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Dear Readers:

We are very excited to be able to bring you the second issue of Growth: The Journal of The Association for Christians in Student Development. The theme for this issue is "Community on the Christian College Campus".

This issue is presented in three sections. The first is dedicated to the theme and consists of three articles that focus on aspects of community on our campuses. The second section includes four pieces including a response written to an article in the last issue of Growth. The inclusion of this response is an effort to encourage ongoing discussion and reflection upon theme topics. As articles in this issue spark thoughts and questions please consider formalizing them and submitting them for consideration by all. The second item in this section is a transcript of an address given by a former Christian college president on the role and expectations of senior student affairs officers. Rounding out this section are two basic research articles dealing with the incorporation of principles of learning theory and the job satisfaction of student affairs professionals respectively. The third section consists of three book reviews.

We want to thank several individuals for their assistance in putting this issue together. Special thanks go to Norris Friesen and Ginny Carpenter for their work on the Editorial Board, to Sharon Givler for her service as Copy Editor, to Steve Christensen for his service as Layout and Design Editor, and to the twenty plus individuals who served as peer reviewers of manuscripts submitted this year. Without their assistance this publication would not have been possible.

Finally, we want to encourage you, the reader, to think about submitting manuscripts for consideration for the next issue of Growth, which will be published in the spring of 2003. We are particularly interested in receiving manuscripts presenting original or basic research. We particularly want to encourage anyone who has recently completed a graduate thesis or dissertation to submit an article based on such work. The theme for the next issue will be "Faith Development of Christian College Students." If you are interested in submitting a manuscript, please refer to the publication policy 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 these pages.
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Seeking Community: Creating Effective Lifestyle Agreements

by Steven P. Bird, Ph.D.

ABSTRACT

Christian colleges wrestle with the creation and maintenance of regulations for correct behavior of campus members (lifestyle agreements). Using theoretical considerations as well as specific application examples, a way is presented to create a lifestyle agreement that is internally consistent and fits the needs of the campus. Specifically, the effect of external constituencies, organizational efficiency, and, most importantly, efforts to develop community, are used to guide the construction of lifestyle agreements. While very specific examples are given, no effort is made to create a one-size-fits-all set of codes. Instead, a framework is constructed to allow a campus to develop a lifestyle agreement suited to its own circumstances. This framework provides colleagues with an approach to answering three specific questions. What should be included in the lifestyle agreement? Who should sign it? When does the lifestyle agreement apply?

INTRODUCTION

Creating and maintaining a set of regulations concerning correct behavior of campus members – what I will call a lifestyle agreement – is a never-ending difficulty for Christian colleges. Different views on whether an existing lifestyle agreement should be expanded, constrained or eliminated continually persist. Concerns erupt over the agreement’s language, content, and implementation. Periodically, sides are chosen, lines are drawn in the dirt, and battle begins, all of which interferes with the organization’s ability to accomplish the goals everyone agrees need to be accomplished.

Clearly lifestyle agreements are important to Christian college campuses or we would not be willing to expend so much energy on their creation, maintenance, and application. But how can we create effective lifestyle agreements that are more internally consistent and useful rather than fragmented and divisive?

This article presents a sociological consideration of the role lifestyle agreements play in Christian colleges in order to provide an approach to their creation and application.
that will be comprehensive and realistic. Using broader theoretical considerations of the social realities of lifestyle agreements and specific thorny application examples, I will present a way to create a lifestyle agreement with an implicit understanding of why it is made the way it is and how it would be applied. It is not my intention to create a specific lifestyle statement that any or all colleges should adopt, but, rather, to present a meaningful way to create such a statement that is appropriate to use at any Christian college wishing to create or modify a lifestyle agreement. Although specific examples will be provided, I am more concerned with providing an approach with broad utility rather than a specific lifestyle agreement. In fact, colleagues could even use this approach and arrive at different conclusions about specifics than I do – but we would understand exactly why and where we disagreed and, perhaps most importantly, we would be able to speak effectively to each other about our disagreements rather than speak past each other in frustration.

Everyone begins with a set of assumptions. There are two that I need to state at the outset. Several others will be introduced later as needed.

Assumption 1: Christian colleges are based on voluntary membership.

It is important to remember that a Christian college is not a coercive organization. Clients and workers alike come to the organization voluntarily – no one is forced into the organization. This accuracy of this statement may seem obvious, but it bears mentioning because we need to remember that individuals have chosen to enter the organization and in doing so have agreed to be part of its mission. After working for a few years at the college, individuals tend to exhibit the same natural tendencies that members of any social organization do. One of those tendencies is to take the organization for granted and begin to think, often unwittingly, of what the organization owes us more than what the organization is there to accomplish. It is very important, of course, to note that the organization has obligations to its members, but in the battles that surround lifestyle agreements the factions sometimes are based on their own interests rather than those of the organization. To combat this tendency it is important to remember that lifestyle agreements were submitted voluntarily. Decisions about changes to or applications of it should focus on what accomplishes organizational goals rather than what makes individuals happier or our their jobs easier. The implications of this voluntary membership will reappear periodically throughout this discussion.

Assumption 2: A Christian college is not a church. It is an educational institution.

Thus we may adopt, but do not develop, doctrinal statements. By this I mean that, as an institution, we are not granted the Biblical authority to produce the creeds that regulate Christians. This is a duty of the Church.

This assumption is a little more complicated for denominational schools where the theologians might be expected to help develop doctrinal creeds. It might even be more complicated for theologians or Biblical scholars at non-affiliated Christian colleges who are expected to deal with doctrinal issues. But the lifestyle agreement of a campus, it is important to note, serves the institution as a whole and the institution is oriented
on an educational mission that is para-church related. Whatever external constituencies we need to satisfy tend to be focused on our organizations as educational institutions that are distinctively Christian rather than churches that happen to also educate. Whatever organizational efficiency we seek to accomplish is primarily aimed at specific educational goals. Whatever community we seek to create is aimed at a whole person education that extends beyond classroom content, certainly, but is still an educational community at heart. This assumption will play an important role in the discussion section regarding the elements to be included in a lifestyle agreement.

The need for lifestyle agreements

The need for lifestyle agreements that establish acceptable behavioral boundaries is a fact of life for Christian colleges. At least three sociological realities drive this need. First, the college has outside constituencies, e.g. parents of current students, alumni, churches, and prospective students, who both expect and want the college to have a lifestyle agreement. Every college has outside constituencies, whether they are state legislatures or parents of current students, but the outside constituencies for the Christian college tend to retain a concern for a certain campus environment with specific controls on moral behaviors. Public and private colleges with no religious affiliation have experienced less of this pressure since the 1960s but still wrestle with it as well. As the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching’s (1990) work on campus life states:

The 1960s brought historic changes. During that decade in loco parentis all but disappeared. Undergraduates enjoyed almost unlimited freedom in personal and social matters, and responsibility for residence hall living was delegated far down the administrative ladder, with resident assistants on the front line of supervision. Top administrators were often out of touch with day-to-day conditions on the campus.

The problem was, however, that while colleges were no longer parents, no new theory of campus guidance emerged to replace the old assumptions. Regulations could not be arbitrarily imposed – on that everyone agreed – but what was left in doubt was whether codes of conduct should be established and, if so, who should take the lead. Unclear about what standards to maintain, many administrators sought to sidestep rather than confront the issue.

To complicate matters further, while college and university officials understood that their authority had forever changed, this shift toward a freer climate was not understood or accepted by parents or the public. The assumption persists today that when an undergraduate “goes off to college” he or she will, in some general manner, be “cared for” by the institution....

Even state legislatures and the courts are not willing to take colleges off the hook... (pp. 5-6).

A second social force that shapes the need for lifestyle agreements at Christian colleges is one faced by all formal social organizations – the need for organizational efficiency. In essence, the organization cannot function if the members do not know what is or is not expected of them. Anyone who has ever had responsibility for some portion of a bureaucratic organization can attest to the fact that organizing people into shared routines and behaviors requires documented procedures and policies that...
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guide interactions. Without these guiding bureaucratic forms, organizations spend most of their time dealing with every person and circumstance in a case-by-case way and organizational inefficiency will quickly consume all available resources. This bureaucratic necessity becomes more and more important as the size of the organization increases. As Scott (1998, pp. 260-261) explains it, "Studies of a wide variety of organizations show reasonably consistent and positive associations between size of organization and measures of structural differentiation, including number of occupational categories, number of hierarchical levels, and spatial dispersion of the organization." In fact, it is in modern mass-population societies where bureaucratic forms of organization have become the normal social organizational technique.

When there are more people involved in social settings than we can reasonably know well, we are forced into formalized arrangements of tasks and people that allow us to proceed efficiently through required tasks and allow us to be confident others will do their tasks as well. When everyone in this complicated division of labor does their part correctly, the overall tasks of the organization are accomplished. If there are only ten of us, the problem is minimal and we need less bureaucracy. But when there are two thousand of us, we have to have carefully specified rules and regulations that make all our duties clear so we can be sure everything is done in a way that fits the overall goals of the organization. Too much bureaucracy is as much a problem as too little. But, it is the need for organizational systems that get the job done, which means an appropriate amount of bureaucratic form, that forces us to adopt formalized rules, policies and procedures like those in a lifestyle agreement.

Finally, it is an intrinsic part of the values of Christian colleges to seek something more than educational factories where students are processed like so much raw material. Or, to use a metaphor more appropriate to the post-industrial society we find ourselves in, we wish to avoid the dehumanizing aspects of a McDonaldized society (Ritzer, 1993) where everything and everyone is processed like "fast-food" people. Those who work in Christian colleges expect to create something more than a nameless, faceless processing of human beings where anonymity replaces a common identity and concern for each other. True, we are only partially successful in our attempts to create these communities where terms like in loco parentis still have importance, but we try nevertheless. It is clear that an explicitly identified value in the Christian college subculture is "community".

Community can be difficult to define since it has several different meanings. For social scientists, the term is commonly used to refer to studies of towns and cities. Ammerman (1997), for example, studied the effects of social location (types of towns and cities) on different congregations. In doing so she followed a rather common practice and referred to towns and cities as communities rather than referring to the congregations as communities—even though many of us might refer to a community of believers. This approach can be used when developing discipline codes on a campus. Paterson and Kibler (1998, part four) provide a very pragmatic approach to constructing a disciplinary code for a campus. Their reference to community, though, is implicitly about a collection of people in a geographically bounded area (the campus) who live within the same social-judicial system. This approach uses the term community in the same way it would be used to refer to a town. Alternatively, the term community is used to refer to people who share some important trait. An example of
this use of the term is Hoekema's (1994) look at efforts to create a shared set of ethics among individuals on college campuses. And, contemporarily, the word community is even used to refer to something as amorphous as people who interact through the Internet (Rehm, 2000).

Many Christian colleges talk of community but they clearly do not mean that they are a collection of people in a geographically bounded area (the campus) who live within the same social-judicial system. And, they are not referring to all campus members being Christian or having some cyber-connection. What colleges mean by community is a set of meaningful and close relationships between the campus members. In essence, colleges are looking for community to be akin to a "primary group." Primary groups are collections of people who have consistent and regular interaction that is intimate and face-to-face such that the members of the group come to have a shared identity— they see a clear distinction of who they are as compared to outsiders. The people in our primary groups are the ones we hold near and dear. This is what we normally mean by community on Christian college campuses: close webs of close relationships that build us all up and hold us all accountable. We seek a collection of people who share a common heart and soul. This idea of community seems similar to the observations of Tönnies (1963) who contrasted pre-modern community and modern society. He argued that modern societies are impersonal and task oriented where the small farming communities of earlier societal forms were based on closer networks of relationships like the ones we seek on our campuses.

The link between a desire for community and the need for a lifestyle agreement is relatively straightforward. To create a sense of shared identity and strong interpersonal relationships, social groups use socially created boundaries. By stating some specific differences that members must voluntarily adhere to, organizations screen out individuals who will not contribute to a stronger primary group type of community. In fact, for churches, the use of a certain amount of social stigma can lead to a much more dedicated and dynamic church body (Iannaconne, 1992). The lifestyle agreements we have establish community boundaries and allow us to know who we are. Without these boundaries, we cannot have as strong an internal community.

The difficult questions of a lifestyle agreement: What? Who? When?

Lifestyle agreements introduce some thorny problems for the campuses that use them. Three questions must be answered and revisited on a regular basis when working with lifestyle agreements. What rules will be included? To whom do the rules apply? When will the rules apply?

Ideally, all of the social forces that make a lifestyle agreement useful or necessary would converge into an undisputed set of rules that accomplished all three needs: satisfying external constituencies, facilitating organizational efficiency, and creating community. But reality rarely provides ideal outcomes. Not only do different external constituencies disagree over what should be allowed on campus and when, but what is often desired by any organization’s clients or other constituencies is not the same organizational form that would most effectively allow an efficient organizational process or interpersonal community. Moreover, organizational efficiency and community often can be nearly antithetical to each other.
In one sense, the most efficient way to enforce rules is to have a no nonsense zero-tolerance policy that is applied to everyone in exactly the same way regardless of context or circumstances. This is bureaucracy at its best and worst. Simply determine if there is any shred of dependable evidence that indicates even the most minimal amount of guilt and then apply the consequences written in the policy. Student development personnel would be able to make quick summary decisions in an expedited way that uses the minimal amount of time or other organizational resource: a textbook example of organizational efficiency. But, creating community is the goal then this type of approach will fail utterly.

A student reacting to the news of his mother’s death might be guilty of the same transgression as a student whose motivation is to cause as much disruption as possible, but few would want both students to experience the same consequences. We desire for more than organizational efficiency. We also want a social setting where everyone attempts to care for each other with compassion as well as accountability.

To help us see how an efficient set of rules and their applications can be in tension with attempts to create a social organization that fosters community, I will compare a couple of familiar ancient rule systems. To begin, imagine being responsible for enforcing the rules listed in the Biblical text of Leviticus. A bulky set of rules, no doubt, but the bulk was in part due to efforts to get every situation and circumstance specified so clearly that the application was very efficient and clear. Enforcing these rules would be tedious but relatively straightforward. Only when a new context arises would there be a need to wrestle with the application of the rules and, even then, only to the extent necessary to extrapolate existing rules to write a specific rule for this new context.

Now, imagine that you are responsible for enforcing the rule system woven into the Sermon on the Mount or the beatitudes as they are sometimes called. These are clearly principles that are meant to create relationship—community—between God and humans as well as between fellow humans. Willard (1998, p.116) summarizes the beatitudes this way: “The religious system of his day left the multitudes out, but Jesus welcomed them all into his kingdom. Anyone could come as well as any other. They still can. That is the gospel of the beatitudes.” The principles of the Sermon on the Mount are meant to guide us into community. How to make these principles bureaucratically useful, however, is not quite as apparent. The reality is that we do have to create a system with bureaucratic utility as well as one that fosters community and satisfies external constituencies that matter to the organization. So, we fall back on the rule listing approach of Leviticus because we can’t figure out how to bureaucratically realize the Sermon on the Mount. But, if community is an overarching goal and bureaucratic efficiency is just a means of promoting organizational goals, then we need to find a way to build the system to serve the goal.

This is our problem, then: we want to create appropriate lifestyle agreements for our campuses that satisfy external constituencies, create organizational efficiency, and create community, while avoiding the tensions created by diverse external audiences and the push-pull relationship of organizational efficiency and compassionate community. Specifically we must wade through all of this and find answers to the three questions posed: what should be included in the lifestyle agreement, who must live within its expectations, and when does it apply.
What should be included in a lifestyle agreement?

Christian colleges, as has been indicated earlier, are para-church organizations. Lifestyle agreements exist to satisfy external constituencies that expect these colleges to teach and mentor and model. They exist to facilitate organizational efficiency that leads to broadly defined educational goals. And, they exist to create a particular kind of educational Christian community. So what doctrinal tenets and behavioral proscriptions need to be included in lifestyle agreements? Where do we get those doctrinal tenets?

The latter question is the easier one to answer. Adopt the doctrinal statements of the Church. But which church is the Church? A denominationally affiliated college secures its doctrinal statements from the tenets and creeds of the church with which the college is affiliated. Inter-denominational schools may have a somewhat harder time, however, as they try to identify the Christian tradition from which to adopt their doctrinal orientation. Nevertheless, each college must look to its own heritage and orientation when deciding from where to secure the doctrinal tenets and creeds that will guide its lifestyle agreement.

Even so, having decided from where to draw our doctrine does not necessarily make clear the items necessary for the guiding statements of a Christian college. To illustrate, I will consider how a college that identifies itself as “evangelical” and “non-denominational,” would approach the question of what should be included. In using this example, I will demonstrate an approach that also will illustrate how other types of colleges would approach the issue.

Theoretically, a non-denominational evangelical college would have many possible theological traditions available to use in designing lifestyle agreements that regulate behavior and establish shared beliefs. But, how do we select from among the competing traditions of denominational evangelicalism? We can be sure that the answer is not an ecumenical one. Ecumenism usually adopts a “lowest common denominator” approach. That approach, eventually, leaves us with nothing. For churches and denominations that have tried to do this, the result has usually been organizational inefficiency and community boundaries that are so weak that they are sociologically inconsequential (Finke and Stark, 1992, chap. 6). In essence, the organization fails when it seeks to be only what is acceptable to everyone in a general tradition. At the other extreme we could try to include everything that every church has ever advocated. This, however, will surely lead to endless battles over the integration of these different statements with each other. Therefore, we cannot settle for what absolutely everyone could agree with and we cannot try to include every theological claim ever asserted.

The answer lies, instead, in a type of evangelical pluralism. The kind of pluralistic system referenced here is one where an over-arching umbrella of key values, beliefs, and norms covers a diversity of lifestyles that all fit within the larger umbrella but differ in many other ways. In general social systems this can be illustrated by a town that has laws that set clear boundaries for all inhabitants, i.e. no murder allowed, but does not dictate how every person must dress or eat. In the more specific example of a non-denominational evangelical college, the lifestyle agreement sets the boundaries that are critical for establishing community and organizational efficiency, within the
span of acceptable views that the external constituencies will accept. It does not, however, seek to specify a stance on every behavior or belief known to Christendom.

We decide, then, which doctrinal statements are central to who we are, establish the over-arching set of expectations, and leave the rest of the issues to individuals in response to their church. If we have become confused and think that the goal of the institution is to define a systematic theology, a theological statement that speaks to every theological issue and question, then we are building the wrong umbrella to cover our diversity. If we remember, however, that our goal is to build a Christian community for the sake of an educational goal, we can succeed.

The first conclusion, then, concerning the criteria for determining what should be included in a lifestyle agreement is:

**Conclusion 1:** A Christian college includes in its lifestyle agreement only the doctrine that is necessary for the definition of the Christian community needed to accomplish its educational goal.

So what would a non-denominational evangelical college include in its lifestyle agreement if the guiding principle of this conclusion is followed? Would it be critical to the nature of such an organization and its community that everyone agree that Christ was, in fact, God? Yes. Any evangelical community must possess such a belief. Is it critical to an evangelical community that everyone be Calvinist or Arminian? No. If a college was more tightly tied to a denominational tradition, that might be a critical boundary, but for a truly non-denominational college being Calvinist or Arminian is a matter of accountability of the members to their own churches. The non-denominational, evangelical college would not need to comment on every doctrinal issue in its lifestyle agreement; it would only need to address the ones necessary for an over-arching umbrella that establishes an evangelical community wherein the organization can accomplish its educational goal. All other issues can be wrestled with in the Church. Eventually, however, doctrine must affect how we actually live. This raises a new set of thorny issues—issues of application.

It is necessary to note here that as a college seeks to define its community it faces the danger of fads or trends in the church. Historically, we have witnessed church doctrine being held hostage by contemporary events. This need not be related to heresy; sometimes it reflects the key issues of the time. But, then again, doctrinal debates can also be detoured into fads that are not particularly consequential. In the recent past many evangelical denominations were focused with great intensity on the issue of divorce. Now the focus tends to be on abortion or, perhaps, homosexuality.

Recognizing this tendency, Christian colleges need to construct a lifestyle agreement that is focused on the key doctrines of the umbrella that we dwell under rather than jumping on the latest bandwagon of popular attention. The doctrinal statements that are woven into the campuses' lifestyle agreement should set the important principles as boundaries; and then, specific applications should be addressed by the people living under that umbrella, rather than placed in the umbrella itself. If the umbrella consists of many specific application issues that are receiving considerable attention at that moment, colleges will need to revisit the lifestyle agreement periodically and revise it to fit the latest hot issues. This is not a particularly efficient organizational approach.
Lifestyle agreements need to be community-defining documents for the long term. Otherwise little continuity will exist in the community and its identity will suffer. On the other hand, lifestyle agreements must be applied to daily life on campus in concrete ways. How do we determine correct behavior for the community and avoid fads of application? We probably can't, totally. We can, however, use the same approach stated above for the complication introduced by making sure our doctrinal positions are derived from a tradition—evangelicalism—instead of a particular church structure. First, we avoid a behavioral ecumenism that devolves into a focus on the individual's rights where anybody can do whatever they deem acceptable instead of focusing on the common good. We also must avoid an approach that tries to include everything that might be remotely relevant, suffocating our interaction and finally crushing the community. Instead, it is best to be concerned only with those applications of doctrine necessary for the defining and maintaining of our Christian community for its educational goal.

