing of the SAM experience are important parts of the learning and developmental process. The preparation of the student may include review of the demographic, economic, and cultural aspects of the country. The reflection process may include daily or weekly times where the team processes what they are seeing and feeling. The debriefing should include time for the student to "scan" and "reinterpret" what they believe. The reflection process may be the most important aspect of the SAM faith development experience. Therefore, it is important to connect the reflection process with issues that focus on critical aspects of faith development.

Fifth, the programmer or facilitator of a SAM experience must understand the critical role that crises plays in the students' development, and will not want to shy away from the controlled crisis experience. Instead, they must learn to utilize the crisis for development.

The sixth and last recommendation is that the SAM experience should be organized to address as many of the core issues or aspects of faith development as possible. For example, a SAM trip program will want the students to engage in social and global experiences meant to bring about greater social justice. This will provide a clearer connection with the specifics of the students' faith development.
RESEARCH ISSUES

Assessment Instruments for Faith Development

The author believes that there is a need for further development of an instrument sensitive to faith changes over a one-month period. Additional sensitivity to the length of the instrument and reduction of the ceiling effects with the Christian college student may be difficult, but important; nevertheless, another important and needed development is the development of a survey with a clear connection to biblical Scripture. The CCCU schools hold closely to biblical doctrine and, therefore, they would appreciate an assessment tool that is closely connected to their biblical theology. Last, it would be best if an integrated pair of surveys were developed, one quantitative and the other qualitative. This would provide the researcher better data concerning each of the specific aspects of the faith developmental process.

At this time, the FMS is still the best survey available to assess faith development of the Christian college student. The FMS's underlying assumptions about faith maturity are most congruent with the underlying assumptions of faith development by Taylor University and the Council for Christian Colleges and Universities. The other assessment instruments reviewed equated faith development to what the author believes are peripheral issues, such as "openness to change" or "readiness to face existential questions without reducing their complexity."

Recommendations for Further Research

Additional research will need to be facilitated to better understand the faith development of college students as related to their involvement in a one-month study abroad SAM experience. The following is a list of recommendations for further research on this topic:

1. There is a need for the development of a reliable and valid survey with a quantitative and qualitative component to test for faith maturity within a short-term experience. It may be most helpful if the newly developed survey is also sensitive to issues related to long-term faith maturity.

2. Development of longitudinal research concerning the effects of a SAM experience on faith maturity is needed.

3. Further development of defined and testable aspects of faith maturity, specific to college involvement with a SAM program, would provide a baseline for continued research.

4. An additional research option would be to conduct a similar research project with a larger and more diverse sample of students sensitive to gender, race, and Christian denomination affiliation (e.g., where a university requires all or a large number of its students to participate).
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Reviewed by Brian L. Carrier, Residence Director/Director of Housing, Trinity Christian College, Palos Heights, Illinois

Knowledge

As I read through Parker Palmer's book, a series of thoughts and questions began to run through my mind. I began asking myself questions such as: How does education coincide with our faith? Has our increase in knowledge helped us or hurt us? What is my motive for continuing education and pursuing knowledge? and What effect does the culture that we live in have on our perceptions? I will address questions like these and the areas of Palmer's book that made these questions arise throughout the course of this review.

The first area on which I wish to focus is the issue of knowledge. Palmer addresses knowledge and its role in our lives throughout the course of the book; however, the areas that sparked my interest the most were found in the first chapter. Palmer begins the chapter by describing a film documentary that illustrates the making and detonation of the first atomic bomb. Through this illustration Palmer poses two questions that I will reflect on in the following paragraphs. The first question relates to the increase in knowledge done solely for the purpose of gaining power. The second question takes a look at the things that have come from the increase of knowledge (Palmer, 1983).

Henri Nouwen, who was instrumental in the development of Palmer's book *To Know as We are Known*, also addresses the temptation to be powerful in his own book, *In the Name of Jesus*. Nouwen tells about the time in his life when he moved from a prestigious position at Harvard to a director role in a community of handicapped individuals. In the depiction of his role in the new community, he admits that his perception of the relationship between knowledge, experience and power was skewed.
Nouwen realizes that true knowledge comes from learning from those around you, and true power is only gained by how you use that knowledge to guide others in your sphere of influence -- rather than climbing the ladder of success and leaving those in your path behind. Our goal in pursuing degrees and positions becomes void if we do not have a love for those around us. Knowledge should not be used for the manipulation and control of others, but rather for the unifying and building of the community around you.