Conclusion 2: Lifestyle agreements should include only the applications of doctrine that are necessary for the definition of the Christian community needed to accomplish our educational goal.

At this point, an additional sociological reality needs to be recognized. American society has made a societal shift to an industrial or post-industrial economic system with wage labor that is based on the individual instead of systems where a larger social unit enters the economic system, i.e. the family. This shift has led to a cultural focus in the United States on the rights of individuals. As previously stated, individuals in organizations tend to lose sight of organizational goals and focus instead on their own interests. This tendency has become exacerbated in the United States by this strong cultural focus on individual rights, sometimes to the exclusion of the greater common good. Such a focus has implications for college lifestyle agreements. Debates about what should be included in the agreement have the potential of collapsing into shouting matches about "my rights" and "your rights." As a result, all sight is lost of the larger purposes of the lifestyle agreement—satisfying external constituencies, organizational efficiency; community. It is worth noting the personal rights focus at this time because specific application issues (restrictions on behavior in particular) are likely to be sidetracked into a discussion of individual rights. To approach a lifestyle agreement in a way that fulfills the three sociological goals that have been identified, a third assumption needs to be stated.

Assumption 3: Community is accomplished through the giving up of some individual rights for the sake of a common good or common goal.

The ramifications of this statement are immense. If we wish to foster community, build organizational efficiency, and satisfy external audiences, we must be cautious about claims of individual rights that trump the organization's mission. Such claims might be valid and may need to be considered, but only within the context of the greater good—the organizational mission—that is being served and an awareness of the voluntary nature of our involvement in the organization. Any individual's rights, in this context, would refer to his or her needs as related to the organizational goals and the
fostering of community—not just a client's right to have whatever he or she wants. If our colleges are reduced to buyers (students) and sellers (the college) negotiating terms of exchange (what they will pay or be required to do), then there will be no chance for community of the sort we seek to exist. Instead of having meaningful primary group relationships we will have impersonal personal-profit type relationships that resemble what is usually defined as a secondary group. This is not the goal most Christian colleges claim to seek.

When considering what to include in a lifestyle agreement, then, little is gained by arguing about "my rights" and "your rights." Efforts to define content of the lifestyle agreement according to personal rights will undermine the community we seek to establish. On the other hand, the community will not be fostered by efforts to create a comprehensive list of dos and don'ts. An attempt to build the necessary minimal umbrella for community would not seek to claim that the group has the right to define all aspects of individual behavior—just the critical ones for community boundaries. To avoid the extremes we need to maintain an awareness of the goals: 1) create an umbrella that fosters and does not stifle community; 2) keep as organizationally efficient a form as we can; 3) attempt to stay within the expectations of as many external constituencies as possible.

Let's take this a step further in application. It is plausible that a non-denominational evangelical college would determine that the maintenance of community necessitates the inclusion of a doctrinal statement in the lifestyle agreement that declares that members of the community seek to be Christ-like, pure of spirit and heart. Such a statement would form a boundary for how the campus members define themselves as compared to people not in their community. The next step would be to determine what specific applications of this doctrinal statement must be included to protect the boundaries of the community. For example, it might be stated that campus members must avoid activities that could reasonably interfere with purity in spirit and heart. They could forbid pornography and agree to give up any rights they have to dance, drink, or use drugs because they can reasonably be expected to undermine the community's members' ability to be Christ-like. These behaviors simply pose too much potential risk to the community's members' fulfillment of the boundary-defining doctrine that defines the community.

Social dancing, as an example, can be harmless, but it also can draw members of the community into avenues of thought and action that are destructive. It has been argued, however, that the umbrella that the community members' live under needs to include what is necessary to establish community boundaries and no more than that, so the organization does not let bureaucracy suffocate the development or maintenance of community.

How do the campus members decide what is necessary and not too much? The answer lies in asking how great the risk is of the activity undermining the doctrinal goal. Pornography, for example, clearly undermines attempts to be Christ-like. Does social dancing? Each campus would have to make a determination of its own. But the question is not whether anyone has the right to participate in the activity and it is not whether it fits into a particular systematic theology that is comprehensive and total. The first question is strictly market economics and not focused on the development of community while also promoting organizational efficiency to accomplish the college's
goals (education). The second is wandering out into the work of the church. The real question is whether we must have this lifestyle limitation to support a specific doctrinal boundary that creates and fosters the community where we can best accomplish our organizational goals of education. These determinations, then, are not based on personal tastes (what students or administrators prefer) but, instead, on organizational awareness. Rather than deciding if I like to see male students wearing earrings (or female students for that matter) I need to decide how much risk this behavior poses to the doctrinal boundary that establishes the very identity of the community the campus has or hopes to have.

As a final example of this process, consider the issue of abortion. Is there a Christian doctrine that indicates a sanctity of life? Yes, there clearly is. Is that doctrine central to the establishment of a useful community on a non-denominational evangelical campus? Surprisingly, the answer could be no. Such a doctrine is central to our identity as Christians, certainly, but not necessarily critical to the definition of a campus community. Remember that we are trying to establish the doctrine that defines an “evangelical Christian community” so that the whole person education being sought can be accomplished. If the campus were a church it would need to be determining doctrine and doctrinal application for its members’ lives in all areas. In fact, that is one reason why all of us maintain a membership in a church. But even though each person needs that doctrinal guidance, and even though evangelicalism clearly asserts sanctity of life, it is not necessarily needed to establish the Christian community needed for a campus’ educational goals.

Sanctity of life discussions on campuses are usually driven by a very specific application of doctrine: abortion. If we are being motivated by a general doctrine for the sanctity of life, we will begin crusades to get people to use seat belts, since many traffic fatalities could be avoided by using a seat belt. We would start crusades against poor eating habits since they lead to heart disease and other pathologies that end life early. Typically, however, we are not thinking about a larger view of the sanctity of life. We are, specifically, thinking about abortion. If the criteria for a lifestyle agreement is to only include the applications of doctrine that are necessary - even critical - to the definition of an “evangelical Christian community” that exists for educating men and women in a Christian identity, then only those applications that halt behaviors that are a risk to the community and that can undermine the common good should be included. A statement on abortion might not be relevant to this purpose. I suspect that two objections will be raised. First, some will say “But then we would be saying our community members can have abortions.” Others will say, “We also exist to make a statement to the world outside of our community. We don’t exist in a vacuum.” Let me address these responses in turn.

Not including a specific prohibition against abortion in a campuses’ lifestyle agreement does not indicate that a campuses’ community members can have abortions. We do not specify every possible behavior in existence as right or wrong for our community members. Instead, we seek to provide specific applications of doctrine to those behaviors that are threats to the kind of community we need for our educational goal. If we allowed them to do so, some students and other members of the community would entertain the opportunity and/or temptation to engage in several behaviors many campuses proscribe. Drinking, dancing, etc. can be engaged in as a matter of
personal conscience yet we prohibit them. We do this because those actions have a high possibility of undermining our community through the behavior or misbehavior of some members of the community. We give up those behaviors for the sake of the community whether we agree that they are sin or not. The goal is to create a Christian community for our educational goal—not to establish a comprehensive doctrinal statement. Thus we all make some sacrifices and, as a community, we only address some doctrinal issues and their applications.

To make the point more clear, consider this—we do not have a statement about assisted suicide even though it has been allowed in some circumstances by the courts. Why not? Because we do not believe assisted suicide is a potential undermining influence on our community. The risk of this behavior occurring and having a destructive influence on the campus community is very low. Each campus would have to consider a prohibition on abortion in the same way. The common conclusion in the evangelical arm of Protestantism is that abortion is immoral but the question for a campus lifestyle agreement is not what is wrong, but what poses a risk to our campus community and its goals. On some campuses, the community could conclude that there is a noticeable risk and the behavior must be specifically prohibited in the lifestyle agreement of the campus. On other campuses it might not be mentioned since it poses minimal risk to the campuses’ community and ability to create the educational experience desired. If a community supports an ethos that discourages abortion and the potential for such an act is about as high as the potential for an assisted suicide there is little need to include it in the lifestyle agreement. Our goal is to identify the issues of application of doctrine that are critical to the definition and maintenance of our community and its educational goal.

How do we deal with the other possible objection: that we also exist to make a statement to the world outside of our community? To what extent are we here to make a statement to the world around us? I would argue that we should seek to do that in a peripheral way. We are not the Church. Thus, we cannot presume to take on the role of the Church. As a community we will make a statement to the world around us, of course. All communities do. But such a statement should be a natural outgrowth of our efforts to fulfill our goal as a community: educating students as intelligent Christians. We need a Christian community to do this.

Do we need to make pronouncements to the world to establish our Christian community? Does doing so help us accomplish our goal of education? To both of these questions I would answer no. There are specific external constituencies that have been referenced throughout this discussion and Christian colleges do react to them in their efforts to create an efficient organization that develops a community appropriate for the campuses’ educational purpose. But making pronouncements to the society at large is qualitatively different than dealing with a college’s constituencies who are needed for the fulfillment of its mission. If Christian colleges decide to make systematic theological statements and/or attempt to preach to the society around them through bold statements on what should or should not be done, it will diffuse the resources of the organization to the detriment of the organization’s mission.

It is a great temptation of many para-church organizations to expand into new missions. We would be wise to take note that organizations that accomplish this effectively in industrial or post-industrial mass-population societies are those that
build autonomous internal systems to accomplish the different goals. Using a single organizational structure to accomplish two very different purposes – make a statement to society and create Christian education – can only create confusion and ineffectiveness.

If we decide that our goal as an institution, or that our creation and maintenance of a Christian community, necessitates making public pronouncements on all issues of moral consequence we had best start writing a lot of news releases. The only circumstance I can envision that would necessitate our doing this is an external threat to our continued community or educational goal. Public pronouncements should be made from individuals or other communities that exist for this purpose – like the church body.

Who must sign the lifestyle agreement?

On many campuses discussions abound regarding who should sign a lifestyle agreement. Should the members of the governing board? The students? The faculty? What about hired staff? This is another area of debate that can be mediated by recognizing that a lifestyle agreement is a device we use to establish a community aimed at an educational goal. In deciding to whom a lifestyle agreement should apply we should seek to determine when and where it must be applied to maintain community. This can be done, to a large extent, by establishing at the outset, which individuals qualify as members of the community. To identify who is a member of a community, we need to return to the definition of community. A community is as a collection of people who have consistent and regular interaction that is intimate and face-to-face such that the members of the group come to have a shared identity.

Community is determined by relationships maintained across time within a shared context—but not just any relationships. Communities are based on groups of people whose relationships affect the identities of one another. If the interaction is not affecting the members’ ideas of who they are, then it is too shallow to foster community. If an individual consistently interacts with a group of people who have some sense of common identity and if he or she affects the group members’ ideas of who they are and what kind of people they should be, then that individual is a member of that community. Who is a part of a campus community, then? Anyone who has consistent interaction with the community members and affects the self-definitions of the other members. Hence, a fourth underlying assumption.

Assumption 4: Those people who have a regular relationship with the other members of the community and have a notable impact on the self-definitions of the other community members are themselves members of the community.

Do the faculty do these two things? Yes. Do traditional students do them? Yes. Administration? Yes. People in these three groups obviously are members of the campus community. Other individuals, however, may be harder to classify.

Do Trustees or Regents have regular interaction with the other community members and have notable impact on their self-definitions? What about part-time students? In large measure our response depends on how much interaction these individuals have
with other community members and the amount of effect they have on the identities adopted by others on the campus.

In the case of part-time students, we may question how many credits they are taking and how much out of class time they spend with others from the community. For predominantly residential colleges, part-time students will have a difficult time getting into the student sub-culture because they are missing the important social linkages gained through eating and living together. At other colleges, part-time students form a notable portion of the campus student body and thus the very nature of the social networks will have become more inclusive of them. On campuses where it is determined that part-time students have regular interaction of great enough impact that they affect others in the community then they would need to sign a lifestyle agreement.

Part-time faculty, on the other hand, probably has more interaction with the students in their class than the part-time students do. They also have a position from which they can have a much greater impact on some other members' identities. It is hard to imagine a Christian college where part-time faculty would have little effect or interaction with others in the community. This suggests that they should sign the lifestyle agreement. Conclusion three becomes evident then.

Conclusion 3: Anyone who has regular interaction with other campus community members and has a notable effect on the type of person others choose to be should sign the lifestyle agreement.

When does the lifestyle agreement apply?

The approach presented for answering the "what" and "who" questions can also serve as a guide us in determining when the lifestyle agreement should apply. It is sometimes argued that when students are gone from campus for a break or to visit parents they are not under the authority of any lifestyle agreement at the campus. At some campuses it has been argued that students need not adhere to the agreement as soon as they are off campus. Similar kinds of arguments are made for workers at the campus. To settle these kinds of issues we need a rationale for when the lifestyle agreement applies that is based on its reason for existence. In this case, I will begin by stating the conclusion and then offer an explanation.

Conclusion 4: A lifestyle agreement applies whenever a person's behavior can impact the continuance of community or its goals. It applies to the extent necessary to maintain us as contributing members of the community and its educational goals.

Communities exist above and beyond the members in them, but certainly the members in them affect the communities of which they are a part. In fact, this is a central assumption to this discussion.

Assumption 5: Each individual member of a community affects the nature of that community through what he or she does and through who he or she is.

When individuals are gathered together on the college campus few have doubts that
the lifestyle agreement applies because it is implicitly recognized that violations of the covenant would violate our community. Individuals recognize that to be part of a group, personal choices must become subservient to the best interests of the larger group if we wish to be part of the group. This is true for any collection of people – family, workplace, church – that wants to maintain some common identity for some length of time. Each requires certain voluntary sacrifices on the part of its members for it to exist.

Now, however, is there some reason that we would make these same sacrifices, or any sacrifices, while not in the group?" To arrive at an answer to this question, let's begin by comparing certain behaviors when they happen on and off campus. If a member of a residence hall openly brought people into the residence hall to take drugs and be sexually active, we would rightly see that the behavior as detrimental to our community. This behavior would violate the shared trust and reaffirmation of Christian principles that our community is based on as defined by the doctrinal statements and applications put forth in the lifestyle agreement. But what if this person did these things while off campus during spring break? Would they still violate our community? They would if the behavior changed them in a way that made them a negative influence when they returned to campus.

Assumption 6: What we do as individuals, while away from any given community, affects who we are.

Let's consider the implications of assumptions 5 and 6. Who we are affects the community. What we do, affects who we are. If a person consorts with prostitutes and violates moral standards it changes that person. When that person returns to the community he or she will very probably undermine the community. Not necessarily by continuing the problematic behavior, but by undermining the degree to which he or she contributes to the community. Communities survive through the contributions of their members. If members are not truly committed they not only quit contributing the support necessary to maintain community, but will also bleed away the contributions of others through their infusion of such detrimental influences as apathy, cynicism, or malice.

How much does a lifestyle agreement apply, then, while we are away from our campus community? It applies to the degree necessary to maintain us as contributing members of the community. This approach moves us away from dichotomous ideas about application. It is not an all or nothing application. It is, instead, a question of intensity of application. Some behavior is always restricted. When involved in sexual immorality, for example, a person changes. When he or she returns to the community after such involvement, he or she becomes a negative influence. Other behaviors are less consequential. For example, Episcopalians are served wine when partaking in Communion. As an Episcopalian, is it permissible to partake of the wine in Communion if all alcohol is forbidden in one’s campus lifestyle agreement? The answer depends on how much effect consumption will have on your ability to be a contributing member of the community when you return. In the Episcopalian's case, it won't have any effect at all.

With regard to organizational efficiency, it is unfortunate that this criterion does not make living out a lifestyle agreement clear cut. But the organizational efficiency
 gained by having total acceptance or denial of off-campus behaviors that would not be allowed on campus does not provide the fertile ground where discernment can grow. Discernment is not only a great trait in community members, but also is part of what we hope to develop in our students anyway. But it does leave us with a more ambiguous standard to apply to off-campus behavior. How do we decide when a behavior is or is not acceptable? And how do we help students and others know how to effectively discern what they can and cannot do? Instead of being able to look at a check list and say "good" or "bad" we must use an approach like this: you entered into an agreement with the community voluntarily, so always try to err by being too careful in your liberties for the sake of the community. If I find myself thinking, “Can I drink in this situation? Does the lifestyle agreement apply now?” I have to assume it does and place the burden of proof on claims that it does not. With this approach I need a compelling reason to move outside the lifestyle agreement because I am putting the common good before my individual gratification.

So, does a lifestyle agreement apply during spring break? Yes. It applies to whatever extent is necessary to maintain a person as a contributing member of the community. Can faculty do things in their homes that students cannot do in the residence halls? Yes, if the behaviors do not change who they are such that the faculty members impact negatively on the community. The lifestyle agreement applies to whatever extent is necessary to maintain them as contributing members of the community. And they would be very wise to err on the side of care for the community.

If a campus has decided that social dancing poses too great a risk to the moral identities of some of the campus members and so has prohibited it, each member of the community must consider this before engaging in social dancing while away from the campus. But even if dances in the residence hall focus the attention of some students on ideas or drives that will negatively affect their involvement in the community, dancing with my wife in the privacy of our living room is not likely to change me in such a way that I would have a negative effect on the community. The real question is whether doing some behavior will make me a less constructive member of the community I have voluntarily chosen to be involved in.

For the few short years they are in the residence halls, the students will probably need to sacrifice a few more individual liberties for the community than faculty and staff do at home. It is worth noting, however, that most employees will be making their sacrifice of individual choice for the sake of the community long after any given student has graduated. Each member of the community makes a noticeable sacrifice of individual rights for the common good.

Two responses I would expect to hear are, “This means I decide how much I’ll be affected, so I can do whatever I want” and “This isn’t fair. It means faculty and others can do things that I can’t just because they are outside of the physical proximity of the community more often.” These responses both focus on individual rights instead of the common good of the community. The first response misses the point entirely. Consideration of the effect on the community is not something to be whimsically tossed aside. To boil down what has just been presented to individual license implies that the lifestyle agreement and the community it establishes are trivial. If a person views them as trivial he or she should not join the community in the first place. Concern for the community does free you to live by the liberty of your own conscience,
but your conscience is bounded by a voluntarily given pledge to the community. The second response also misses the point. If we are arguing about who gets what, we have already lost sight of the community we claim to be voluntarily joining and supporting.

So how does this effect certain internal constituencies like non-traditional students? Does the lifestyle agreement apply to students who live off-campus? If non-traditional students who are consistently enrolled are members of the community, then they would sign the lifestyle agreement and must ask themselves how strongly it applies at any given time. While they are at home or at work they must decide whether any given behavior will detract from their ability to be a contributing member of the community. If they choose to view this as license to do as they please, they have violated both the agreement and their pledge to the community. They should, instead, seek to do what they believe is honestly acceptable without making themselves a detriment to the community and its educational goal. If there arises a disagreement between the student's view and the student development faculty's view of what is acceptable behavior under this philosophy, the good of the community outweighs other considerations. Further, the organizational realities for having a lifestyle agreement necessitate that the campus staff has to bear the burden of making a correct decision and the student is bound to live within it. This assumes that the student development faculty member is seeking to carefully apply limits only as necessary and not just in the way most convenient for him or her and it assumes that the student understands that voluntary submission to the community bears this kind of a price.

Since our focus is on the good of the community, and the lifestyle agreement is a statement of doctrine and its application that is necessary for the establishment of community, we can also note that a person of integrity cannot cheat the system by saying "I'll do this proscribed behavior now and then reconcile to the community later." With that insincere approach reconciliation is not truly possible. He (or she) has made choice of who to be that makes him a negative influence on the community when he returns to it. If a person violates a lifestyle agreement and then sincerely seeks to reconcile to the community it is a different matter. A person also cannot in good faith say "I will sign the lifestyle agreement and then behave out of accord with the community's expectations because the community is wrong and needs to change its stance anyway." This response is, put baldly, a betrayal of the community. If a person feels that the community is wrong in some doctrinal stance or application then he or she has two choices. Stay out of the community and share his or her concerns from without, or join the community and live within the expectations of the lifestyle agreement while sharing those concerns from within.
CONCLUSION

A lifestyle agreement is a means to establish a Christian community for the fulfillment of a university's mission statement. I have tried to demonstrate how certain thorny questions can be answered through a focus on the sociological forces that drive the need for a lifestyle agreement: community, organizational efficiency, and external constituencies. Specifically, it has been suggested that decisions about what to include in a lifestyle agreement can be made by remembering that the agreement is a means to establish an educational community. Consequently, only those doctrinal statements and their applications that are necessary for the community need to be included. I have also suggested that a focus on community can assist us in determining who should sign the lifestyle agreement. And, I have suggested that it can be determined when a lifestyle agreement applies to any given community member by remembering that as long as we intend to return to the community we should avoid any behavior outside the allowances of the lifestyle agreement that could denigrate our ability to be a contributing member of the community. Finally, I suggested that to minimize the risk to the community by the exercise of individual liberty, the good of the community be weighed ahead of individual rights.

Throughout this discussion, I have sought to address the real issues of application that it raises. Even so, my primary goal has been to provide an approach to lifestyle agreements that can guide our efforts to build effective ones. There is room for debate about the conclusions drawn from the approach presented. Others using the same sociological approach might disagree with the conclusions presented as to what should be included in a lifestyle agreement, who signs it, and when and to what extent the agreement applies. The gain of using this approach is not that everyone agrees on specifics, but, rather, that all will understand the basis of those disagreements and still be able to construct an internally consistent lifestyle agreement.

For each of our campuses, community is the foundation from which we seek to accomplish our educational goal. A lifestyle agreement is no more, and certainly no less, than the means by which we establish the boundaries and nature of that community.
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Commonality & Diversity

by Donna Thoennes, Ph.D.

ABSTRACT

As students are increasingly influenced by postmodern thought, which promotes ideas of community without a common center and emphasizes difference, so students may have fresh conceptualizations of what community is and how it functions. This study explored students' conceptions, experiences, and ideals of community.

The tension between commonality and diversity within community has caused much debate in the social sciences. Interviewees, who were students at member institutions of the CCCU, recognize the same tension and often struggle to navigate their relationships within a collegiate environment that promotes both.

Thirty undergraduate senior students at two Christian colleges were interviewed in February 2000. A semi-structured interview protocol was used. The interview yielded tape-recordings, then transcribed raw data. Verbal analysis provided several recurrent themes. Students' conception on the two most prevalent themes, commonality and diversity, are discussed in this paper. Finally, implications are drawn for the Christian college campus.

Community: Student Voices on the Tension Between Commonality and Diversity

With radical force, postmodern thought has wrecked havoc on a fairly common understanding of what previously constituted a community. The idea that community consists of a group of similar people who are held together by commonalities is challenged by the postmodern emphasis on difference. What has been termed the "sameness assumption" (Furman, 1998), that is, the modern tendency to assume that ideal communities are homogeneous, has been replaced by the idea of diversity at the center of community.

Dr. Donna Thoennes is an assistant professor at the Torrey Honors Institute, Biola University. She has a Ph.D. in educational studies from Trinity Evangelical Divinity School. Her master's degree was completed in educational ministries at Wheaton College, with Emphasis in College Student Development and her undergraduate B.S. Ed. Physical Education was done at Central Connecticut State University.
A continuing battle rages between libertarian and communitarian thinkers around the issue of shared substantive values at the societal level. University professor and founder of The Communitarian Network, Amitai Etzioni, is a leading communitarian. His research of American and foreign history has led him to conclude that the proper view of American society is a mosaic held within a frame. His article “The Community of Communities” speaks of American society as a conglomeration of diverse parts that share a commitment to shared framework. Unlike most countries of the world, the United States is characterized by increasing heterogeneity. Etzioni suggests reinforcing the bonds that unite Americans and cautions against emphasizing difference. “By relentlessly classifying and distinguishing between Americans -- by stressing diversity but not the elements that bind us -- we further diminish our already weak and weakening commonalities: We face the danger of coming apart at the seams” (Etzioni, 1996, p. 128).

Etzioni is not advocating the blending of culture and difference, but appreciation coinciding with shared bonds. He argues that libertarians proclaim that any determined commonality threatens individual rights and thus form a “thin society”. In contrast, the “thick society” framework incorporates shared core values to sustain and maintain “a reasonable measure of unity” (Etzioni, 1996, p. 130). However, the core values need not be rigid and untouchable, “to maintain its own continuity, the framework must continuously adapt to changing balances within society and to geopolitical changes” (Etzioni 1996, p. 130). He heralds “layered loyalty”, diversity within unity, bonded pluralism, and communities within community. That is, to “a view of society in which persons respect differences while maintaining unity” (Etzioni 1996, p. 137).

Communitarian ideals pushed to the extreme cause libertarians to fear what they call “the dark side of community.” While community is generally considered a social good, Noddings cautions educators to intelligently consider that “Community is not an unalloyed good; it has a dark side” (Noddings 1996, p. 245). Community ideology can result in domination, distrust of outsiders, alienation, assimilation, conformity, coercion, parochialism, exclusivity, marginalization, balkanization and totalitarianism (Noddings, 1996; Furman, 1998; Shields and Seltzer, 1997; Giroux, 1992; McMillan and Chavis, 1986). Noddings suggests a built-in ethical system of collective goods, which is free from the dark side. Rorty’s (1989) answer is community with liberalism as its center. Noddings seeks to answer whether collective orientation and individual liberty can coexist. If a unifying center at the societal level is inconsistent with liberalism, perhaps the local level is the place for communitarianism (Noddings, 1996). The public-private split laid out by Rorty gives credence to this resolution in which community at the public level exists only for utilitarian purposes, such as voting, with no genuine allegiance. Etzioni sees danger in this solution.

Without a firm sense of one supra community, there is considerable danger that the constituent communities will turn on one another. Indeed the more one favors strengthening communities, which is the core of the Communitarian agenda, the more one must concern oneself with ensuring that they see themselves as parts of a more encompassing whole, rather than fully independent and antagonistic. (Etzioni, 1993, p. 155)
Magolda and Abowitz point to the writing of John Stuart Mill and John Locke as the foundation for liberal political philosophy, emphasizing liberty, the autonomous self, and persons as rational machines, devoid of cultural and relational influence. The liberal views persons as able to maintain "a critical distance" (Magolda and Abowitz, 1997, p. 272) on societal influences and able to freely choose their identities and commitments. Communitarians consider this view of human beings "naïve," as it presupposes a "divided self" or an "unencumbered self" (Galston, 1989, p. 722), thus ignoring the shaping of social groups on an individual. Rather, communitarians see people as interdependent and making meaning from social contexts.

Noddings (1996) refers to the feminist ethic of care and primacy of relation. She champions women in history who demonstrated compassion and service to others in spite of differing intellectual viewpoints. Noddings offers care as the center for community, as she defines it:

> The felt obligation (prior to agency) to respond helpfully when needs present themselves; a sense of universality based on needs and feelings rather than beliefs, principles, affiliations or highly contested versions of humans as imago dei; and a recognition of the contingent nature of even the closest and most loving communities. (Noddings, 1996, p. 266)

Noddings desires that a center is maintained within community, but one which can be embraced by diverse people because it is free from ideological content. She warns against declaring the majority, traditional, Eurocentric, white values as the shared societal values. Communitarians retort by stating that as the community evolves, so must the core ideals. Theirs is not a call to preserving or maintaining antiquated, and therefore inadequate, societal values. Rather, re-evaluating values as the population changes.

Christians who seek a proper understanding of Christian community also feel this tension between commonality and diversity. In his commentary on 1 Corinthians 12, Gordon Fee (1987) argues that there can be no unity without diversity. In responding to problems within the church at Corinth, Paul establishes his plea for diversity within unity by highlighting that God himself (the Three in One) displays diversity within unity. Within the church, "their common experience of the Spirit in conversion is the key to unity (vs.13)" (Fee, 1987, p. 583). He continues, the need for diversity exists "if there is to be a true body and not simply a monstrosity" by which he means a healthy church as opposed to a homogeneous one (Fee, 1987, p. 583). The postmodern emphasis on diversity is a reminder to Christians that the Christian community is diverse in its makeup of race, age, gender, gifts, nationality, personality, handicap and social status. However, the one around whom the Christian community rallies, that is, the triune God, is the one who manifests variety throughout his creation. Diversity is a valued reality within the community, but the common center is essential for the community to exist at all.

First Corinthians 12:4-11 stresses the diverse gifts God manifests to different people for the common good of the community which are a result of their faith in the same Spirit and same Lord. The great diversity builds up the community, not the individual. Discussing verses 12-14, Fee emphasizes that Paul suggests that even though the body is one, it does not consist of one member but of many. Thus, it requires diversity since
it is, in fact, already one body. However, the unity that exists is not uniformity (this is the correction Paul is offering the Corinthians), and Fee strongly states, “there is no such thing as true unity without diversity” (Fee, 1987, p. 602). Paul strengthens his statement by obliterating the significance of distinctions between Jew and Greek, slave and free. While the distinctions remain, their significance pales in comparison with the new unity and common life that exists in the Spirit.

In this passage, Paul is not requiring a multicultural “look” for the church at Corinth, but rather addressing the problem that arose over gifts. Specifically Paul deals with the gift of tongues and the believers’ tendency to find distinctions and value according to gifted-ness. Paul is also not hinting at pluralism or relativism within the church. Each of verses 4-9, and 11 mention the “same Spirit,” “the same Lord,” “same God,” or “one Spirit” after each mention of the type of diverse gift. The diversity he promotes is variety, which is initiated and bestowed by God himself upon a person who has submitted to him in faith.

THE RESEARCH

The purpose of this study was to explore the way college students who attend Christian colleges and universities conceptualize community. The tension between commonalities and diversity within community arose consistently throughout the interviews. Students’ responses to interview questions reveal that this tension between commonality and difference continues to frustrate and intrigue them.

The research project was undertaken to answer the question: In what ways, and to what extent, are the community experiences of college students who attend two Christian liberal arts institutions similar and dissimilar to their ideals about community? Thirty senior students from two Christian liberal arts institutions, who met a demographic profile based on the Council for Christian Colleges and Universities’ “Report on the 1996 CCCU First-Year Entering Students,” participated in a sixty-minute pre-determined open-ended interview that was tape-recorded, transcribed and analyzed.

Major Findings

Students’ conceptions of community emerged as the interviews were analyzed. Several specific themes came into view from the data; this paper will consider two, Commonality and Diversity.

Commonality

When speaking about Christian community, students were unwavering on the importance of commonality, or having things in common with others in the community. After identifying places where they had experienced community, students were asked to describe the nature of their community experiences since coming to college. Repeatedly, they could not do so without commenting on the commonalities among those in the community. In all of the examples, the community members were Christians, thereby sharing their faith in common.
Students said that in order to be a member of the community, they all must be “believers,” or have put their faith in Jesus Christ for salvation. In addition, they must share specific common beliefs, or the basic tenets of the Christian faith. Some students delineated the specific beliefs necessary for Christian community. Peter, an athlete and literature major, said

\[ \text{Christian community is a group of people where the people are joined by a common set of beliefs. They all accept basic points of Christian orthodoxy; Jesus was the Son of God, conception of the truth of the Word. They are in community because this is their focus ... a core set of beliefs, it doesn't have to be my personal theological points, but a core set that is basic Christian orthodoxy.} \]

Secondarily, Peter wanted the community to share a commitment to justice and a commitment to taking care of other people.

Nate said, “Christian community is a certain bond or connectedness amongst Christians that is based on shared values and goals and beliefs. The shared values and beliefs unite them and create some of the connectedness and unity and love.”

Students assert that these commonly held beliefs are necessary in order for Christian community to exist. Membership within the community is contingent upon faith in Jesus Christ. More than just adherence to external lifestyle habits, students speak of a spiritual unity through Jesus Christ and a mystical union because of the indwelling of the Holy Spirit. Further, they maintain that a shared belief system determines the kind of community that unfolds—one that is guided by a common purpose, the topic of the following section.

In addition to common faith, several other commonalities were mentioned: common goal of wanting to serve God, to educate the college campus about missions and provide opportunities for missions, glorifying and loving God, united in zeal for missions, common team goal to win championships, enjoy God together and a common focus or purpose.

When asked to define Christian community, a recurring answer was that Christian community consists of Christians serving the same purpose. Students spoke of a bond or connectedness based on shared purpose and goals that grow out of their shared values and beliefs. The community is thus able to “experience Christianity together.” The goal, as they share their life, is “to glorify God” and to “bring each other closer to the Lord.”

In similar fashion to student’s answers regarding a definition of community, their answers regarding their ideals of community consistently demonstrated the importance of commonality. Their answers are three-fold and can be divided into three categories that are represented by heart, mind and strength. Inwardly, students speak about the common indwelling of the Holy Spirit and a common commitment to Jesus Christ in one’s heart. Intellectually, they speak of assenting to a common goal, agreeing on a common vision, or submitting to a common purpose. Brooke said this assent to common ideology is “foundational to building a community.” However, the goal or purpose is flexible and may change depending on circumstances. The common purpose gives birth to common activity as ideology works itself into community life in tangible ways: sharing the gospel, learning, ministry, working and service surfaced as potential common ways for the community to minister.
When students were asked to mention elements that are essential for the existence of Christian community, the majority of students responded that commonality was non-negotiable. Repeatedly commonality was identified as a common goal, focus or purpose. The object of the goal was God himself, the desire to be Christ-like, like-mindedness, the desire for God, the desire that others grow closer to God, and serving the Lord. Kari succinctly stated, “a true Christian community needs to have a definite desire for pursuing God.” All of these can be summed up in the purpose to glorify God and Sam represented the thinking of many when he said “God is glorified in a special way when there’s a large group of people.”

It is interesting to note that when students were asked to distinguish between Christian and non-Christian community, their ideas about non-Christian community were pessimistic and dismissive. Because there could be no common ideology to provide the glue necessary, a community would be based on one’s residence or job and this is neither permanent nor deep enough to warrant lasting bonds.

To summarize, students’ experiences and ideals of commonality within community were consistent. In both cases the spiritual, rational and physical aspects were employed and vital. Commonality in all three aspects gave birth to the community and allowed it to be enjoyable, functional, educational and soil for growth.

Diversity

A second strong theme that emerged from the data was diversity, or difference between people. Students recognize that community requires a common center, such as belief in Jesus. They think diversity is often considered a threat to community although theoretically, that should not be the case. As mentioned in the previous section, commonality within the community is non-negotiable. Diversity within the community can co-exist with commonality because the nature of the diversity is external or in the non-essentials of the faith. While commonality is necessarily at the center, diversity is on the periphery. The two do not oppose one another; they are different aspects of the same entity, like different organs of the same organism. The diverse attributes of an individual are peripheral in comparison to the innermost things held in common. Jason appealed to the body of Christ and insisted, “diversity is essential to community ... Unity comes in Christ and wanting to live as Christ lived, but diversity comes on a variety of levels, gender, etc.”

When describing diversity, students offered these realms of difference: different backgrounds, gifts, “places people are at,” interests, nationalities, personalities, strengths, ethnicities, majors and worship styles. They did not offer different theological views or religious faiths as acceptable points of diversity within Christian community. It seems, the stuff of their faith is central; the stuff of diversity is peripheral.

When asked if diversity and commonality can coexist, students reported that they could indeed. Apparently, because the two do not claim the same theoretical “place,” they can easily coexist. Each serves a different role in the design and functioning of community. Sonja offered her prescription for balancing the two:
I guess for it not to be (in) tension what you have in common needs to be more important than what is different ... The center for Christian community needs to be the core beliefs and the dedication to the Christian faith and a desire to enact that.

Asia, reflecting on her two years in Zimbabwe said,

*Diversity brings about commonality, understanding the hugeness of the Lord and how he can be worshipped makes you a person who can see commonality more ... it makes commonality so much more precious because it's those things that really, really matter.*

Students also mentioned that diversity improves the community, thereby making it more effective. The same goal can be worked toward with a diversity of gifts or ideas. Shane saw the need for emphasizing commonality when there is diversity.

*Some people from different races come here (to college) and assume that all white people are bad and you have to acknowledge that whatever our race is we all have Jesus Christ in common, so you have to be intentional about what's in common or else there will be many problems. Diversity is a threat on the surface level issues that can be difficult to get past like language barriers or outer differences, but at a deeper level it shouldn't be a threat in theory.*

Logan adds, “If we focus on the big picture, we can exist with our differences. We shouldn't focus so much on our diversity. Little things aren't detrimental to community unless it's something that we make detrimental.” Kate's assessment was, “Diversity is only a threat to community when people are coming at it from a place of pain and people are defensive then you can't get to the real issues because of the symptoms.” One student said the center of Christian community is theological: faith alone, grace alone, Scripture alone. Human diversity is not in tension with that core.

In their definition of community, a small number of students indirectly touched upon the issue of diversity through the idea of gifts. That is, rather than specifying diversity explicitly, they mentioned that a community is like the body of Christ which is made up of people with different gifts and roles. These differences are necessary to the functioning of the organism. While perhaps not central to what it means to be Christian, diversity is recognized as God-given.

While diversity appeared tangential compared to commonality, students were skeptical of a community when individuality is squelched and people are forced to be alike; they want to maintain what is unique to each. Some see individualism as an extreme emphasis on individuality and a desire to stand alone. Others confuse the meaning of individualism and individuality, stating that individualism and being individualistic is good and should be encouraged.

The theme of comfort and the desire for it was easily discerned when students spoke of diversity. Diversity makes community less comfortable and it can be difficult to feel a sense of belonging. They state it is much easier to be in community with similar people. Therefore, students naturally gravitate toward people who are similar to them. Tori admitted,
We like to circle around people most like us who agree with us because they support our way of thinking and encourage and affirm us. We don't naturally go to people who are more diverse and will challenge us by disagreeing with the way we think.

Others divulge that there is a lot of similarity among their friendship group. Rachel purports, “Commonality is important, because you must connect in order to build a community or friendship ... it (is) easier to be comfortable and build relationships, like with my RA staff, because we had a lot in common.” Some are concerned about the loss of comfort when diversity is pronounced. Martha, believing that strongest connections occur among those similar, said, “The point of community is to develop a network of people who are like you ... Community is people who are just like you that you can bond with.”

Speaking of interacting with an international student, Nate said hesitatingly, “I learned a lot, I see the world differently, and it adds a lot of richness. But I won’t ever be as close to him as I will to other people.” Because his experience was less comfortable, Nate would prefer to interact regularly with those who were less different. Wyatt, sharing Nate’s concern, poses the question:

*Using the terms diversity and community in the same sentence is really crossing the streams ... if someone different acts differently than you do, do you need to feel compelled to go and interact with them for the sake of diversity and exposing yourself to something new that’s extremely unnatural?*

Later he added,

*If you pick up too much diversity though two people may not feel comfortable interacting, there may not be enough common ground between them to promote community. Diversity can eliminate common ground if there’s too much of it or if you accumulate more diversity.*

These students, having felt pressure to diversify their campuses and lives, question whether the loss of comfort is worth the benefits that diversity affords.

In addition to desiring comfort, students cited a positive outcome of their community experiences was learning to appreciate people who are different from them. They recognize that differences help a group function and that dissimilar people can learn from one another. Indeed, learning to appreciate people was the most common answer students offered for positive benefits of their community experiences. They appear to sense that people are valuable and therefore should be appreciated. There is room in their ideal communities for individuality and some want to allow for individualism. Several people would intentionally include diverse people in their ideal community. However, individuals are subordinate to the community.

Kate recognizes both the importance of comfort and challenge. She suggests that being “heard and understood” are nurtured in situations that are not diverse: “It’s good when you can relate to people in community and are heard and understood, but I’ve come to appreciate those who are more diverse from me.”
To summarize, students see the potential difficulty of being in community with those who are different, yet they refer to "learning to appreciate them" as one of the greatest outcomes of being in community, suggesting that it is a process. That is, the appreciation is not immediate but learned.

Students were asked to discuss the negative aspects of their community experiences. "Difference" surfaced as a cause for relational struggles. Some students found interaction with different personalities difficult. Jason generalized, "When someone thinks different from you, your immediate response is to become defensive." Anna added, "It can be uncomfortable to be different from others and it's good to learn to deal with that." In her eyes, the benefit of the rough experience outweighs the negative.

To summarize, students had strong consistent ideas of the importance and content of diversity. They had developed ideas of the tension and solution to the tension caused by diversity. When talking about the nature of their community experiences, diversity was not highlighted very often. When a brief reference was offered, such as, "the diversity was immense," it came without describing it or developing the importance of it. When asked directly about diversity students had much to say, but in open-ended question, they did not volunteer much on the topic.

Interestingly, while students see the necessity of commonality, they often describe themselves and their group/team/school in terms of differences. However, the differences mentioned are often parochial, social butterflies verses wallflowers, or west coast verses midwest, football player verses quartet singer. One may question whether these qualify as substantial cultural differences. When considering the breadth of human difference within the world, those who attend an American Christian college may appear homogenous.

In most cases, their experience was one of pleasant homogeneity: similar people sharing a similar Christian worldview out of which grew similar commitments and lifestyle. Most students interviewed have only experienced "Christian community." Most of them have grown up in Christian families and attended evangelical churches. Some attended Christian schools prior to college. Their responses are thusly influenced by their experience.

Conclusions and Recommendation

Students did not offer their ideas about diversity unless provoked. As they described their community experiences most did not mention diversity. Further, they did not state that diversity was essential to Christian community. When directly asked, they wanted to maintain individuality, but maintain the primacy of the community over individuals. The few students who saw the necessity of diversity were usually those who had substantial experiences in diverse communities. Several had concerns about how comfortable community would be with those very different. One may wonder whether these students may be fearful of the unknown when speaking of diversity. Their community experiences have been mostly homogeneous. Therefore, they clearly point out, this is most comfortable to them. Although they state that sameness is comfortable, they do not stop there with their analysis. Rather, the majority said that difference is essential to good community and that learning to appreciate difference is one of the greatest benefits of community. Apparently, when diversity is already
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established within a given community, positive ramifications result, but because the process may be uncomfortable, few would intentionally diversify their community.