As indicated above, the second area that I want to reflect upon deals with taking a closer look at the fruit of increased knowledge. In the past years, knowledge has increased in immeasurable quantities. This knowledge has affected us in both positive and negative ways. We celebrate and focus on the conveniences and luxuries that this increase in knowledge has brought us, but seldom do we focus on the consequences that the increase of knowledge has brought along with it. Palmer makes reference to some of these consequences such as: the deterioration of the ozone layer, global warming, destruction of the rain forests, pollution of various bodies of water, increase and abundance of illegal drugs, genetic engineering and choosing the gender of a child, abortion and nuclear warfare. He poses this question: "Is our knowledge -- the very knowledge that distinguishes human beings from the beasts -- creating a world far less human, far more beastly, than the natural world itself?" (Palmer, 1983, p. 6).

In struggling with this thought-provoking question and trying to give this increase in knowledge validity, the only place I could turn to for a conclusion was Scripture. Proverbs 24:3-5 states that "By wisdom a house is built, and by understanding it is established; and by knowledge the rooms are filled with all precious and pleasant riches. A wise man is strong, and a man of knowledge increases power" (International, 1992, pp. 1049-1050). Based on this verse, there needs to be a balance of knowledge and wisdom. Wisdom is the foundation that allows knowledge to be used in appropriate ways. Palmer writes, "The goal of a knowledge arising from love is the reunification and reconstruction of broken selves and worlds. A knowledge born of compassion aims not at exploiting and manipulating creation, but at reconciling the world to itself" (Palmer, 1983, p. 8).

Truth

Palmer states, "The personal truth revealed in Jesus is not limited to knowledge of God alone. To allow such a limitation is to succumb to one of secularism's self-protective devices -- the claim that this mode of knowing may apply to our spiritual lives but has nothing to do with the secular knowledge on which modern life depends. To allow such a limitation is to make God one more object among others and to violate the premise of faith that all things were made by God's personal Word" (p. 60). This particular paragraph really impacted me based on where I am today. Over the last two years, I have been working in a Christian institution that is rooted in the Reformed tradition. In that time I have begun to know and embrace the worldview that knowing and worshiping God is not to be compartmentalized from life's daily tasks. I passionately acknowledge what Jesus claims in John 14:6, "I am the way, the truth and the life, no
man comes to the Father except through Me" (International, 1992, p. 1742). He does not say "I am a truth," but He says, "I am the Truth." If Christ is the Truth and He is also the Creator and Sustainer of all things, then how can we not observe Him in all that we do?

Reading this book has reaffirmed my understanding that indeed all things do come from the Lord and therefore do contain truth. As indicated above in Palmer's quote, nothing is formed or has been sustained without the personal command of God's direct Word. I would be putting God in a box if I were to only study His Word and His attributes without acknowledging and worshipping Him through my ability to learn through education, my relationships with the people He has created, and through my love for His beauty in the outdoor cathedral of nature.

Education vs. Spirituality

Dr. Spindle, President of MidAmerica Nazarene University, once summed up education as a spiritual act of worship by saying that every classroom is a sanctuary and every desk is an altar. As we study and learn and increase our knowledge, if doing so in love, we are worshipping God. We need not compartmentalize our lives into separate areas with church and Bible study being the spiritual portions of our lives and then work, relationships, entertainment, hobbies, etc. being the "other parts of our lives." Instead, our lives and our actions need to fit underneath one umbrella of living a life of service and worship for Christ.