Overall, students wanted the emphasis in community to be on commonalities and not on diversity. This may be a reaction to a perceived emphasis on diversity surrounding them in the media or at their institution. They sense that increasing diversity is an institutional initiative and have been exposed to speakers who provoke guilt in them for attending (and being comfortable in) predominately upper/middle class, white institutions. Some are frustrated by this push to diversify, others are relieved that the problem is receiving attention. Regardless of the reasons for their ideas about diversity, one thing is clear; their own comfort is a priority. They seem to be saying, "relationships are hard enough, let's not complicate them more by immense differences!" What they consider a big difference is sometimes as inconsequential as what hobby or sport they enjoy. It is ironic that, although they say they want to emphasize commonality, they highlight parochial differences as challenges. It seems they look for points of distinction and allow those as reasons for division. Perhaps this is part of their quest to establish their own sense of identity. In noticing the differences in others, they are establishing their own uniqueness. At many Christian institutions, the students, faculty, staff and administrators are all Christians. Consequently, it appears that students seek to find significance in other ways. External distinctions are elevated as students formulate their identity. It seems plausible that Christian students who attend secular universities would emphasize their common faith to counteract their feelings of isolation or being misunderstood. In their need for fellowship, these students may minimize distinctions that the students interviewed would find divisive, such as personality, interests and background. In this way, students at secular universities may have a truer concept, or at least experience, of Christian community.

While students have learned from those different from themselves, their comments indicate that comfort is more highly prized in friendships than challenge or sharpening. They state that initial discomfort may give way to comfort in time, but perhaps they do not want to invest the extra time and effort necessary, but rather want immediate comfort in relationships. A community of like individuals is perceived as conducive to immediate comfort. According to interviews, students highly value authenticity and being known. Their reservations with regard to diversity suggest that being known may be compromised as difference pervades. Other's ability to instantly know them well will be challenged by their different personality, background, culture or theological stance. Further, students desire vulnerability within relationships. However, they must be confident that they will not be judged once they reveal who they are. They abhor judgment and see it as detrimental to community. Perhaps they fear that someone very different will misunderstand them, and thereby find it easy to judge them. Consequently, they would not be free to be themselves and not feel known. The end result would be a community that does not provide the feeling of connectedness for which they are primarily searching.

When different portions of students' interviews are brought together, they appear incongruent. Students admit they desire to be comfortable and find difference prohibits that, but also theoretically want commonalities to be more highly valued in community than difference. If the essential commonalities were as strong as students say they should be, the points of difference would not pose a challenge to their comfort level.
Why would peripheral issues challenge relationships? Could it be that they view others “according to the flesh,” 2 Corinthians 5:16, rather than according to their essence? Perhaps they know how things should be but have a hard time making it reality.

On one hand students say all believers are one in Christ, and that diversity is important for a community to function. On the other hand, some say they are too uneasy to force relationships with those who are markedly different. The apostle Paul provides them with a challenge -- God broke down the dividing wall and brought peace so that all believers are fellow citizens. Legal, ethnic and national distinctions are obliterated in light of faith in Christ, Galations 3, Ephesians 2. To those students who see dissimilarity as a hurdle, Paul says you are no longer strangers and aliens, but one. Relationships and interactions should be driven by this theological truth, not by fear of the unknown or by a desire for comfort. Students should be challenged to live out this theological reality regardless of opposing feelings.

Racially and ethnically diversifying the campus is difficult but should be a priority of admissions offices. Many Christian colleges recognize this need and are making efforts toward this end. The issue of minority students being drawn to and comfortable in a predominately white institution arises. The burden then falls to human resources to hire faculty and staff who represent other racial and ethnic groups.

Effort should be made toward integration of race, interests, intellect and ethnicity in the living environment. Separate living quarters based on interests or race may be detrimental to the community efforts being made in other realms of campus. Modeling appreciation of difference among faculty can be accomplished by team teaching with someone from a different field or viewpoint to demonstrate respect, openness and collegiality.

Teachers of programs such as “The Freshman Experience” or “The First Year Seminar” have the unique opportunity to interact with first year students coming straight from high school who are eager to learn what college life and learning are all about. Here, at the beginning of their college career, is an opportune time to teach on the necessity of difference for the functioning of relationships, specifically marriage, family, in ministry and the church.

Faculty and staff can communicate a proper concept of community to students simply by the language they choose to use. We must begin to view community as something we are rather than something we create. We are the body of Christ, a group of diverse people rallying around Christ, who is our center. Commonality and diversity are theological realities within Christian community because of God’s intentional design and creativity. Our responsibility is to reflect what is true of us, not seek to create it anew. Our parlance must be consistent with this theological truth. Perhaps then our students will rejoice in both commonality and diversity rather than perceive these two aspects of community in negative tension.
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FOOTNOTES

1 In an effort to interview students who were typical of CCCU member schools, the Council for Christian Colleges and Universities' "Report on the 1996 CCCU First-Year Entering Students" was used to determine a demographic profile. The points of the profile were (1) at least 60% female students; (2) students between eighteen and twenty-two who had entered college the same year they graduated from high school; (3) Caucasians; (4) approximately 60% of students from families with annual income $25,000-$75,000 with a median income of $50,000; (5) students who had parents who were "living with each other;" and (6) United States citizens who spoke English as first language. Seniors were interviewed because they had entered college in 1996 when the CCCU Report was conducted.

2 Analysis provided several recurrent categories. Within these categories, subcategories could be determined that further defined students' conceptions. The seven most common themes, which became the main categories, were: commonality, diversity, authenticity, living together, leadership, interaction and activities. Two additional categories were probed directly, theology and learning.
Community and Technology

by Skip Trudeau, Ed.D., and André Broquard

INTRODUCTION

Virtual communities, e-mentoring, electronic personalities and social computing are all terms that are used in conjunction with modern college campus communities. New and emerging technologies have transformed the teaching/learning process on many campuses at an alarming rate. But at what cost? There is some indication that the advent of new technology has outpaced policy considerations as to how the use of these new technologies has impacted the campus community. Gregory Blimling, Vice Chancellor for student development at Appalachian State University and editor of the Journal of College Student Development had this to say about this phenomenon:

Technology is not a new issue for anyone in higher education. Those of us who work with student programs and services outside the classroom may have come late to the conversation, but when the clamor from students and others grew loud enough, we entered the world of technology with gusto-only to discover that we were running hard to catch a train that was pulling farther and farther ahead of us. (2000, p. 3)

What Blimling seems to be implying is that the race to stay cutting edge in terms of keeping up with technological advances may have created a classic tail wagging the dog scenario in which potentially profound changes are occurring to campus communities in a vacuum of policy considerations.

The purpose of this article is to begin a dialogue on how technology has impacted community at Christian colleges. There are two underlying assumptions that serve as a context for this paper. First, community is a fundamental concept for Christian college campuses. Second, technology has dramatically changed all of higher education. This paper does not represent basic or original research, rather the authors reviewed and
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analyzed current literature in order to generate a dialogue concerning the impact of technology on community as well as make some recommendations for future discussion. This article is organized as follows: a development of the two underlying assumptions, a development of an operational definition of community from a Christian college perspective, a discussion of the impact of technology on Christian college community, and finally some suggested recommendations for Christian college student affairs practitioners.

The Underlying Assumptions

Assumption One: Community is a fundamental concept for Christian colleges. The small private Christian college has long been associated with a caring and nurturing campus climate. This atmosphere can be thought of as a sense of community where participants have shared experiences, similar values, and where students are exposed to Christian nurturing and care by faculty, staff, and administration. A more detailed definition of community is developed later in this article.

This notion of community has a rich history in higher education as a whole. The earliest colleges founded in the United States existed as small living and learning communities where faculty and students lived and studied together in pursuit of a largely religious agenda (Brubacher and Rudy, 1958; Rudolph, 1962). The way we think about campus communities has changed over the 350 plus years of American higher education but the concept is still important to the modern day campus. Even at large research institutions administrators and faculty are still interested in developing learning communities where the benefits of students and faculty living in proximity to one another is maximized (Blimling, 2000).

The creation, support and maintenance of a nurturing community is likely more critical to Christian colleges. This sense of community is one of the major reasons why students choose to attend Christian colleges and parents support this choice (Holmes, 1987; Winston, 2000). Arthur Holmes in his seminal book *The Idea of the Christian College* that was first published in 1975 devoted an entire chapter to the importance of community to Christian colleges. A simple review of the admissions literature from the average Christian college will reveals each college campus desires a strong sense of cohesion and unity. The ethos of the campus is one of the first criteria that prospective students notice and a measure of how current students rate their experience. Community on the college campus is fragile and must be intentionally developed and enhanced by students, faculty, and staff.

Assumption Two: Technology has dramatically changed higher education. There can be little doubt about the huge impact of technology on our lives. Computer based innovations have impacted nearly every area of our daily existence. The way we communicate, conduct business, entertain ourselves, provide healthcare, and on and on, has and will continue to change as new technologies emerge to replace the new technologies that were just put into service a short while ago. In purely economic terms the computer associated impact on our national marketplace is measured in billions of dollars on an annual basis (Dryer and Eisbach, 1999). Education has not been immune to this technological phenomenon.

The face of higher education is in the process of dramatic change. The students
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coming to our campuses are different, the way they learn is different and the teaching tools, thanks in large part to emerging technologies, available to educators are different. Few could have predicted how the advent of the computer and other technological advances would impact education in general and higher education in particular. Approximately one half of all college courses offered utilize some form of computer technology and one million students took online courses in 1999 (Howard, 2000). The traditional classroom with a professor lecturing to students face to face is being challenged by virtual experiences which utilize tools such as Mentoring, asynchronous and synchronous discussions, computer mediated communications (CMC), computer supported cooperative work (CSCW) and multi-user domains or MUDS.

The rapid onslaught of technology has been experienced across the spectrum of institutional types from large public universities to smaller private schools. Many traditionally church-related institutions have joined in the technology race by utilizing computer based instructional aides and online course offerings (Winston, 2000). The need for cutting edge technology transcends institutional type and size and is a major player in terms of its importance to the success of any college or university.

Before turning to the discussion of the impact of technology on the Christian college communities it seems appropriate to attempt to operationally define what we are talking about. This is no easy task as defining community is a little like trying to define the wind. It can't be seen or held and it differs in intensity and frequency based on geographical location, but you definitely know its there.

A Definition of Community on the Christian campus?

With the escalating growth of technology, the definition of community has become very broad. Two CEO's of large omnipresent Internet companies: Jeff Bezos of Amazon.com and Steve Case of America Online (AOL) both claim that they are about building community. Bezos says that community is “neighbors helping neighbors” and that Amazon.com is about providing the opportunity for people around the world to help others. Case claims that AOL is not only a moneymaking enterprise but is in the business of reviving community (D'Souza, 2000). While these interpretations of community can be the starting point it is not what should be expected on a Christian campus. The level of “community” that exists between “shoppers” or entertainment seekers of Amazon.com or AOL does not suffice our institutions.

Another definition of community that has come about in our research is based upon shared values and ideas. A community is built of persons having common interests and desires. Whatever the value, idea or ideal, scholarly research or maybe the study of the fine arts for example, the coming together of persons in this mutual purpose is community. Learning communities ... are groups of individuals who come together based on personal decisions and shared interests to support and encourage each other in the educational process (Kowch & Schwier, 1997). This definition of community at first read is not far off what is happening at many Christian liberal arts institutions.

However, there are some glaring shortcomings. First, there is no mention of geographic location of the individuals within the definition. This is done for the purpose of expanding the possible influences that a student can experience which theoretically provides the opportunity for students to develop learning communities around the
state, nation and world. The other issue missed in this definition is the recognition that one of the benefits of community is that we learn most from those with whom we are most different. This being true, the call for “open” communities, where students are permitted to pick and choose individuals with similar interests, is a step backwards. Being able to filter out any person that does not share the communities “ideas and ideals” is not a positive step.

Even though many Christian colleges have a selective admission policy, there is always room for divergent thinking and various points of view. One of the greatest lessons of college is learning from and through a roommate or floor-mate. These sometimes-involuntary relationships are most instrumental for self-discovery and understanding the human experience. If a community is homogeneous by choice the richness of learning and growth will be limited and incomplete. Hence the community based solely on shared “ideas and ideal” can scarcely be classified as authentic community in the first place.

If community is more then passing “bits and bytes” of information on the Internet and deeper then shared ideas, then what is it? What is the definition of community as seen from the viewpoint of a Christian liberal arts institution? Steven Garber in the Fabric of Faithfulness says, “Community is the context for the growth of convictions and character. What we believe about life and the world becomes plausible as we see it lived out all around us,” (1996, p. 146). It is not something that takes place through Web relations or only with those who share our common thought. Instead, true authentic community involves direct, geographic contact with “real” people sharing not only similar ideas and ideals but also the whole of a person. Steve Bird refers to authentic community as “primary groups.”

Primary groups are collections of people who have consistent and regular interaction that is intimate and face-to-face such that the members of the group come to have a shared identity — they see a clear distinction of who they are as compared to outsiders. The people in our primary groups are the ones we hold near and dear. This is what we normally mean by community on Christian college campuses: close webs of close relationships that build us all up and hold us all accountable. We seek a collection of people who share a common heart and soul (Bird, 2001, p. 7).

Hence, authentic Community on the Christian liberal arts campus will be made up of groups of students with diverse backgrounds and interests who through daily interaction are on a journey through life; discovering, admonishing, discussing, serving, debating, supporting, caring with and for each other in every area of life.

The Impact of Technology on Christian College Community

First and foremost it is important to realize that this is not a question of whether or not technology should be imbedded in education. It is clear that this is a train that has already left the station and there is no stopping it now (Blimling, 2000). Overall, it is obvious that technology has a positive affect on education and higher education
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in particular. The use of technology and alternative delivery techniques has allowed many individuals to earn further degrees. Technology has also enhanced students' access to information as they study and research. The overall benefits of technology are not in doubt, but the affects of technology on community need to be discussed and understood.

In the literature reviewed for this paper there are two separate schools of thought on this issue. These differing philosophical views may be best represented by two recent publications. The first is The No Significant Difference Phenomenon by Thomas Russell published in 1999 by the Office Instructional Telecommunications at North Carolina State University. This impressive work reviewed a large number of sources concerning the impact and effectiveness of non-traditional educational practices. Russell's basic conclusion was that in essence these practices, including many associated with the use of advanced technology, produce at least similar results as traditional methodology.

Phipps and Merisotis (1999) provided a competing view with the publication of What's the Difference? These authors pointed to several differences between more traditional educational practices and those associated with advanced technology. One of their basic conclusions was that there is a difference in educational outcomes based on the methodology of delivery. For the purposes of this paper this raises the question of what is the impact of technology on the campus community. There is debate on this issue within the literature with one side saying that community is either not affected or is enhanced by technology (Bennet, 1999; Russel, 1999; Single and Muller, 2000) and the other side pointing to side effects of technology that could appear to erode community (Blimling, 2000; Phipps & Merisotis, 1999).

The authors identified two areas of concern in terms of how technology may be affecting the sense of community on Christian college campuses. We have called these areas interpersonal development and the learning environment. These are rather broad categories and the reader will notice some overlap in the issues under each. The authors also make the assumption that student affairs professionals should be significantly concerned and involved in both. In other words we contend that the learning environment is not the sole domain of teaching faculty but rather hold to the "seamless learning" environment associated with modern learning theory (Kuh, 1996). Conversely, we also contend that the interpersonal development area is also not the sole domain of student affairs but should be a central focus, especially at Christian colleges due to their emphasis on community building, of the entire campus.

There is no questioning that certain technological advances such as email and instant messaging have changed the way persons communicate on college campuses. To be sure these advancements have had numerous beneficial affects on campus communication. We are able to communicate faster, more accurately, more creatively, and have more choices on how to deliver our messages than ever before. Technology has enhanced our ability to "multi task" (Blimiling, 2000) and has encouraged those less likely to engage in personal communication to join the conversation with a sense of privacy and anonymity (Palloff and Pratt, 1999). The benefits are clear but what are the costs to community?

Maybe the greatest pitfall in the advances of technology is the effect of reducing the number of face-to-face interactions for students to students and students to faculty, the very interaction that is a hallmark of the Christian college experience. What
are the potential affects of this lack of face-to-face interactions? Some authors have claimed that there are not negative side effects and that virtual communications and relationships can go through the same stages as traditional face-to-face interactions. Moreover, they can even produce positive side effects such as better conflict management, enhanced ability to provide personal mentoring, and providing extremely introverted or shy students with opportunities to voice their thoughts in ways they have not been able to before (Bennet, 1999; Palloff and Pratt, 1999; Single & Muller, 2000). Other authors have identified some potential negative affects such as loss of intimacy, lack of social engagement, a dehumanizing effect on users, increases in addictive behaviors, an association with increased incidents of depression and the creation of a communication gap between those sophisticated in technology usage and those less adept (Blimling, 2000; Dryer and Eisbach, 1999; Palloff and Pratt, 1999; Wetsit, 1999). These negative effects would appear to serve as detriments to community.

Technology has also had significant impact on the learning environment. No longer is the teaching/learning experience totally dominated by the "sage on the stage" traditional classroom setting. New and emerging delivery systems such as distance education and the virtual classroom have become commonplace in higher education as a whole and they are increasingly becoming part of the landscape in the Christian college sector as well (Winston, 2000). Here again, the benefits of technology are noteworthy. Technology has greatly enhanced access to education to underserved populations, provided far greater access to a wider spectrum of information, aided in the communication between faculty and students outside the traditional classroom, and increased the opportunities for collaborative efforts via virtual and other electronic modes. However, again the question arises as to the cost to the community.

There is also significant disagreement in the literature concerning the affects of technology on learning. On the positive or enhancing side are claims of enhanced personal mentoring between faculty and students, increased collaboration in academic endeavors, and positive assistance in classrooms through media based technology and classroom friendly software applications (Bennet, 1999; Palloff and Pratt, 1999; Single and Muller, 2000). There are, however, potentially negative aspects that have been associated with technology. Here again, the loss of face-to-face contact, primarily between faculty and students but also between students to students, is a primary area concern for educators (Blimling, 2000; Wetsit, 1999). The fear is that the lack of face-to-face interaction associated with virtual delivery cannot produce the same experience as more traditional approaches. A particular concern for those working in the Christian college arena is whether or not schools will be able to transmit their specific religious agenda via virtual means. There is not a lot of evidence either way in answer to this question although there are those who have suggested that it is at least a very difficult way to provide religious values based education (Winston, 2000). A higher drop out rate has also been associated with non-traditional delivery systems (Phipps & Merisotis, 1999), which has an obvious negative impact not only on the learning environment but also on the campus community as a whole.

It is important to remember that we are not suggesting that Christian colleges go through an evaluation process to weigh the advantages of technology versus the negative side effects on the community. Technology is here to stay and any discussion to the contrary is fruitless in light of the market demands of students and their
Community on the Christian College Campus

families (Blimling, 2000). Rather our contention is that student affairs professionals at Christian colleges need to be proactive in the discussions concerning new and emerging technologies and to discover and implement strategies to maximize on the benefits and minimize the dangers to campus communities. In other words, we can't afford to let the train get completely out of sight without giving thoughtful attention to where it is taking us. With this in mind let us turn to some recommendations for how Christian student affairs and professionals can begin to discuss and address technological issues.

Discussion Few Recommendations

While the human inclination is to search for more convenient and faster methods of doing everything, human interaction must not be shortchanged. With the influx of technology, Christian colleges must not allow face-to-face moments to be overtaken by face to monitor connections. “While the relationships we develop on the Web may be useful and entertaining, they are generally too thin and ephemeral to constitute genuine community. The Web can supplement physical community but (it cannot replace it,)” (emphasis ours) (D’Souza, 2000, p. 9). Communication technology is undoubtedly helpful, however it must take place within an existing relationship: A relationship that is sustained by regular face-to-face contact. In other words, we are suggesting that a balance be struck between the fast paced development of new and emerging technologies and the continual creation and maintenance of community that is essential for Christian colleges to stay faithful to their heritages and unique niche within higher education. In the interest of achieving this balance, we offer these three recommendations to Christian college student affairs professionals:

1. First we make a clarion call for scholarly research on the relationship between community and technology. The infusion of technology into the college campus is a “delicate and challenging task.” (Blimling, Whitt & Associates 1999, p. 165). It is hardly appropriate, or for that matter possible, to ignore technology. There is not a college campus in the nation that has not recognized that the direction of society is going toward more reliance on technology. They must find meaningful ways of identifying and then communicating any concerns that appear. In an academic climate that means research. For the Christian college, it is of utmost importance to fully understand the impact of communication technology on the ethos of the campus and to our thinking it is imperative that student affairs because of their vested interest in campus communities need to be active participants in this type of research.

2. It is imperative for student affairs to participate not only in the assessment process, but also be involved in the policy-making decisions. Decisions to embrace new technologies should not be made without first considering their impact on the campus community. Student affairs personnel at Christian colleges should insist on being at the table when technology decisions are being considered. This will require that the student affairs practitioner become well versed in existing technologies and mindful of advances on the horizon. In short, student affairs staff should not leave technology decisions to those who
work in technology related functions and they must become experts in how technology affects the ethos of the campus community.

3. Student affairs professionals at Christian colleges need to discover ways to use technology to enhance community on their campuses. They need to examine the available technologies and design approaches to their usage that will enhance existing efforts to create and maintain authentic communities.

SUMMARY

In conclusion, we are not advocating any type of competitive or aggressive relationship between emergent technology and campus community. Referring back to the two assumptions at the beginning of this article: One, community is a nonnegotiable for the Christian college and two, technology is dramatically changing the face of higher education. They both can and should exist together on the college campus. However, the objective for student affairs professionals is to discover avenues in which technology can be harnessed to support and enhance the learning environment and interpersonal development on campus. We must find ways to limit the negative impacts that technology has on community and uncover methods of positive integration. Now that we are on the train, we must climb into the conductors seat and take control of the engine.
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A Response to Jay Barnes Essay

by John Witte

The editors wish to thank John for this thoughtful reflection upon the theme of last year's journal. The inclusion of this response represents an attempt to encourage continued dialogue and consideration of the important issues involved in assessing “the state of Christian student affairs.” This piece offers the critical challenge to consider the ultimate ends of our work with students. We are grateful for the opportunity to carry on this significant discourse.

In the opening of his essay, Dr. Barnes reflects on the state of our profession, both when he began his doctoral program back in 1976 and today, in the year 2002. And since my own graduate work began somewhere between these years, I recognize the problems and challenges he explores. As a profession, are we merely a conglomeration of staff members with no other logical connection than that we deal with students “outside of the classroom?” With few standards for admission into our field, with a mostly borrowed research base, and with no accrediting bodies to ensure standards, can we really call “Student Affairs” a profession? And specifically as Christians, do we (and should we) operate any differently than our “secular” counterparts?

The last question is perhaps the most important. Dr. Barnes has suggested that perhaps we as Christians should be looking at a guiding paradigm for our profession in the world of theology or philosophy. After all, our worldview assumptions are considerably different than many in the field. All professionals in student affairs, no matter their setting or religion, would likely profess a desire to promote student development and student learning. But development and learning to what end? A good job? A “successful” life? Is good citizenship the ultimate goal? Then citizenship where, and why?

John Witte is the associate dean for residence life at Calvin College. He has a master's degree in college student personnel from Bowling Green University and a BA from Calvin College.
A Christian in higher education should see other aims, and those of us in Christian higher education should see those aims woven throughout our institutions. Ultimately, we are about a type of vocational development, but defined much more broadly than a career or job – we should be preparing students to take up their place as citizens in the kingdom of God. In as much, teaching the many implications of this life-long vocation would be outstanding goals for any institution.

Having a better guiding paradigm will not let us off the hook as a profession, however. The research problem Dr. Barnes discusses is real. Though we should not have to mirror our faculty colleagues, we can certainly learn from them. Our faculties are continually assessing the learning that goes on in the classroom, through grades, course evaluations, senior seminars, alumni surveys, etc. Are we being as diligent with assessment as they are? The typical excuses that time and budgets are tight provide all the more reason we ought to be sure that what we are doing is "worth" the effort. Are we staying as current in our field as our faculty colleagues are expected to be? Are we aware of new trends in staffing, pending legislation which affects our work, or relevant research into specific student populations? Can we do more in the realm of Christian higher education to encourage our graduates and professionals to take up some of this research, and can we contribute voices to the broader discussions which are ongoing in student affairs? We have the minds within our ranks.

Dr. Barnes exposes several issues and questions in his essay with which we will continue to struggle as a profession for years to come. How can we better root our work in a firm foundation? Are there better ways to align ourselves in the institutional hierarchy so that our efforts are seen as more co-curricular than extra- or even anti-curricular? Will we come to accept ourselves professionally, in spite of (and perhaps because of) our different roles in our institutions? As the Association for Christians in Student Development continues to grow and develop, I hope we continue to grapple, discuss, prod, explore and dream about these issues, because on this side of Heaven, we will never be done with our task of furthering God's kingdom.
Mutual Expectations: The Relationship of the President to the Student Personnel Officer

By David McKenna with Steve Moore

ABSTRACT

This article is a transcription of an address presented by Dr. David McKenna at a recent pre-conference workshop at an ACPA conference. The workshop was sponsored by ACSD in conjunction with the annual prayer breakfast. Dr. McKenna shared insights gleaned from his more than thirty years of service in Christian higher education including three presidential posts. The article focuses on two areas. They are one, what a president expects from a senior student affairs officer and two, what the SSA can expect from a president.

INTRODUCTION

A president recently fired a key administrator with the explanation, “We are not on the same page.” In response, the administrator asked, “How could I know which page we were supposed to be on when I had never even seen the score?”

From this short exchange, we learn some fundamental lessons of leadership. One lesson is that a president owes an administrator a clear statement of the expectations he or she has for the administrator’s role. The second lesson is that these expectations must become the basis for performance review. A third lesson is that the relationship between a president and an administrator is defined by expectations that run on a two-way street. Each party has expectations of the other that must be clearly understood and consistently followed, not just for the effectiveness of the organization, but for the quality of the relationship. As you would know, the fired administrator is a thoroughly confused and deeply wounded person in the ranks of the unemployed today. Adding to the confusion and the hurt is the fact that both the president and the administrator are colleagues in Christian higher education and believers in Christ.

Taking a lesson from this incident, we know that we must frame the relationship between the president and a student personnel officer in terms of mutual expectations. Accordingly, I have chosen to divide my reflections into three parts. Part I identifies
Foundational Expectations for the President

Let me begin by stating the obvious. A student personnel officer can expect the president to serve as a model for Christian leadership. After reading endless definitions of leadership, I keep coming back to the four strategies for leadership given by Bennis and Nanus in their book, *Leaders*. With just the turn of a phrase, these strategies can be stated as expectations that an administrator can expect of the president in any organization, but especially in Christian institutions.

First, the president is expected to cast an engaging vision for the future. Such action captures the imagination of followers. Although the idea of vision casting is overworked, it is a fundamental expectation that we cannot neglect. When Peters and Waterman were searching for the qualities that made business organizations excellent, they assumed that leadership made little difference. After they identified the companies of excellence, however, they found that many of them had the common quality of a leader with a vision for the future and sensitivity to human values.

Second, the president is expected to communicate the college’s mission with clarity and passion. Such action provides followers with a sense of meaning and purpose in their respective roles. As the president’s vision for the institution answers the question “What?” the president’s statement of mission answers the question, “How?” In those answers, each person is finding meaning for his or her role in the future of the organization. Again, even though mission statements are in vogue and often innocuous, they are still an indispensable expectation for presidential leadership.

Third, the president is expected to be consistent in word and action, especially during times of transition. Such action gains the trust of followers. Nothing creates greater chaos in an organization than inconsistency on the part of the president. One of the most creative presidents in Christian higher education demonstrates how one’s strength can become a fatal flaw. His administrators and faculty say that they can expect a new vision for the institution every six weeks. He is a classic example of the adage, “Ready, fire, aim.”

Fourth, the president is expected to give himself wholeheartedly for the good of the organization. Such action serves to mobilize the energies of followers. Self-deployment is the word that Bennis and Nanus use to describe this expectation for leadership. In Christian circles, we talk about the terms self-giving and self-sacrifice. Before the president can expect hard work and sacrificial efforts from followers, he or she must set the example.

With these four expectations as the base upon which we build other expectations, we now turn to more specific expectations that a student personnel officer can expect of the president.
What the Student Personnel Officer Can Expect of the President

The president must meet several expectations of the student personnel officer in order for the officer to be effective in his or her role. First, a student personnel officer can expect the president to be committed to his or her personal and professional growth. As with all expectations of leadership, this expectation sets the stage for the commitment that the student personnel officer will make to students. Such an expectation may not be as obvious as it seems.

When I did institutional research for the president's office at The Ohio State University in the 1960s, the law stated that all Ohio residents who had a reasonable chance of academic success and wanted to attend the university had to be admitted. 7500 students crowded out the freshmen class in the year that we performed our study. The students were divided into two groups: the 
*Coms* and the 
*Non-Coms.* 
Coms were freshmen that were already committed to a major field of study. The large majority of freshmen, however, were Non-Coms or students who had made no commitment to a major. The ratio of advisors to the students who were committed to a major was 1:6, but for students who had made no commitment, the ratio of 1:600. Who would be surprised then to learn that of the 7500 that enrolled as freshmen only one half survived the cut to become sophomores! Add to this the fact that 80 percent of the students at Ohio State never had a class taught by a person with professorial rank until they were juniors!

Out of that study, I developed a working principle that I brought with me into my presidency in Christian higher education. A president's most sacred trust is the lives of those who have made a commitment to the institution. This trust begins with the direct reports of the president. Again, no commitment is one way. When a person of leadership quality makes a commitment to the president, the president makes a commitment to that person. I spell out that commitment with the expectation I will immediately embark upon the development of personal and professional growth plan for that administrator. Early on in our working relationship I ask three questions - “Who do you want to be in five years?” “Where do you want to go professionally in five years?” and “How can I help you get there?” The most fun comes when the person answers, “I want your job.” This response poses no threat to me because that is the kind of person with whom I want to work and whom I want to see grow.

In the early years of my career, I tended to limit my commitment to professional growth plans for my administrators. As a discipline on my own leadership role, I set annual performance goals for the president, announced them to the community, did a mid-year review, and publicly appraised my own performance in the last faculty meeting of the year. Using this model, I asked my administrators to present the annual goals for their area each fall followed by a mid-year and final review in the spring. On one occasion, I had a tough mid-year review session with the dean of students. We reworked his goals and scheduled another appointment in the next quarter. Watching his performance through that quarter, I was prepared for what I call a “show cause” meeting. As he came into the office, I noticed that he slumped into the chair. So, I asked, “How is it going?” Usually, we ask that question not wanting a true answer. In this case he said, “Not well.”

When I asked him to tell me about it, he opened his heart to tell that his brother
was dying of aids and he had to bring him home to live with his family. Talk about a paradigm shift. In an instant I changed from a president on the warpath to a pastor in a counseling session. From then on, I always started my performance review sessions by honestly asking, "How is it going?" and then giving a ready ear to listen. More than that, I added the personal and family dimension to the professional growth. Still later, I realized that spiritual growth was a dimension that we took for granted in Christian higher education. When I added it to the developmental plan, another world opened up in our relationship.

Out of these sessions has come my greatest satisfaction. Administrative sabbaticals have been established, family vacation periods have been ordered, physical examinations have been scheduled, cell groups for spiritual growth have been encouraged, confidants have been recommended, and advanced degrees have been achieved. I believe that a student personnel officer can expect that kind of commitment from the president. As proof of my intent, I counted eight different vice-presidents or deans of student life with whom I worked over a period of 33 years as a president. Four of the eight became presidents of Christian colleges!

Second, a student personnel officer can expect the president to show full confidence in his or her ability to lead and manage campus life and student development. As chief executive officer, the president is the sole employee of the board of trustees with sole authority and responsibility for the welfare of the institution, its mission and its people. If the job is to get done, then authority and responsibility for student life must be delegated to the student life administrator by the president. Once again, it may seem as if we are rehearsing the obvious, but in many instances, this is not the case.

Empowerment has become another code word in our managerial language, but its overuse does not deplete its meaning. A president not only delegates authority and responsibility to the student life administrator, but he or she also wraps those formal functions in a cloak of confidence that gives meaning to the word empowerment. Our son, Doug, a general manager for executive development with Microsoft, says that any less than full confidence between a CEO and the primary reports will inevitably cause trouble. Without full confidence in the administrator, the president will second-guess decisions, and without full confidence from the president, the administrator will lead with uncertainty. Doug says that, in fairness to both parties, a president should never hire an administrator in whom he or she does not have full confidence. If you have such a person reporting to you, decide what needs to be done to inspire full confidence or make plans to relocate or fire that person. Those sound like tough words until you begin to think about cases you have known and perhaps situations in which you find yourself at the present time.

I happen to be a person who cannot hide my feelings. If I don't have full confidence in an administrator, I will communicate that lack of confidence in a thousand ways. The way I state a question, the way I parcel out key assignments, and the way in which I share privileged information are all dead giveaways on the level of my confidence. Yet, full confidence in an administrator is essential to the performance of an effective president. With all of the demands upon the president for external relations, such as capital campaigns, and internal relations, such as trustee development, no chief executive can be successful unless he or she can delegate authority and responsibility in key administrative areas with full confidence.
Third, a student personnel officer can expect the president to provide clarity of performance goals, performance evaluation, and appropriate rewards or sanctions. Returning to case of the executive who was fired without knowing the president's expectations or the basis upon which he was being evaluated, we come to a cardinal principle of leadership that applies at all levels. The principle is this: Never allow hidden expectations to be the basis upon which you are evaluated.

A president owes a student development officer a written statement of performance goals that are high, clear and consistent. Not that the president should write those goals. My approach is to ask the administrator to write five to eight performance goals in priority order with a quality outcome upon which performance can be evaluated, a time schedule for achievement and resources that are required. These goals, of course, must be consistent with our mission and operational outcomes for the strategic plan. The administrator then sends those goals to me in advance of a scheduled meeting so that I can review them, comment on them and be ready for a focused discussion. From that discussion comes an agreement for our working relationship. At a later review session, I ask the administrator to provide a self-evaluation of his or her performance. Room is made for contingencies that affect the outcomes so that priorities and performance may be influenced. I like to ask the question, “If you were to accomplish only one thing this quarter, what would it be?” More often than not, I will say, “If you do this, you will have met my expectations.”

Presidents can also be expected to be clear and consistent with their sanctions and rewards based upon performance review. Of course, we know about the formal sanctions of “show cause” probation or dismissal and formal rewards of salary increases. They are not all. A former vice-president wrote to me recently to say, “I especially remember the times when you said, ‘I have a bone to pick with you.’” He was referring to the times when I had a question about an issue that threatened to separate us if we allowed it to fester. One wise man wrote, “A leader who avoids risk is always at risk.” The same can be said about confronting an issue. “A leader who avoids confrontation only prolongs greater confrontation.” The vice-president then added another sentence, saying, “I also appreciate the blue cards that you sent to me saying, ‘Well done.’ I still have them in my file.”

A student personnel officer can expect the president to provide clear and consistent sanctions and rewards, formal and informal, as an essential part of their working relationship.

**What the President Expects of the Student Personnel Officer**

Now for the other side of the story. Here we see how vital the student personnel officer is to the life of the institution when we consider the expectations the president has for the person who holds that position.

First, the president expects the student personnel officer to be a mission-maker. Contrary to some opinions, the mission of the Christian institution of higher education cannot be fulfilled without an effective leader of student life. Because the integration of faith and learning is at the core of the curriculum in Christian higher education, there is a tendency to make the quality of student life secondary to the academic function. Our mission, however, is not complete until we speak of faith, learning,
living and serving as the totality of the educational experience. For this reason, I have always reacted against the idea that student life involves extra-curricular experiences. We should be talking about co-curricular experiences because the whole sphere of student development is a partner with academic development.

As president, then, I expect that the student personnel officer will envision himself or herself as a mission-maker. At Asbury Theological Seminary I had a prominent trustee who was the federal district judge for South Texas. He also served as a member of the Southern Methodist University Board of Trustees during the time when the school got caught in a scandal that seriously undermined its credibility. From that experience, the judge learned a lesson that he brought to our seminary board. Whenever I presented a proposal for a new venture for the seminary, he would ask the question, “Is this consistent with our mission?” At first I resented the question, but as time went on, I realized that I needed this check and balance on my entrepreneurial nature in order to keep us on track. The same question should guide the student personnel officer in the development and assessment of living and serving programs.

For example, if the mission of the institution is to admit only Christian students, it has a direct bearing on the nature of student services for that kind of community. Presumably, Christian nurture takes precedence over evangelism and serving becomes the natural extension of Christian living. But if our mission is to admit all students who qualify, the purpose of student services takes a radical turn. Evangelism, discipline, counseling and leadership development must be customized to the college culture created by that decision. Leadership development serves as case in point. The other day I heard about a Christian college that has admitted all comers in the interest of building the enrollment. Someplace along the line of growth, however, the critical mass of students shifted from Christians to non-Christians. Consequently, the college is now dealing with issues of skepticism about the integration of faith and learning in the classroom, opposition to required chapel, and division of the campus into two distinct subcultures. Needless to say, the vice-president for student life has the unenviable task of bringing integrity to the mission of the college. Although this is an extreme example, it illustrates how vital the role of the student personnel officer is to the mission of the institution.

At this point, let me run the risk of venturing into a field of land mines. Student personnel officers are often perceived as second-class citizens in the academic community because they may hold professional degrees without obvious identification in an academic discipline. This may be unfair, but it is realistic. To address this issue, I always included in the growth plan of student personnel officers a special academic and intellectual component. Whether it was an opportunity for participation in a research project or reading books in an academic field of interest, the purpose was to close the gap between faculty and the student life officer. To teach a class and obtain faculty status is my goal. I like to think of the student personnel officer as a person who can “eyeball” it intellectually with a faculty member. One of my favorite questions when interviewing prospects for a student personnel position was to ask, “What are you reading that you can recommend to me?” Not only do you learn a lot about the intellectual interest of the candidate, but you also open the door for a continuing conversation for intellectual growth.

Second, the president can expect the student personnel officer to be a tone-setter. Of
course, the president is the primary tone-setter for the institution. My experience in Christian higher education, however, has led me to conclude that there are primary tone-setting places that complement the president’s role. I see the chapel as the setting for the spiritual tone, the library as the setting for the academic tone, and, the dining commons as the setting for the social tone. Secondary tone-settings are residence halls, gyms or playing fields, snack bars and the bookstore. Note the number of these tone-setting places that are within the responsibility of the student personnel officer. Let me choose, from among this list, the chapel for additional comment.

Elton Trueblood, who was dean of the chapel at Stanford before moving to Earlham College in Indiana, told me that you could read the spiritual quality of a campus by observing the chapel services. On his many visits to college campuses, he found some chapel services that were only ghosts of a spiritual past and others that were the heartbeat of vibrant spirituality within the community. From his observations, Trueblood concluded that the Christian integrity of a college could be read from the chapel experience. For him, the chapel served as the centering point for the integration of faith, learning and living. While Trueblood was most concerned about the dilution or loss of the chapel experience in Christian colleges, we may have another concern. Chapel programs that follow the format of contemporary worship in order to attract students put themselves in danger of losing their value as the point of integration for the learning experience. Even when chapel attendance is required of all students and a contemporary worship experience attracts the numbers, the chapel program still may not serve its integrative function. One concern is that the chapel program becomes an experience fragmented from the academic process. This leads immediately to another concern - faculty attendance at chapel. If faculty do not attend and participate, the integration of faith, learning and living suffers and the community is spiritually fractured. I am especially concerned about the theology of worship that our chapel programs teach. In some instances, the fundamentals of Christian worship are lost in the entertainment motif and the focus upon spiritual self-interest. In other instances, a counter-culture to the institutional church is being created, even in denominational colleges. It is important to ask questions about our chapel programs. Are they teaching a Biblical model of worship?” “Are they helping the student experience a variety of worship styles in the Christian tradition?” “Are they preparing the students for leadership in the church?” and “Are they serving as the integrative center for the total educational experience?” As a president, I can expect the student personnel officer to address these questions as a part of his or her tone-setting responsibility.

Third, the president can expect the student personnel officer to be a gatekeeper. This function reminds me of the story that Martin Marty tells about Olga and Sven, a married Norwegian couple who belonged to two different Lutheran churches. One church served wine at communion and the other served grape juice. When Sven finally got Olga to attend church with him, communion was served with wine. Afterwards, Olga complained about the sinful practice and Sven said, “But honey, Jesus turned the water into wine!” “Yah,” answered Olga, “And dat’s youst anodder ting that I don’t like about Jesus!” To be a gatekeeper is an expectation for the student personnel officer that we would like to avoid or forget. But we cannot. Even though we are just a generation or so from the days when the dean of women measured the length of a girl’s skirt and
the dean of man enforced the 18-inch rule between couples, our responsibility for ethical development in Christian living cannot be forfeited. The code words, “lifestyle choices,” “values,” and “campus ethos,” are intended to cushion this responsibility, but they do not negate it. All one needs to do is to review the surveys by Gallup and Barna to see that the moral behavior of evangelical Christians is not significantly different from their secular counterparts. While the primary responsibility rests with our homes and churches, the Christian college must complement these institutions, especially during the formative years of moral decisions.

A tragedy in the Northwest recently serves to illustrate my point. At a fine Christian college with a public witness in athletics, a vital chapel experience, and an affirmative campus climate, as many as 200 students were renting a house off campus for keggers. The parties ended when as many as 100 students jammed the deck of the rented house so that the weight brought the structure crashing down. A freshman was killed and many were injured. Each of us is aware that a similar event could happen on our campus because students everywhere are under pressure to make life choices that are in conflict with Christian values.