In examining the question, "How college student affairs can work exemplify education as a spiritual journey?" based on what I have processed thus far, I think the bottom line is maintaining a complete spiritual act of worship in all we say and do. Palmer points out that this must be done in love. I believe that all too often in the field of college student affairs, we focus more on having well-attended programs, building solid relationships and providing a secure community than we do on the value of education. We need to become conscious of how our departments can align our goals alongside those of the institution and the primary motivation for attending college, which is to provide and receive an education. With that in mind, perhaps our focus needs to be directed more towards exemplifying the relationship between education and spirituality rather than separating the two from each other as the courts have done by banning prayer in the schools. But instead, we must work to join the two fundamentals together to give our students and community a complete, and not fragmented, college experience.
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The Outrageous Idea of Christian Scholarship by George Marsden tackles the reality of academia's abandonment, if not rejection, of religion within the academic setting. As a Christian scholar, Marsden emphatically challenges any notion implying that one's religious or Christian perspective indubitably taints true intellectual comprehension. Mr. Marsden confronts such implications in a series of introductory inquiries, such as: "Why, in a culture in which many academics profess to believe in God, do so few reflect on the academic implications of that belief?" "Why are there no identifiable Christian schools of thought in academia to compare with various Marxist, feminist, gay, post-modern, African-American, conservative or liberal schools of thought?" "What is it about the dominant academic culture that teaches people they must suppress reflection on the intellectual implications of their faith?" George Marsden attempts to address these questions, among others, in *The Outrageous Idea of Christian Scholarship*.

Marsden begins his exploration of this subject matter by first detailing a historical explanation as to why mainstream academia has come to trivialize and minimize religion's influence inside the university. In what he defines as his "Historical Argument," Marsden proposes as his central theme the notion that academics today are suspect of Christianity because of Christianity's historically authoritarian role in higher education. Whereas Christianity focused on the more particular and parochial, America's pace-setting, Protestant universities of the post-Civil War era focused on conformity and free scientific inquiry. Such an approach, in the liberal Protestant's view, would lead to a unified national culture of high ideals.

As liberal Protestant universities prospered throughout the early twentieth century, institutions became increasingly secular. This secularization continued throughout the 50s, 60s and 70s, until 1980, when clear prejudice against religious perspectives occurred. Now, at the dawn of the twenty-first century, we find religion to be on a "short leash," contained within a department or confined to the realm of the extracurricular.

Why have our campus environments become void of religion? Marsden cites three factors affecting the secularization of the American university: academia's mutu-
ally exclusive perception of science and religion; the rise of multiculturalism in America; and the gross distortion of the true constitutional meaning behind the phrase "separation of church and state."

Mainstream academia has adopted a philosophy claiming that scientific exploration is the most valuable standard for truth. This standard, Marsden claims, is perceived by academics to be contaminated when religious faith is introduced into the arena. Marsden, however, discredits this belief on a number of fronts, but most importantly because it "unduly favors scholarship based on purely naturalistic presuppositions." Such scholarship, like Freud's theory on religious origin, is fabricated from a biased premise.

The era of multiculturalism has reinvigorated fear of imperial Christianity resurfacing in society and squelching the voices of the less represented. Marsden suggests that such a belief is erroneous because today a more moderate, diverse Christian population exists — rather than the feared, ultra-conservative, one-minded Christian population of yesteryear.

Marsden considers the anti-establishment clause of the First Amendment to be widely misinterpreted, with abhorrent results. What was originally meant to protect against a national religion has been manipulated over the years to define any expression of religious perspective within a university system to be unconstitutional. Marsden argues that a teacher's religious viewpoint, if relevant to the subject material, is necessary for a complete presentation of facts and critical to the pursuit of truth.

How, then, should Christians participate in an academic environment? According to Marsden, we are to become "resident aliens," obeying the "laws of the land" as long as they do not conflict with our higher allegiances. As such, we must guard against tendentious scholarship by offering a refreshing alternative to the partisanship prevalent throughout academia. We must be critical of our own heritage as much as we are critical of others. In so doing, we learn to communicate more clearly the significance of Christianity and its necessary presence in academia.

Critics may say that Christianity cannot play a significant role in academia because its theories and principles are inapplicable to many academic specialties, such as the technical and mathematical fields. Marsden undoubtedly disagrees with such a notion. He does concede that the more a scholar relies on empirical observation, the less apparent the relevance of faith. However, Mr. Marsden believes faith affects all scholarship in four distinct ways. First, it may be the motivating factor for scholars to succeed in their particular endeavors. Second, one's religious faith may affect the applications one has for his or her scholarship, such as altruism. Third, scholars may define a specialty related to their faith perspectives. Lastly, faith may play an important role in a scholar's reflection on the wider implications of his or her work and its subsequent place in a larger framework of meaning. Marsden believes faith perspectives, once introduced into mainstream academia, expose the "myth of a liberal neutrality" in higher education and challenge academic reductionism.