I have no answer to the dilemma, but I do have a suggestion. In the 1960s when student protest was rising, studies revealed that campuses had an “environmental press” or “prevailing tone” that influenced student behavior. How was this “press” or “tone” created? At first, it was thought that the critical mass of students made the difference. In our case, it would mean that a critical mass of Christian students would set the press or the tone. But, then, the researchers found that student protesters were setting the tone with as little as four percent of the campus population. Leadership, then, became the difference. Whether at Berkeley, Chicago or Kent State, dominant leaders set the tone for the protest.

Let me turn this illustration into an expectation of the president for the student personnel officer. I expect the student personnel officer to be a tone-setter by working to shape the environmental press of the campus. The shaping tools are the cultivation of the critical mass and the development of campus leaders. After being surprised by the quality of students who came into leadership by default, I made leadership development a specific expectation for the student personnel officer. We need to identify potential leaders who represent the outcomes we identify in our mission statement and cultivate their development through a series of experiences that prepares them to lead. Much more could be said, but this is sufficient to illustrate the importance of the role of the gatekeeper of campus climate for the student personnel officer.

Fourth, I expect the student personnel officer to be a community-builder. Much is said about building an academic community. But, we also need to build on campus a biblical community that embraces and extends the academic community. Usually, we define the biblical community by three strong words from the Greek text—kerygma or the community of proclamation, koinonia or the community of fellowship, and diakoinia or the community of service. Once again, the critical role of the student personnel officer comes into view while fulfilling the mission of the Christian college.

The academic community is bound together in the search and discovery mission of scholarship and teaching. In the secular institution, that is the limit of the intellectual endeavor. But, in the Christian college, when divine revelation and human reason meet the discoveries become the basis for the proclamation of the Word and its relationship
to human learning. Chapel is the natural center for this proclamation. The kerygma or the Good News of the Gospel must be proclaimed as well as researched and taught.

The community of fellowship or koinonia is a well-known concept among us. In practice, however, it always needs to be cultivated and renewed. Each of us has seen instances where the bond of trust is shattered by incidents or issues on campus. In such instances, the common bond of faith in Jesus Christ must be renewed with the understanding that Christians can disagree without breaking that bond. My guess is that lessons learned through the process of reconciliation are some of the most important lessons that students can learn during their college days. These lessons will become even more important as our campuses diversify with differences of gender, race, age and ethnic origin.

Of course, we recognize that a community of service or “diakoinia” is at the heart of all learning institutions. Whether Christian or secular, all institutions of higher education claim the three functions of teaching, research and service. But there is a distinction between the way in which Christian and secular institutions serve. All institutions will serve by educating leaders for the public sphere, employees for the marketplace and citizens for a democratic society. Christian colleges will do the same with the distinction of “vocation” as divine calling and “service” as self-giving servant-hood. Frederick Buechner defines “vocation” as the “deepest gladness within us meeting a deep human need.” I expect that the student personnel officer will both model and communicate that meaning in the context of a community of service.

Certainly it is in the working out of the details that we come face to face with the real dilemmas of life. I find that student personnel leaders are sometimes timid when they come to the table with their higher education counterparts in academics, finance or such. My final encouragement to you is to be proactive and bold! These are not days for timidity. They are days in which we must step up and make a difference in the institutions of which we are a part.
Student Affairs Divisions’ Incorporation of Student Learning Principles at CCCU versus Non-CCCU Institutions

by Jeff Doyle, Ph.D.

ABSTRACT

With the shift from an industry-based to a knowledge-based society, American higher education, and student affairs in particular, is under increasing pressure to prove its role in facilitating students’ learning. The Student Learning Imperative (ACPA, 1994) and the Principles of Good Practice for Student Affairs (ACPA & NASPA, 1997) provided a professionally supported foundation for the new learning philosophy within student life.

The strong religious mission and the ministry model of student development in Christian higher education may affect the degree to which student-centered learning is incorporated. This study examined the extent to which chief student affairs officers at institutions in the Council for Christian Colleges and Universities (CCCU) reported their student affairs divisions had integrated principles of student learning.

This quantitative study was based on the survey results of 216 chief student affairs officers’ (CSAOs) at United States’ colleges and universities whose enrollments were between 500 and 3,000 students. Fifty-eight percent of the CSAOs returned the 54-item Survey of Student Learning Principles, based on the seven Principles of Good Practice for Student Affairs.

Using repeated-measures analysis of variance, student affairs divisions at Christian universities were found, in comparison to non-Christian universities, to be more successful at helping students develop coherent values and less successful at building inclusive communities. The strong emphasis on moral education from both faculty and student affairs staff at Christian colleges may be one reason for the emphasis on developing values. The predominantly white demographics of Christian colleges may be a factor in their failure to make more efforts to include underrepresented groups. Student affairs divisions at both CCCU and non-CCCU institutions reported doing poorly at systematically assessing to improve performance and effectively using resources to meet institutional goals.
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INTRODUCTION

My plea then, is this: that we now deliberately set ourselves to make a home for the spirit of learning; that we reorganize our colleges on the lines of this simple conception, that a college is not only a body of studies, but a mode of associations, that its courses are only its formal side ... It must become a community of scholars and pupils ... a free community, but a very real one.

Woodrow Wilson (quoted in Blimling and Alschuler, 1996, p. 214.)

With the shift from an industry-based to a knowledge-based society, American higher education is under increasing pressure to prove its role in facilitating students' learning both inside and outside the classroom. Because student affairs is the institutional division most responsible for shaping the co-curriculum, it has begun focusing more on promoting student learning. By 1996, approximately 25 percent of all student affairs divisions had amended their guiding philosophy to reflect an emphasis on learning (Ender, Newton, & Caple, 1996). Despite this reemphasis on learning in student affairs, during the past four years there have been very few studies to document the successful implementation of practices associated with student learning.

The student learning practices on which this study was based were created by a group of student affairs experts in 1997. Using the Seven Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education (Chickering & Gamson, 1987) as a template, these experts developed a similar document to serve the profession of student affairs. This concise and practical document, the Principles of Good Practice for Student Affairs (ACPA, and National Association of Student Personnel Administrators [NASPA], 1997), articulated the following seven principles:

Good Practice in Student Affairs ...
1. Engages students in active learning.
2. Helps students develop coherent values and ethical standards.
5. Uses resources effectively to achieve institutional missions and goals.
6. Forges educational partnerships that advance student learning.
7. Builds supportive and inclusive communities (p. 1).

This document, combining the philosophical foundation of student affairs with the emphasis on student learning, represented the fruit of a rare joint effort between both national student affairs associations.

ACPA and NASPA are not the only national student affairs professional associations to encourage the creation of learning-focused student affairs divisions. The Association for Christians in Student Development (ACSD), whose membership represents over two hundred Christian higher education institutions, has actively promoted student learning since 1997 (Guthrie, 1997). Christian higher education institutions are defined as institutions in the Council for Christian Colleges and Universities (CCCU). David Guthrie, in Student Affairs Reconsidered: A Christian View of the Profession and its Contexts (1997), proposed several principles for enhancing student learning in student...
affairs divisions of Christian colleges and universities. Other journal articles in ACSD’s journal *Koinonia* affirmed Guthrie’s call for a greater emphasis on learning in Christian student affairs (Sailers, 1996; Stratton, 1997). As recently as 2001, Guthrie authored an article in which he offered his opinions on the extent to which Christian college student affairs divisions had incorporated the *Principles of Good Practice for Student Affairs* (1997).

Although the attention to student learning in CCCU institutions has increased in the past five years, the distinct and deeply grounded religious mission of these institutions may affect the incorporation of student learning principles. Learning at CCCU institutions must be based on the Council’s mission statement: “to advance the cause of Christ-centered higher education and help institutions to effectively integrate biblical faith, scholarship, and service” (CCCU, 2001). The attention to student learning in a realm where all learning is measured against a clearly identified set of religious values suggests that student affairs divisions at CCCU and non-CCCU institutions vary in their success at integrating behaviors linked to student learning.

**Review of Methodology**

The population for the study was student affairs divisions at the United States’ 1,055 four-year colleges and universities whose institutional enrollment ranged from 500 to 3,000 students. The chief student affairs officer (CSAO) of 216 colleges and universities received a paper-based survey. Ninety-eight of these CSAOs represented almost the entire population of the Council for Christian Colleges and Universities (CCCU), excluding a few Canadian and larger United States CCCU institutions. After the CCCU schools were removed, 118 of the remaining 957 CSAOs were randomly sampled from the population of United States four-year college and universities with 500-3,000 students.

The survey for this study was adapted from a 60-item inventory that originally accompanied the *Principles of Good Practice in Student Affairs* (ACPA & NASPA, 1997). After piloting the survey for face and content validity, over half of the items were eliminated or rewritten, resulting in a final survey of 54 items. Subsequently, these items were tested for internal consistency within each principle and improvements made to the items as a result of these data. In contrast to the original inventories, the remaining items were more behaviorally rooted and resulted in greater variability among respondents. There were six items for each of the seven principles.

Because it allows for comparisons among two or more means, analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to determine institutional differences in the incorporation of the seven student learning principles at CCCU and non-CCCU institutions. The repeated-measures ANOVA was the most accurate analysis to use because of the expected correlation within a student affairs division’s incorporation of the learning-related principles. This correlation between principles produced an error term that was less than it would have been in an unrelated analysis of variance. The interaction between institutional type and the principles revealed where CCCU and non-CCCU institutions differed in their principle incorporation. One-way analyses of variance were computed on the principles’ means at CCCU and non-CCCU institutions to make specific comparisons between institutional type.
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The Council for Christian Colleges and Universities is a professional association of approximately 100 higher education institutions that aims to “advance the cause of Christ-centered higher education and help institutions to effectively integrate biblical faith, scholarship and service” (CCCU, 2001). CCCU member institutions have tried to distinguish themselves from other institutions with more ambiguous religious affiliations by developing stringent membership criteria that include the requirement that every full-time faculty member and administrator demonstrate a personal faith in Jesus Christ. The distinctiveness of CCCU institutions is evident in research that found in a study of over 2,000 CCCU faculty that CCCU faculty members are significantly more conscious of their efforts to develop students’ moral character and personal values than faculty at private colleges and universities (Baylis, 1995). In an example of student distinctiveness, a study of 4,600 CCCU seniors compared to a national sample of private college seniors found that CCCU seniors rated themselves as having much stronger religious beliefs and convictions and reported participating in significantly more religious activities than the private college sample (Baylis, 1996).

The requirement that CCCU institutions integrate a faith in Jesus Christ with students’ learning has the potential to alter significantly the approaches to student learning at CCCU institutions. Specifically, student affairs divisions at CCCU institutions may demonstrate different approaches to student learning than those evident at other higher education institutions. For example, it is likely that student affairs professionals at CCCU institutions spend more time than student affairs professional at non-CCCU institutions helping students learn about Christian and other moral teachings (Baylis, 1995). On the other hand, student affairs professionals at non-CCCU institutions may spend more time than CCCU student affairs staff exploring religions and cultures which have not made major contributions to the Christian faith.

Most of the CCCU institutions have student affairs staff members represented in the Association of Christians in Student Development (ACSD), a separate national professional association for Christian student affairs professionals. Hundreds of student affairs professionals at CCCU institutions attend ACSD’s yearly conference, and all ACSD members receive the Koinonia, the association’s newsletter/journal. Although there is some overlap in membership of ACPA and NASPA with ACSD, the Christian student affairs profession is distinct from the rest of student affairs.

In addition to the more common student affairs models of student development and student learning, the Christian student affairs profession includes another philosophical model. The ministry model, based upon evangelism and discipleship, seeks to share Jesus Christ with students and guide them into a deeper understanding of His will for their lives. Typical student affairs activities at Christian colleges often include Bible studies, prayer groups, volunteer programs, praise singing and fellowship or accountability groups (Guthrie, 1997, p. 71). The professional literature in ACSD’s Koinonia indicates this emphasis on ministry. The lead article for the Spring 1994 issue of the Koinonia identified a major goal for Christian student affairs professionals: “to contribute to the work of Christ and the church worldwide” (Schulze, p. 1). Another issue of the Koinonia included a feature article entitled “The University as a Place...”
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of Spiritual Formation,” which encouraged student affairs’ ministry efforts to balance the academic emphasis on learning (Peterson & Moore, 1994). The existence of the ministry model is a major reason student learning may occur in different ways at CCCU institutions.

Although the ministry model has been relatively common at many CCCU institutions, student development theory also has made its impact on the Association of Christians in Student Development. ACSD was founded in 1980 and its name was chosen to reflect student affairs’ promulgation of student development theories. The organization’s first constitution also included the goal of “integrating the use of scripture and the Christian faith in the student development profession” (Loy & Trudeau, 2000, p. 5). However, since ACSD’s founding, critics within Christian student affairs have argued that the integration of theories based on “self-actualization” have not been sufficiently examined for compatibility with Christian growth and maturity. Many Christian student affairs professionals have struggled with the question, “Are We Campus Ministers or Student Development Professionals?” (Loy & Trudeau, 2000, p. 5).

In the 1990s the role of Christian student affairs divisions as facilitators of student learning began to emerge. In 1993, Wolfe and Heie published a book on reforming Christian higher education that called for “staff responsible for student development programs outside the classroom context needing to design programs that insure the focus is on learning” (p. 56). In the spring of 1996 an article was published in Koinonia which argued that the primary purpose of Christian education was making connections between faith, living and learning (Sailers, p. 5). This article integrated the ministry model with the student learning approach by basing student affairs’ mission on the Bible commandment, “To love the Lord your God with all you heart and with all your soul (faith) and with all your mind (learning) and with all your strength (living)” (Mark 12:30, New International Version, as quoted in Sailers, p. 5). This new emphasis on learning was firmly established as an important paradigm the following year when David Guthrie edited a book entitled Student Affairs Reconsidered: A Christian View of the Profession and its Contexts (1997), which argued for the adoption of the learning-oriented model for student affairs. This book was published almost at the same time as the Principles of Good Practice for Student Affairs (ACPA & NASPA, 1997), and it also identified principles for student learning that are essential to Christian student affairs professionals. These principles, which included learning as an intentional, communal, and integrated endeavor, were similar to the Principles of Good Practice in Student Affairs (hereafter referred to as the Principles). Guthrie suggested that the true purpose of student learning was wisdom development, defined as remembering (who we are), discerning (what we believe) and exploring (what we can become).

In 1997, a distinguished panel of Christian student affairs professionals discussed and debated the ramifications of Guthrie’s book at the ACSD national conference. Guthrie followed his book with an article in the Koinonia that criticized student development theory for contributing to student affairs’ lack of credibility in Christian colleges and universities (1998). Rebuttals to Guthrie’s charge soon emerged, but the emphasis on articles in the Koinonia and keynote speakers at the national conference soon began to take a more learning-oriented approach (Stratton, 1997). In the Spring 2000 issue of the Koinonia an article on the past and the future of ACSD identified...
the adoption of the student learning approach as one of the three major themes for the future of Christian student affairs (Loy & Trudeau). In the first issue of Growth: The Journal of the Association for Christians in Student Development, Guthrie (2001) writes an article attempting to ascertain the status of Christian student affairs in adopting the Principles and their learning components. In sum, although ACSD is in many ways separate from NASPA and ACPA, its members seem to have reached similar conclusions about the importance of student learning to student affairs. Due to the narrowly articulated Christian mission of CCCU institutions and the role of the ministry model, the embodiment of student learning may, however, be much different from the approaches to student learning at non-CCCU institutions.

Data Presentation and Analysis

Description of Institutional and Individual Respondents

Response Rate

Of the 1,055 small colleges and universities with student enrollments between 500 and 3,000, 216 were invited to participate in this study. The response rate for the entire 216-institution sample was 58 percent (126 surveys out of 216), which represented approximately 12 percent of the population of colleges and universities with enrollments between 500-3,000 students.

Half of the institutions (59 surveys out of 118) in the non-CCCU sample of colleges and universities returned the survey. Almost 70 percent (67 surveys out of 98) of institutions in the CCCU returned the survey. The lower response rate for non-CCCU institutions when compared to CCCU institutions may indicate less representative results for the non-CCCU institutions. For a complete listing of institutional response rates, see Table 1.

Table 1

Response Rate of CSAOs at Non-CCCU, CCCU and Total Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population Size</th>
<th>Number Sampled</th>
<th>Percent of Population Sampled</th>
<th>Number Responded</th>
<th>Percent Response</th>
<th>Percent of Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-CCCU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>957</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCCU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,055</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Internal Consistency Analysis of Principles

Although similar to the internal consistency analysis done in pilot testing, the following internal consistency analysis was based upon all 126 of the surveys returned in this study. This analysis helped indicate items whose results may not have been most indicative of the principle. The lowest Chronbach's alpha was for the principle that involved helping students develop coherent values and ethical standards (.54). The alphas for the principles based on engaging student in active learning (.59) and setting and communicating high expectations for learning (.60) were also low when compared to the other principles. Six of the nine scales had alphas of .70 or greater. The alphas for each variable are listed in Table 2. The three principles with the lowest alphas were also the first three principles in the survey. Because testing fatigue sometimes leads to less discrimination in respondent's ratings, CSAOs' testing fatigue may have contributed to the high internal consistencies in the last six variables.

Data Analysis for Differences in Principle

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internal Consistency Summary for All Nine Variables</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs Forges Educational Partnerships that Advance Learning</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs Uses Systematic Inquiry to Improve Student &amp; Institute Performance</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs Strives for Continual Improvement</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs Clarifies Its Core Values</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs Builds Supportive and Inclusive Communities</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs Uses Resources Effectively to Achieve Institutional Mission &amp; Goals</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs Sets and Communicates High Expectations for Learning</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs Engages Students in Active Learning</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs Helps Students Develop Coherent Values and Ethical Standards</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Integration at CCCU and Non-CCCU Institution

The research question stated, "To what extent do student affairs divisions at institutions in the Council for Christian Colleges and Universities (CCCU) differ from institutions not members of the CCCU in their incorporation of the Principles of Good Practice for Student Affairs?" The means for chief student affairs officers' perceived extent of principle integration in student affairs divisions at both CCCU and non-CCCU institutions are reported in Table 3.

A repeated-measures analysis of variance among the chief student affairs officers' perceived extent of their student affairs divisions' incorporation of the principles with institutional type (CCCU or non-CCCU) as a between-subjects variable revealed that the interaction was significant (F = 4.07, p < .01) (see Table 4).
Table 3
Principle Incorporation at Non-CCCU, CCCU and the Total Number of Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Our Student Affairs Division</th>
<th>Non-CCCU</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>CCCU</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Builds Supportive and Inclusive Communities</td>
<td>20.22</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>19.15</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>19.65</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helps Students Develop Coherent Values</td>
<td>18.74</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>20.06</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>19.45</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engages Students in Active Learning</td>
<td>18.89</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>18.81</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>18.85</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forges Educational Partnerships</td>
<td>18.17</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>17.76</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>17.95</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sets and Communicates High Expectations</td>
<td>16.51</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>17.09</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>16.82</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses Resources Effectively to Achieve Goals</td>
<td>16.73</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>16.39</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>16.55</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4
Repeated-Measures' Analysis of Variance for Institutional Type and Principle Incorporation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Between Subjects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Type</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/Institutional Type</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>(20.83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Within Subjects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principles</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>53.50**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principles X Institutional Type</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.07**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principles X S/Institutional Type</td>
<td>726</td>
<td>(4.52)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Values in parentheses represent mean square scores. S = subjects. ** p < .01.

Graphing the interaction demonstrated that the CCCU and non-CCCU institutions' incorporation of the principles differed primarily in the extent to which CSAOs reported their student affairs divisions built supportive and inclusive communities and helped students develop coherent values and ethical standards (see figure on the next page).
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Interaction between Institutional Type and Principle Incorporation

- CCCU Institutions
- Non-CCCU Institutions

Principle Incorporation

Builds Supportive and Inclusive Communities
Engages Students in Active Learning
Sets and Communicates High Expectations
Uses Systematic Inquiry to Improve Performance

Helps Students Develop Coherent Values
Forges Educational Partnerships
Uses Resources Effectively to Achieve Goals

Principles of Good Practice for Student Affairs

Growth, Spring 2002
An analysis of the differences between CSAOs’ perceptions of their student affairs divisions’ incorporation of the principles at CCCU and non-CCCU institutions provided statistical confirmation of the visible interaction. This interaction was revealed in the extent to which CSAOs reported student affairs divisions at CCCU and non-CCCU institutions built supportive and inclusive communities and helped students develop coherent values and ethical standards (see Table 5). The ratings of the success of student affairs divisions in helping students develop coherent values and ethical standards were higher for CSAOs at CCCU institutions than CSAOs at non-CCCU institutions [F(1,122) = 9.95, p < .01]. The ratings of the success of student affairs divisions in building supportive and inclusive communities were lower for CSAOs at CCCU institutions than CSAOs at non-CCCU institutions [F(1,122) = 6.78, p = .01].

Table 5
One-Way Analysis of Variance for Differences in Principle Incorporation at CCCU and Non-CCCU Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our student affairs division helps students develop coherent values</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.95*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and ethical standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our student affairs division builds supportive and inclusive communities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.78*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our student affairs division sets and communicates high expectations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our student affairs division uses resources effectively to achieve</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>institutional missions and goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our student affairs division forges educational partnerships that</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>advance student learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our student affairs division uses systematic inquiry to improve student</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and institutional performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our student affairs division engages students in active learning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note. ** p &lt;= .01.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUMMARY

There were two significant differences between CSAOs’ perceptions of their student affairs divisions’ incorporation of the principles at CCCU and non-CCCU institutions. The ratings of the success of student affairs divisions in helping students develop coherent values and ethical standards were higher for CSAOs at CCCU institutions than for CSAOs at non-CCCU institutions. The ratings of the success of student affairs divisions in building supportive and inclusive communities were higher for CSAOs at non-CCCU institutions than for CSAOs at CCCU institutions.

DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, and RECOMMENDATIONS

The research question stated, “To what extent do student affairs divisions at Council for Christian Colleges and Universities (CCCU) institutions differ from student affairs divisions at non-CCCU institutions in their incorporation of the Principles of Good Growth, Spring 2002
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Practice for Student Affairs?" The review of the literature described the distinctiveness of CCCU institutions, which includes stringent membership criteria requiring a mission statement that is clearly based on the “centrality of Jesus Christ and evidence of how faith is integrated with the institution’s academic and student life programs” (CCCU, 2001, p. 2). In addition, all full-time faculty members and administrators are required to have a personal faith in Jesus Christ. It is within this Christian academic environment that student affairs divisions at CCCU institutions have attempted to incorporate the student learning philosophy. However, with the popularity of not only the student development model, but also the student ministry model, it was questionable how well student affairs divisions at CCCU institutions would do at incorporating the Principles of Good Practice for Student Affairs.

Success at Helping Students Develop Coherent Values and Ethical Standards

The results indicated that, although the interaction between student affairs divisions’ incorporation of the principles and the institutions’ affiliation with the CCCU was significant ($F = 4.07, p < .01$), only two of the seven principles’ incorporation were significantly different in student affairs divisions at CCCU and non-CCCU institutions according to CSAOs. The most significant difference was found in CSAOs’ perceptions of CCCU and non-CCCU student affairs divisions’ efforts to help students develop coherent values and ethical standards ($F = 9.95, p < .01$). Item analysis revealed that the ratings of the success of student affairs divisions in incorporating the following items were higher for CSAOs at CCCU institutions than for CSAOs at non-CCCU institutions:

1. Our student affairs division offers formal programs/activities with the expressed purpose of helping students evaluate their own moral positions and beliefs.
2. Our student affairs division expects that all students will affirm, as a part of their enrollment in the institution, a student compact, creed, statement or honor code that articulates the institution’s core values.
3. Our student affairs division plans for times within new student orientation to intentionally communicate institutional values and standards for student conduct.

Considering the expressed intent of CCCU institutions to base their educational mission on a value-laden Christian worldview, it was not a major surprise that student affairs divisions at CCCU institutions were doing more than student affairs divisions at non-CCCU institutions to help students develop coherent values and ethical standards. It could be argued further that CCCU institutions have a moral obligation to both students and parents to provide students a total educational experience framed in Christian values. Although educators on most non-religious campuses make every effort to give students the freedom to choose their own life values, educators at most religious institutions are charged to graduate students who expressly believe in a set of values aligned with that institution’s religious mission.

The expectations of entering freshmen at CCCU institutions revealed a readiness for developing values within a religious context. Over 20,000 CCCU freshmen participated in the College Institutional Research Program’s (CIRP) annual survey in the
fall of 1996. Of these CCCU students, over 66 percent stated that their main reason for selecting their college was its religious affiliation. Only 8 percent of the students attending private, four-year institutions selected this as their main reason for attending the college (Baylis, 1997). In addition, over 67 percent of the freshman at CCCU institutions anticipated participation in religious activities during college while only 21 percent of the freshman at private, four-year institutions expressed this same anticipation (Baylis, 1997).

In addition to student expectations for learning more about Christian values, faculty at CCCU institutions also expressed a strong emphasis on helping students learn Christian values. In a 1995 Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) study of 2,191 full-time undergraduate faculty members at CCCU institutions, respondents indicated that the highest institutional priority was helping students understand values (Baylis, 1995). Although thousands of faculty at hundreds of private higher education institutions in this same study considered developing student values as important, value development was not ranked as high an institutional priority for private institutions’ faculty as it was among CCCU faculty. When the faculty members in this same survey were asked to select the importance of goals for undergraduates, 88 percent of the faculty at CCCU institutions reported that helping students develop personal values was essential or very important versus only 69 percent of the faculty at private colleges and universities (Baylis, 1995). On a related goal, over 90 percent of the faculty at CCCU institutions agreed that developing moral character was essential or very important versus less than 75 percent of faculty at private institutions (Baylis, 1995). Although faculty members are not student affairs professionals, it is logical to suggest that student affairs professionals at CCCU institutions hold many of the same beliefs.

The results of this study only serve to confirm the greater attention student affairs professionals at CCCU institutions give to coherent value development compared with student affairs professionals at non-CCCU institutions. Of the seven principles of good practice, the value of helping students develop coherent values was reported as most incorporated by the CSAOs of CCCU institutions. This quantitative data only adds to Guthrie’s (2001), “Report Card for Christian College Student Affairs,” in which he asserts that student affairs professionals at Christian colleges have considered character development “a fundamental and necessary aspect of their work for many years” (p. 28).

However, because of the non-religious missions of many of the non-CCCU institutions, it would be unfair to suggest that these institutions should spend more time developing religious values. A more valid question for non-CCCU institutions to consider is “What values do we consider as important as CCCU institutions consider their religious values?” It also should be remembered that CSAOs reported that student affairs divisions at non-CCCU institutions rated their incorporation of helping students develop coherent values and ethical standards higher than they rated four of the other seven principles. Therefore, the data indicates that while CSAOs at non-CCCU institutions still consider values development important in student affairs, CSAOs at CCCU institutions report that values development is the most important value in Christian student affairs.
Difficulty Involving Students in the Leadership of the Values Education Process

In spite of CSAOs reporting that student affairs divisions at CCCU institutions made more efforts than student affairs divisions at non-CCCU institutions to assist students in developing coherent values, one item in this principle was more significantly integrated at student affairs divisions in non-CCCU institutions than student affairs divisions at CCCU institutions. This item, “Our student affairs division includes students in the processes for adjudicating student misconduct,” helped to clarify how students were assisted in their value development at non-CCCU institutions. The results of this item indicated that students at non-CCCU institutions may be given more opportunities to actively participate in decision-making around values development. The lower scores on this item by student affairs divisions at CCCU institutions indicated that students may not be as trusted in student affairs’ efforts to ensure student compliance with institutional standards. The commonly expressed opinion of student affairs professionals at non-CCCU institutions is that involving students in judicial decisions serves as an educational experience that helps students develop their own values. Although student affairs professionals at CCCU institutions probably would not disagree that students hearing judicial cases is educational, it may not be important enough to risk compromising the community values that students agree to abide by when entering the college. Further evidence of the failure of student affairs divisions at CCCU institutions to include students in decision-making bodies was evident in their significantly lower scores than student affairs divisions at non-CCCU institutions in their “inclusion of students on many institutional and student affairs committees” (t = -4.89, p < .01). In short, although student affairs divisions at CCCU institutions helped students develop coherent values and ethical standards more often than student affairs division at non-CCCU institutions, they were not as effective at giving students a voice in many of the divisional or institutional decisions that affected their personal value choices.

Student affairs professionals at CCCU institutions may want to ask themselves why they make less of an effort to include students in campus leadership of values education than student affairs professionals at non-CCCU institutions. The research is clear that the more opportunities students have to be involved in college, the more they will learn and stay in college (Kuh & Schuh, 1991). Is there a lack of trust in the ability of students to make wise decisions when given institutional leadership opportunities? If so, would involving students in groups that influence the institutional values dilute the values transmission process? These questions and others into the failure of student affairs administrators to include students in the leadership of character forming when compared to non-CCCU student affairs divisions are worth considering in the future.

Success at Creating Supportive Communities/ Difficulty in Creating Inclusive Communities

There was a second principle on which there was a significant difference in student affairs divisions’ incorporation of the Principles of Good Practice for Student Affairs at CCCU and non-CCCU institutions. CSAOs at non-CCCU institutions reported that their student affairs divisions did significantly more to build supportive and inclusive
communities than was reported by CSAOs at CCCU institutions. Considering the close-knit communities for which religious colleges and universities are known, this result was somewhat surprising, particularly since student affairs divisions at CCCU institutions had significantly higher mean scores than student affairs divisions at non-CCCU institutions at “having their entire staff investing time in students’ learning and growth and placing relationships with students above other work activities” ($t = -2.54, p = < .05$).

Furthermore, in a report on the results of the 1996 CCCU Senior College Student Survey, which compared 4,593 college seniors at 37 CCCU institutions with thousands of seniors at private four-year colleges and universities, 70 percent of the CCCU seniors reported being satisfied with the community on campus versus only 58 percent of seniors at private higher education institutions (Baylis, 1996). This item represented the largest difference in satisfaction with the college experience between CCCU and private college seniors. Therefore, there is evidence to suggest that CCCU students are more satisfied with the community on their campuses than students at private higher education institutions.

When the t-tests on the items for which student affairs divisions at non-CCCU institutions incorporated significantly better ($p < .01$) than student affairs divisions at CCCU institutions were identified, the lower means of student affairs divisions at CCCU institutions on this principle were clarified. The t-tests revealed that it was the following three items that student affairs divisions at non-CCCU institutions incorporated more than student affairs divisions at CCCU institutions:

1. Our student affairs division consists of staff members who are comfortable with people from other cultures and whose attitudes, language and behavior reflect awareness of and sensitivity to other cultures and backgrounds ($t = 2.61$).
2. Our student affairs division has close and positive relationships with diverse student groups often isolated from the rest of campus ($t = 2.85$).
3. Our student affairs division formally identifies strategies for promoting open discussions of diversity issues among students ($t = 4.52$).

These three items revealed that it was the elements of this principle that involved creating an inclusive community, not a supportive community, which CCCU institutions incorporated least well. To avoid insinuating that student affairs divisions at CCCU institutions do not build supportive communities, this principle may have been better defined by ACPA and NASPA as two separate principles, one that focused on building a supportive community and one that focused on building an inclusive community.

Potential reasons into why student affairs divisions are less inclusive than their non-CCCU counterparts are many. For one, Christian colleges probably are not welcoming to “religious” perspectives diametrically opposed to Christianity, such as paganism, witchcraft or Satanism. Alternative religious perspectives such as Islam, Judaism, Buddhism, and Confucianism often directly contradict Christian beliefs and therefore may also be unwelcome at a CCCU institution. Cultural shifts such as the growing acceptance of homosexual behavior, sex outside of marriage and the openness to showing nudity and sexual behavior on TV, are values that again, are incompatible with
much of Christianity and therefore excluded from most, if not all, CCCU institutions. Because of the preeminence of the Christian mission at CCCU institutions, all of these examples are valid excuses for a failure to demonstrate the inclusivity of non-CCCU institutions.

However, another reason for Christian student affairs divisions' failures to establish inclusive communities may link to an analysis of the racial demographics of the CCCU institutions. In a 1995 HERI study of faculty, which included over 2,000 faculty at CCCU institutions, the percentage of minority faculty at CCCU institutions was less than half the percentage of minority faculty at private four-year colleges and universities (Baylis, 1995). In addition, in the previously mentioned CIRP study of freshmen, which included over 20,000 freshmen at 47 CCCU institutions, 93 percent of the freshmen at CCCU institutions were white versus 78 percent of the freshmen at private higher education institutions (Baylis, 1997). With a faculty and student body that is overwhelmingly white, it is a valid estimate that student affairs professionals are also predominantly white. Campuses that are almost completely white are less likely to hear the opinions of people of color and therefore less likely to include these voices in the construction of an inclusive institutional community. Therefore, outside of viewpoints that may be anti-Christian, there may also be viewpoints that express Christian beliefs in different ways that are being left out of the learning communities at CCCU institutions. This lack of institutional diversity was not a factor lost on students at CCCU institutions. In the 1996 CCCU Senior College Student Survey, the item on which CCCU seniors indicated the least amount of satisfaction (by over 10 percent) was with the ethnic diversity of faculty. Although minority students represented relatively small numbers on CCCU campuses, according to this statistic the lack of satisfaction with faculty members' ethnic diversity was evidently an issue for a large number of white students. This statistic from the Senior College Student Survey and the results from this study indicate that CCCU student affairs divisions' lack of attention to diversity issues may have some harmful effects on students' satisfaction with the "inclusive" community established at CCCU institutions.

In short, although there is evidence that CCCU institutions offer supportive communities for students, this study suggests that the community at these institutions may not be as supportive for students from minority groups. In an era of increasing globalization and diversity, CCCU institutions would do well to heed students' demand for more inclusive community. If they do not, as the birth rate for white people in the United States continues to decline (United States Census Bureau, 2001), many CCCU institutions will be faced with some institutional survival issues that could be mediated by finding ways to attract a greater diversity of students. Diversity does not always mean "opposed to Christianity;" it may often mean expressing Christian beliefs in a manner with which white people of middle and upper class backgrounds are not used to.

Additional future research might explore the differences between student affairs divisions at CCCU and non-CCCU institutions in creating inclusive communities. Specifically, why do CCCU institutions do so poorly at enrolling students of color and hiring faculty of color? Why do student affairs divisions at CCCU institutions focus less than student affairs divisions at non-CCCU institutions on creating a welcoming community for students of all races and cultures?
Less Time and Attention Invested in Recognizing Student Successes

The item-by-item analyses of the differences between student affairs divisions at CCCU and non-CCCU institutions revealed two additional noteworthy findings. According to CSAsOs, student affairs divisions at non-CCCU institutions did a better job of "regularly recognizing outstanding student accomplishments through rewards, honorary organizations, and/or other forms of public recognition" ($t = 1.98$, $p < .05$). This finding is consistent with CCCU freshmen and seniors who expressed significantly less desire for recognition than expressed by freshmen and seniors at private colleges and universities (Baylis, 1996, 1997). These results provide support for the hypothesis that "Christian humility" results in a culture on CCCU campuses in which less effort is made to recognize student accomplishments, lest students become too prideful in their own abilities. While it might be argued that the lack of recognition for students could affect students' self-confidence or self-esteem, the findings of the CCCU Senior College Student Survey (Baylis, 1996) challenges this hypothesis. When compared to private college seniors, CCCU seniors self-report much stronger leadership abilities and interpersonal skills. People who self-report strong leadership abilities and people skills do not seem to be the type of people to report low self-confidence or self-esteem. In short, the finding that CCCU institutions make less of an effort to recognize student accomplishments warrants further research into the reasons behind its existence.

Less Interest in Hiring Student Affairs Staff with Graduate Degrees

The other noteworthy item on which student affairs divisions at CCCU and non-CCCU institutions differed related to graduate education. Student affairs divisions at non-CCCU institutions were much more careful to "ensure that staff had some formal graduate education/coursework in student affairs" ($t = 2.05$, $p < .05$). Part of the reason behind this finding may be that the large majority of student affairs graduate programs exist in non-religious higher education institutions. For student affairs professionals educated on CCCU campuses, some of their same reasons for choosing a Christian college may inhibit their desire to receive graduate education at a secular institution. Fear of leaving the safety of the Christian college enclave and venturing into graduate work where Christianity is not universally accepted as the Truth most likely intimidates many young student affairs professionals.

Graduate degrees from secular institution may intimidate not only the potential graduate students, but the supervisors of these new professionals also. Deans must be careful not to hire professional staff who have been polluted with the student development and humanistic theories of the liberal establishment within higher education. These Deans, or veteran student affairs professionals at CCCU institutions may also not have graduate degrees themselves. Why hire a new staff member who outranks the boss with his/her educational background? This could lead to major conflicts for the student affairs veterans who know and read little outside their institutional or denominational enclave. Support for this hypothesis may be in the 1995 HERI study of faculty (Baylis), which found that the highest completed degree for CCCU faculty was lower than the highest completed degree for faculty from private colleges and
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universities. This finding is probably transferable to student affairs divisions. Anecdotal evidence collected at conferences of the Association for Christians in Student Development also suggests that more student affairs professionals at CCCU institutions lack master's degrees than at other private, non-religious higher education institutions.

Fortunately, because of the non-significant differences between student affairs divisions' incorporation of five of the principles at CCCU and non-CCCU institutions, the lack of formal graduate student affairs training has not adversely affected CCCU student affairs divisions' incorporation of most of the Principles of Good Practice for Student Affairs (ACPA & NASPA, 1997). Of course, this data comes from the chief student affairs officers, the same veterans just discussed above.

Support or Lack of Support for Guthrie's Report Card

Although this article was mostly written by the time Guthrie's "Report Card for Christian College Student Affairs," was printed in Growth, it would be a mistake not to revisit Guthrie's informed opinions with the quantitative data of this study for comparison. It does not take a genius to recognize that Christian colleges and universities are focused on helping students develop coherent values and therefore Guthrie had no problem making this claim. He went so far as to describe the character building efforts of Christian colleges as "synonymous" with the college experience. While the data clearly supported the significant difference between student affairs divisions at CCCU and non-CCCU institutions in helping students develop coherent values, it is worth noting that student affairs divisions at non-CCCU institutions also reported doing quite well at helping students develop coherent values when compared to the other principles in this study.

Guthrie's analysis also matched the results of this study in identifying the positive efforts of Christian colleges in creating a supportive community versus the less than positive efforts of Christian colleges in creating an inclusive community. Guthrie drew attention to an article by McMinn (1998) which argued that the "bubble" around Christian colleges can make it difficult to reach out to and understand people who are different. With regard to the efforts of student affairs divisions to engage students in active learning, Guthrie's informed opinion was that student affairs professionals at Christian colleges "had made important strides" (p. 28). Because the data in this study indicate that engaging students in active learning is the third highest incorporated principle of the seven principles, Guthrie's impression seems accurate. In other words, because the research on active learning has only been widely disseminated in the past fifteen years, it is noteworthy that this principle ranks higher than student affairs divisions' efforts to set high expectations, use resources effectively and several other principles.

Guthrie's analysis of the extent to which student affairs divisions at Christian colleges have used systematic inquiry to improve student and institutional performance was that there could be more effort made in this area. Guthrie identified the challenges that outcomes assessment has posed for Christian colleges. While the results of this study reveal Guthrie to be accurate in the failure of student affairs divisions to do much in the area of systematic assessment, this study indicates that the difficulty with outcomes assessment is not limited to Christian higher education, but inclusive of higher education in general. In fact, of the seven principles of good practice, the extent
to which colleges are using systemic inquiry to improve performance ranked last among the seven principles. All student affairs divisions could do more to present and study research findings, include research priorities in the institutional research agenda, and implement a comprehensive plan for assessment of student learning.

The only principle whose incorporation was nearly as low as the extent to which student affairs divisions systemically assessed was the extent to which student affairs divisions used resources effectively to achieve goals. The items on which this principle was based included preparing a strategic plan that linked to educational outcomes, evaluating cost-effectiveness of programs, insuring staff members were knowledgeable of fiscal resource management and organizational development, and communicating guidelines for prudent expenditures of money. Both CCCU and non-CCCU institutions rated themselves as incorporating this principle much less than they incorporated all the other principles except systematic assessment. Guthrie, however, believed that student affairs professionals at Christian colleges “did well with respect to this principle,” and “attempted to use resources wisely as a matter of personal and professional faithfulness” (p. 30). Not wanting to indicate a lack of faithfulness of student affairs professionals at CCCU institutions, it might be that student affairs professionals struggle more with the challenges of evaluating cost-effectiveness and preparing staff to effectively handle fiscal planning and management. Of all Guthrie’s educated impressions, this was the one in which this results of this study most differed from his insights.

Guthrie’s hypotheses of student affairs divisions’ efforts to set high expectations and forge educational partnerships were not as clearly defined when compared to his other hypotheses. The results of this study, however, indicate that both CCCU and non-CCCU institutions have some work to do to increase the expectations for learning they set and their efforts to forge educational partnerships. In short, most of Guthrie’s “report card” compares favorably with the results of this study. Hopefully, the results of this study will add quantitative support to the strengths and weaknesses of student affairs divisions at CCCU institutions.
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Searching for the Perfect Fit: An Examination of the Job Satisfaction of Middle Management Student Affairs Professionals in Christian Institutions of Higher Education

By Brent Ellis, Ed.D.

INTRODUCTION

In the latter half of the twentieth century a considerable amount of research surfaced on the satisfaction or lack of satisfaction experienced by individuals in the work place (Herzberg et al., 1959; Locke, 1976, 1983, 1984; Liacqua & Schumacher, 1995; Lawler, 1971, 1973, 1995; Smith, Kendall, & Hullin, 1969; Wanous & Lawler, 1972). Initially the research focused on workers in industry; however, over the last thirty years the research areas have grown to include all areas of employment.