Theological perspectives, according to Marsden, often provide intellectual rationale where secular academia falls short. Christian theism, with its unambiguous perspectives on Creation, the Incarnation, the Holy Spirit, and the human condition,
provides legitimacy to support moral intuitions that many academics share. This theological presence protects against the tendency to absolutize the relative and holds us accountable to a higher allegiance.

What strategy should we adopt to implement a Christian perspective into academia? Marsden believes several things can be done by large and small institutions to ensure the representation of Christian scholarship in higher education. First, he suggests institutions must bring together scholars concerned with faith and learning. Secondly, schools with a Christian heritage must take specific steps to combat the process of secularization. Thirdly, communal worship, fellowship and camaraderie should be cultivated and promoted throughout the institution. By enacting these measures, Marsden concludes that a religiously diverse and healthy culture will create an intellectually superior culture.

I find many of Marsden's theories and arguments significant and applicable to the current condition of higher education. First and foremost, I concur with the author's critique of the public's perception of an authoritarian Christian perspective. Although a present-day classification of the Christian perspective as authoritarian may be inaccurate, it remains clear that the historical, ultra-conservative institutions of long ago created lasting impressions that do not easily dissipate. To combat such impressions, I agree that we as Christians must lay down our guard and enter into the academic arena without parochial, partisan concerns. We must, to reestablish trust in our perspective, be willing to look back upon Christianity and critique its failings as much as we celebrate its achievements. Perhaps then we will find the public arena more accepting of a Christian viewpoint and less inclined to cry "foul" when such a perspective is introduced.

Marsden argues that universities and colleges have embraced three false positions that have been attributed to an increased probability and rate of secularization. Specifically, he finds academia's perception of scientific exploration, multiculturalism and church and state to be erroneous. He argues that each has worked independently to disengage academia from the critical concepts and philosophies of Christianity. I agree wholeheartedly with Marsden's critique of these factors and wish to address one of these factors more intimately.

After receiving a degree in biology and having attended medical school, I am comfortable in defining science and religion as mutually inclusive rather than the more prominent, less accurate notion that the two are mutually exclusive. How can I make such a claim? I do so by embracing the revelation I experienced during my six years of scientific inquiry. First, I found that the more I discovered through scientific exploration, the more I became aware of my dependence on an omniscient Other. In medical school, my colleagues and I would often discuss the limits of our intellect. I remember multiple evenings when my colleagues and I "crashed" for some coffee and comfort after many hours of intense study and exploration of our cadavers in Gross Anatomy. The complexities and brilliant "architecture" present within the constructs of the human body are compelling. We declared ourselves "significantly insignificant" when reflecting on our experiences, and all of us gave credence to God for the magnificence of human creation. As Marsden suggests, this incident serves as an example of how a the-
logical perspective can provide intellectual rationale where secular academia falls short.

Marsden presents a clear and substantial argument detailing the false concept of liberal neutrality. He provides substantial evidence describing academia's tendency to lean toward a philosophy naturalistic reductionism. In so doing, each branch of academia aggrandizes its own perspective without acknowledging the role of God. Evidence of this exists on my own campus today as we find "God-talk" becoming confined to specific classes, majors or functions. In fact, our top administrators have recognized this truth and have actively encouraged administrators and faculty members to comply with *Ex Corde Ecclesia*. This papal document addresses the dilution of catholicity and encourages a restoration of genuine Christianity throughout Catholic colleges and universities.

In summary, I conclude that Marsden has sufficiently and accurately detailed the history and condition of Christian scholarship within academia. I find his observations and suggestions to be extremely helpful in assessing my own Christian academic environment. I am confident that, through adherence to his recommendations, Christian scholarship can prevail in the private and public arena as we embark upon the twenty-first century.


**Reviewed by David M. Johnstone, Resident Director, Westmont College, Santa Barbara, California**

Do you remember John Kennedy's assassination? Do you remember the explosion of the shuttle Challenger? What you do not remember may be a better way to identify your membership in a generation. Your collective memory helps to shape the distinctive nature of your generation. The authors of the bestseller *13th Gen* have again sought to define and understand a new generation of young people. "Who cares?" you might ask. "You should," is the answer for those in any area of higher education. Increasingly this incoming generation of first-year students has been labeled as the "why," "XX," or "NeXt" Generation. In *Millenials Rising: The Next Great Generation,* Howe and Strauss aggressively challenge the negative view of this generation. Calling them the "Millennials" (a name chosen by members of this generation to describe themselves), the authors suggest, with statistical, anecdotal and historical data, that the United States is on the verge of another "great generation."

The significance for those in higher education is that a generation shift is taking place across North America. As the Millennial generation becomes college freshmen, they will stand in radical contrast to their elders in the Boom and X generations. Howe and Strauss have provided a provocative apologetic for the generation that is graduating from high school after 1999. After extensive surveys of students and countless interviews with children, adults, parents and educators, they believe that they have
discerned the significant priorities and values of this coming generation. While many suggest that they are just another representation of previous generations, Howe and Strauss suggest that this conclusion is baseless. While seeking to present the descriptive extremes of the pressures facing this group of students, they present the realism of this generation's context. They conclude that Millennials are unique and vastly different from the two previous generations.

The volume ranges over many areas and topics; however, it all focuses on bringing about more understanding of the Millennial character. It examines many topics, including Millennial drug use, sexual mores, and approaches to school and family. The descriptions are laced with humor, anecdotes and reflections from many sources. The volume also examines the notions and implications of what the authors describe as "generational cycles." They examine how past trends might affect and shape this generation. These components are seen as part of the heritage passed on to them by past generations.

With extensive use of sidebar quotations, charts and cartoons, this is the perfect book to read, put down, digest and then pick up again. It is fascinating to read all the way through, yet reflection on what the authors assert and forecast is necessary for a deep understanding of its implications. *Millennial Rising* is packed with information that anticipates a significant change in the national character over the next few decades.

There are some weaknesses to the work that will need to be covered by others in the growing literature on this generation. Specific to this book is that much of its survey research is limited to the Virginia region. The authors glean material from various sources, however the information is geographically limited. The multicultural implications of this generation need to be understood as well. As the Latino and Asian populations in the United States increase, so will their impact on the nature of the Millennials. The authors discuss the diversity of this generation, however the impact of its multiculturalism needs to be examined more in depth.

This volume is important primarily because it provides a different view of the incoming generation of students. Conventional wisdom paints them with an unfavorable brush. It is encouraging to read a survey that articulates something of which many in higher education have been observing. While incoming college students do demonstrate some of the "prima donna" characteristics, a vast number also demonstrate a deep commitment to service, academics, relationships and character. These are not qualities that are acknowledged by those specialists who see this generation as an "echo boom."

*Millennials Rising* also anticipates some of the trends that we may encounter in the upcoming years and challenges those in higher education to begin evaluating the types of programming in which we are investing. For instance, what is the state of our service learning programs? Are they strong enough to respond to anticipated demands placed upon them in four or five years?

Contrasting the Millennials with the GI generation, Howe and Strauss believe the Millennials are the next "great" generation. The authors suggest that the Millennials will be far more responsive to the quality of leadership than those among the Silent, Boom or X generations. The character and principles of those leading this generation will be of great significance for the Millennials. Men such as FDR and
Harry Truman, who were perceived as men of depth who came from the previous generation, led the GI generation. In a similar manner, the authors anticipate that the Millennial generation will be responsive to Boomer and Gen X leaders who articulate a depth of character and have demonstrated that they can be "moral exemplars." This prediction is encouraging for any that are committed to the character, faith and whole life of the student.

In conclusion, I would suggest that the above observations alone make this volume a worthwhile study. This book has a vast amount of information for anyone interested in ways to invest in this generation. It is imperative that the Millennial generation is not seen as a shadow of Gen X or a reflection of the Baby Boomers. They have distinctive traits and will need a contextual response laced with wisdom and discernment. *Millennials Rising* is a strong place to start and a foundation from which to develop that response.
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