This research emphasis can be explained in numerous ways, but none so simple as the fact that work "fills the greater part of the waking day for most of us. For the fortunate it is the source of great satisfactions; for many others it is the cause of grief" (Herzberg et al., 1959, p. 3). Because of the very obvious, yet profound truth, job satisfaction has become an important area of research for all areas of employment.

The reasons, however, do not cease with a surface analysis. Research has shown that an average person spends as much as one-third of his or her life at work (Adams & Ingersoll, 1985). Work also influences physical and mental health, families, self-confidence, longevity and develops identity (Adams & Ingersoll, 1985; Burke, 1970; Cranny, 1992; Herzberg et al., 1959; Locke, 1976, 1983; Sigelman & Shaffer, 1995). Obviously, job satisfaction is an area that affects life profoundly and therefore, is important to study.

This study focused on the job satisfaction of middle management student affairs professionals at Christian colleges and universities. Middle management refers to any student affairs position subordinate to the dean of students' position. Such positions would primarily consist of residence life, student activities, leadership development, career development, orientation, housing and campus ministry staff. The positions of residence hall directors, however, were not included.

Brent Ellis is the director of the center for the development of christian leadership at LeTourneau University. He has an Ed.D in higher education administration from Indiana University.
Theoretical Background

Research has shown that several factors affect the job satisfaction of college and university student affairs professionals. Among these factors are student relations, faculty relations, ideological fit, prestige, professional growth, supervision, equitable pay and the availability of resources (Nestor, 1988; Plascak, 1988; Lucas, 1996; Iiacqua & Schumacher, 1995). However, particular causes of job satisfaction for student affairs professionals at Christian colleges and universities have not been examined.

While administrative positions have been shown to be one of the top twelve most stressful occupations (Charlesworth & Nathan, 1985), the existing research has yet to examine student affairs professionals at the middle management position in Christian higher education. When research has focused on student affairs administrators either the senior administrators, specific sub groups such as residence hall assistants, student activity programmers, and senior housing officers, or a global study of all administrators has taken place (Adams, 1995; Bender, 1980; Burns, 1982; Clements, 1982; Forney & Wiggers, 1984; Liddell, 1986; Nestor, 1988; Studer, 1980; Tarver, Canada, & Lim, 1999). Attempting to examine midlevel administrators could identify interesting differences between what impacts the job satisfaction of this group of student affairs professionals and what impacts the job satisfaction of the professionals that have been researched in prior studies.

Faye Plascak’s (1988) study serves as an appropriate model for this project. This study measured job satisfaction among university faculty and found that student relations, faculty relations, ideology, autonomy, prestige, professional growth, supervision, equitable pay and the availability of resources had the most significant impact on job satisfaction for faculty.

Methodology

Survey Development

A survey instrument, adapted from Faye Plascak’s (1988) survey, was developed to identify the information necessary to measure job satisfaction among middle management student affairs professionals at Christian colleges and universities. The instrument used in this current study was comprised of 40 questions and categorized into three major categories. Twenty-one questions measured the sixteen facets influencing job satisfaction. The next nine questions asked specific demographic information. The next eight questions ascertained the dependent variable, job satisfaction. Finally the last two questions allowed for the individual completing the questionnaire to offer any particulars that the questionnaire did not cover.

The first part of the instrument, questions 1-21, measured levels of various work elements or facets. These facets are determinates of job satisfaction (Locke 1976; Locke et al., 1983). The facets were: work itself, autonomy, role overload, role conflict, recognition, prestige, pay, evaluation standards, participation in decision making, general resources, working conditions, opportunities for professional growth, ideological fit, peer relationships, supervisory relationships and relationships with students. These items are shown in Table One.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONCEPTS</th>
<th>ITEMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relationship With Students</td>
<td>#3 How often do you interact with students?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#13 How often do you interact with students informally?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#16 How often do you have opportunities for developing mentorships or personal relationships with your students?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Relations</td>
<td>#14 How often do you interact with colleagues?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory Relations</td>
<td>#15 How often do you interact with your dean of students?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideological Fit</td>
<td>#17 How much congruence is there between your personal mission and the mission of your institution?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#18 How much congruence is there between your philosophy of education and the philosophy of education of your institution?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#21 How much congruence is there between your religious beliefs and the religious beliefs of your institution?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestige</td>
<td>#10 How much of your work is perceived by your university community as valuable or legitimate?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#19 How much of your work is perceived by the public as valuable or legitimate?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Growth</td>
<td>#8 How many resources are available for professional growth?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Conditions</td>
<td>#9 How appropriate is your working space?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Resources</td>
<td>#7 How many resources are available that you need to carry out your job?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in Decision Making</td>
<td>#6 How often do you participate in decision-making?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Standards</td>
<td>#5 How fair are the criteria used to evaluate your work?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>#20 How often are you recognized by your institution for your work?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Conflict</td>
<td>#11 How often do you spend time in activities you value outside of your job?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Overload</td>
<td>#4 How high is the level of your workload?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Itself</td>
<td>#12 How often do you work with creative ideas?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>#1 How often do you determine your own work activities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equitable Pay</td>
<td>#2 What is the value of your fringe benefit package to you?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The second part of the survey gathered demographic information. Certain demographic information about the individuals was helpful in interpreting the results of the survey. Information such as gender, age, ethnicity, educational level, number of years working in field, number of years at current institution and if the person is working for his or her alma mater, all gave interesting insights to the findings.

The third part of the survey measured the dependent variable of job satisfaction. Plascak (1988) adapted these survey questions, 10a-10h, from Price and Mueller (1986). The alternation between satisfaction and dissatisfaction in the statements was used to increase reliability in the responses.

Site

The site for this research was a small, private Christian liberal arts university in a small mid-western town. The university is located approximately 45-55 miles from two major metropolitan areas. During the month of June 2000, this institution hosted the national conference of the Association for Christians in Student Development (ACSD), an organization of Christian student affairs professionals from around the world. This institution was instrumental in the development of ACSD and has remained a chief contributor to the organization since its inception.

Sample

Names of individuals who fit the constraints of the research were obtained from the membership rosters of the Association for Christians in Student Development and the Council for Christian Colleges and Universities. Only full-time employees were identified in order to reduce the variability of responses and knowledge about particular institutions, as well as increase the reliability and validity of the study. ACSD has approximately 1,100 members in its association. Of those 1,100 approximately one-half are classified as middle management professionals.

Measurement of the Independent Variables

Job Elements – Facets

The need fulfillment or need and need discrepancy theories, based on Maslow’s theory of motivation, propose that satisfaction is the result of a reduction of tension between unmet and fulfilled needs (Maslow, 1954). Research that has been conducted utilizing the postulates proposed in these theories simply asks about the amount of a certain facet or outcome an individual employee receives (Lawler, 1995). The primary objective of this research was to identify what facets affect job satisfaction in middle management student affairs administrators at Christian colleges and universities.

Each respondent was asked to identify the amount of each facet he or she currently experiences in his or her position. The questionnaire used a seven point Likert scale with 1 = minimum/absent level to 7 = very high level. A list of the facets and a brief description of the facets will be helpful in understanding the research. These descriptions are found in Table Two.
Table Two
Facet Description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACET</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Relationship With Students</td>
<td>Opportunities to develop mentoring or positive relationships with students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Peer Relations</td>
<td>Interaction with colleagues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Supervisory Relations</td>
<td>Interaction with supervisor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Ideological Fit</td>
<td>Congruence between personal ideology and the ideology of the institution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Prestige</td>
<td>Prestige assigned to position.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Professional Growth</td>
<td>Resources available for professional growth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Working Conditions</td>
<td>Adequate working environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. General Resources</td>
<td>General Resources implementation of job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Participation in Decision Making</td>
<td>Opportunities to aid in making decisions for department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Recognition</td>
<td>Recognition for work done.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Role Conflict</td>
<td>Balance between work and other life responsibilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Role Overload</td>
<td>Adequate amount of time to fulfill job requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Work Itself</td>
<td>Challenging and rewarding work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Autonomy</td>
<td>Determining work activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A factor analysis was conducted to ensure reliability in these measures. The outcome of the factor analysis was the formation of five multiple item factors that were used in the regression equation. The composite factors matched the projected variables, with the exclusion of evaluation standards, work conditions and role conflict. The composite factors resembled the projected variables with a few exceptions. All other factors loaded into one of the five multiple item factors. The five multiple item factors were named professionally minded, relationship with students, ideological fit, peer and supervisory relationships and autonomy. The three composite variables that combined variables from the projected variables were, the professionally minded, peer and supervisory relationship and autonomy. Table Three demonstrates these multiple item factors.
Table Three
Reliability Measures for Multiple Item Independent Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th>ALPHA</th>
<th>ITEM #</th>
<th>SURVEY FACTOR LOADING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professionally Minded</td>
<td>.743</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.62034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.73400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.75194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.60501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.57660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship With Students</td>
<td>.785</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.78973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>.82451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.80539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideological Fit</td>
<td>.767</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.50255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.80569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.75841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.77008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer and Supervisory</td>
<td>.526</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.72841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>.75497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>.505</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.78513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.58975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.64036</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Demographic Variables

Seven questions were used to investigate the impact that demographic variables have on job satisfaction. According to a study conducted by Iiacaua and Schumacher (1995), demographic information gives valuable insight into the job satisfaction of employees. Research has also shown that gender and age impact job satisfaction (Johnson & Johnson, 2000; Koretz, 2000; Lincoln & Kalleberg, 1990; Zefane, 1994). However, the findings of Plascak (1988) and Nestor (1988) do not support this finding. Because of the investigative nature of this study, the researcher included an examination of the effect of demographic variables on job satisfaction. The demographic variables used requested respondents to provide information about gender, ethnicity, tenure at current institution, tenure in student development, age, educational level and whether or not the respondent is currently employed at his or her alma mater. These questions were then assigned numerical values based upon the responses.

Two steps were taken to ascertain which demographic variables influenced job satis
faction. First a correlation matrix was created that showed two variables as significant - age and years at institution. Also, a forced entry regression analysis was performed using only the demographic variables on the dependent variable, job satisfaction, to ascertain if any demographic variable impacted job satisfaction at a significant level. Only one of the eight demographic variables measured at a significant level - age. Age measured at .009 significance. As a result of this finding, age was included in this investigation as the only demographic variable in the regression equation for the study.

**Measurement of the Dependent Variable**

Eight questions were used to measure the dependent variable. The overall satisfaction of the participants was established by calculating an arithmetic mean from the responses to the eight statements from Price and Mueller's (1986) job satisfaction questionnaire (Table Four).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Satisfaction Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I find real enjoyment in my job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I consider my job rather unpleasant.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I enjoy my job more than my leisure time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I am often bored with my job.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I am fairly well satisfied with my job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I definitely dislike my job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Each day on my job seems like it will never end.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Most days I am enthusiastic about my job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(*=Scored in Reverse)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants answered the questions by checking a box that best represented their responses to the statements. The choices for responses were, *strongly agree, agree, neither agree or disagree, disagree, and strongly disagree*. Based on a Likert scale, numerical values were assigned to these responses to ascertain the overall job satisfaction.

It was assumed that the questions provided a reliable measure of job satisfaction based on the surveys used by Price & Mueller (1986) and Plascak (1988). An exploratory factor analysis was conducted on the questions comprising the dependent variable. In the factor analysis, however, one question did not meet the .50 standard for factor loading - *I enjoy my job more than my leisure time*. The factor score for this question was .448. Subsequently, this question was removed from the dependent variable. The dependent variable was then measured by the seven remaining questions.
Alpha coefficient tests were then conducted on the seven remaining questions to test the reliability of the questions. The results showed an alpha value of .8266. Reliability coefficient values range from 0 to 1.0 and the closer the value is to 1.0 the more reliable the variable (Wiersma, 1995). Cronbach’s alpha coefficient of .80 or higher is typically accepted for basic research. It was concluded that the questions measuring the dependent variable provided a reliable measure of job satisfaction.

RESULTS

Overall Satisfaction of Participants

Although the primary emphasis of this study was the identification of facets that affect the satisfaction of student affairs professionals in Christian higher education, a quick examination of the overall satisfaction of the participants will be helpful in understanding the findings of the research. The majority of studies indicated that student affairs professionals are satisfied with their jobs. The data in this study also revealed that the majority of respondents in this study have a high level of satisfaction with their positions.

To further illustrate the high level of satisfaction of the respondents, a frequency distribution table was created (Table Five). The results of the frequency distribution expressed what the mean did, that the respondents are satisfied; however, it also expressed the groupings of responses more adequately. For instance the statement, I enjoy my job more than my leisure time is better clarified by viewing the distribution of responses. Where the mean showed neither agreement nor disagreement, the frequency distribution showed that 46.3 percent of respondents disagreed with the statement while only 12.5 percent agreed with the statement. In all other categories, however, the respondents expressed extreme satisfaction. Positive scores for the remaining seven scores vary from 85.8 percent to 95.5 percent of respondents. The analysis of the frequency distribution supports the finding of the arithmetic mean, that the participants of this study were satisfied with their jobs.
Table Five  
Frequency Distribution of Overall Satisfaction Item Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>CATEGORIES/NUMBER/PERCENTAGES</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I find real enjoyment in my job.</td>
<td></td>
<td>n=0</td>
<td>n=4</td>
<td>n=4</td>
<td>n=76</td>
<td>n=91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
<td>51.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I consider my job rather unpleasant.*</td>
<td></td>
<td>n=0</td>
<td>n=6</td>
<td>n=4</td>
<td>n=89</td>
<td>n=76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>50.6%</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy my job more than my leisure time.#</td>
<td></td>
<td>n=11</td>
<td>n=70</td>
<td>n=72</td>
<td>n=17</td>
<td>n=5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am often bored with my job.*</td>
<td></td>
<td>n=2</td>
<td>n=6</td>
<td>n=14</td>
<td>n=79</td>
<td>n=74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am fairly well satisfied with my job.</td>
<td></td>
<td>n=1</td>
<td>n=11</td>
<td>n=13</td>
<td>n=93</td>
<td>n=57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I definitely dislike my job.*</td>
<td></td>
<td>n=1</td>
<td>n=2</td>
<td>n=5</td>
<td>n=49</td>
<td>n=118</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each day on my job seems like it will never end.*</td>
<td></td>
<td>n=0</td>
<td>n=6</td>
<td>n=6</td>
<td>n=81</td>
<td>n=82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most days I am enthusiastic about my job.</td>
<td></td>
<td>n=0</td>
<td>n=6</td>
<td>n=12</td>
<td>n=100</td>
<td>n=57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Reversed Scoring
#Removed from Global Job Satisfaction Equation
Factors Influencing Satisfaction

Regression analysis was used to determine which variables had significant impact on the job satisfaction of student affairs professionals. According to Hair et al (1987), “multiple regression analysis is a general statistical technique used to analyze the relationship between a single dependent variable and several independent variables” (p. 17). Two outcomes are useful in interpreting the relationship. First the $R^2$ indicates the amount of variance in the dependent variable predicted by the independent variables. Second, the regression indicates which variables have a statistically significant influence on the dependent variable (Hair et al, 1987). The results of the regression analysis are indicated in Table Six.

Table Six
Regression Analysis and Analysis of Variance for Independent Variables Impact on Student Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES IN THE EQUATION</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>STD. ERROR</th>
<th>BETA</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>SIG. LEVEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ideological Fit</td>
<td>.186</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.325</td>
<td>4.466</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship With Students</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.184</td>
<td>2.746</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.149</td>
<td>2.190</td>
<td>.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>2.021</td>
<td>.045</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES NOT IN THE EQUATION</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>STD. ERROR</th>
<th>BETA</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>SIG. LEVEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role Overload</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.384</td>
<td>.702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Standards</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>1.884</td>
<td>.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Conditions</td>
<td>-.035</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>-.032</td>
<td>-.461</td>
<td>.645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Conflict</td>
<td>-.021</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>-.040</td>
<td>-.576</td>
<td>.565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionally Minded</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.962</td>
<td>.338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer/Supervisor Relationships</td>
<td>-.058</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>-.103</td>
<td>-1.474</td>
<td>.142</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.873</td>
<td>2.968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>33.697</td>
<td>.198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F=14.975</td>
<td>Sig.=.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Four of the ten variables proved to be statistically significant in accounting for the variance in the dependent variable, job satisfaction. A cutoff level of .05 for significance was set for inclusion in the regression equations. The four most significant factors were ideological fit, relationship with students, autonomy and age, listed in order of respective beta values. The beta value denotes the amount of the total variance of the dependent variable explained by the independent variables. Beta values must be interpreted in the context of the variables in a single equation. These variables combined, in the regression equation, to explain 24.3 percent of the variance. The results showed that institutional fit accounted for 32.5 percent of the total variance explained by the adjusted $R^2$ score of .243. The factors of professionally minded, peer and supervisory relationships, role overload, evaluation standards, working conditions and role conflict did not meet the .05 cutoff and therefore were not considered statistically significant.

The analysis of the variance (ANOVA) for the total sample resulted in an F ratio of 14.975 and a significance level of .000. The F ratio is the ratio of the sum of squares to mean squares (Hair et al, 1987). The significance level score showed that the independent variables in the regression equation were significant in predicting the respondents' satisfaction and not just a result of random error.

Ideological fit had the highest level of effect on the overall job satisfaction of the participants in this study. Ideological fit's beta value was .325. This is interesting based upon the fact that this particular job facet was only identified in one other study, Nestor (1988). Nestor found that ideological fit had important influence on job satisfaction for student affairs professionals. This finding should not be surprising given the expectations and desires of this particular subset of student affairs professionals.

The second highest beta was relationship with students (beta = .184). The amount of impact this particular variable had on overall job satisfaction was as expected given the characteristics of this particular subgroup of student affairs professionals.

The factor, autonomy, had a surprisingly low beta, .149, compared to other research. In this study, autonomy had an alpha coefficient score of .505. This is a low alpha score and could suggest that this variable does actually influence job satisfaction to a greater extent than is represented by the data in this study. This finding suggests that although autonomy did impact job satisfaction, it did not do so to its expected level.

The final factor, age, had a beta score of .145. This finding is supported by the literature of other researchers who found older employees were more satisfied (Johnson & Johnson, 2000; Koretz, 2000; Lincoln & Kalleberg, 1990; Zefane, 1994).

The findings of this multiple regression analysis and analysis of variance suggest that many of the job facets that influence overall job satisfaction for college and university student affairs professionals do impact job satisfaction for this particular subgroup working in Christian higher education. However, it is interesting to note that many of the facets that have a high level of influence, according to other research, either do not impact or have very little impact on the job satisfaction of these participants.

**Discussion of Important Findings**

Several important findings were gathered from the statistical analysis of the data. The most important finding of this study was that ideological fit had the greatest influence on job satisfaction. Although ideological fit had been shown to impact job satisfaction in
Nestor’s (1988) study, it had not surfaced as a primary predictor in other studies. This predictor is defined by the degree of congruence between the organization’s ideology and the person’s ideology (Nestor, 1988).

If there is a high level of congruence between the personal ideology of an employee and the ideology of the institution, then job satisfaction is likely to increase. As the level of congruence between the two ideologies decreases, so does job satisfaction. The beta value for this variable was 43 percent higher than the second highest predictor — *relationship with students*. *Ideological fit* was measured by asking about three specific areas of the respondent’s job — correlation between the institution’s and the respondent’s personal mission, philosophy of education, and religious beliefs. The independent variable of *ideological fit* emerged as the best predictor of job satisfaction in this particular study.

The second important finding concerned the second best predictor for this study — *relationship with students*. The beta value for this independent variable was .184. Other research has demonstrated that opportunities to mentor and to have informal contact with students have a positive effect on job satisfaction (Newell and Spear, 1983; and Nestor, 1988). However, contact with students for disciplinary reasons impacts job satisfaction negatively (Nestor, 1988). The statistical analysis of Nestor’s (1988) data corroborates the findings of this study. Relationships with students, in a positive context, influences job satisfaction in a positive manner.

A third important finding involved the high satisfaction levels of the participants in this study. The high mean scores on the questions designed by Price & Mueller (1986) that measure job satisfaction substantiate this finding. The overall mean score for all eight answers combined was 4.12, which indicates that the respondents were very satisfied with their jobs. The mean scores for the individual statements were 4.45, 4.34, 2.63, 4.24, 4.11, 4.61, 4.37, and 4.19. High scores ranged from 12.5 to 94.9 percent. As previously noted, the 12.5 percent positive answer and 2.63 mean score are both from the question *I enjoy my job more than my leisure time*. Taking that particular question out of consideration, the next lowest percentage is 85.2 percent of responses falling in the positive category (positive referring to either 4 or 5 on the Likert scale). This question was removed from the dependent variable because it did not meet the minimum .5 factor loading score. This shows a high level of satisfaction for the participants of this study. This is a very important finding.

The fourth important finding was that six of the ten independent variables were shown not to be significant in the regression equation. This is especially interesting considering the body of research that shows variables such as *relationships with peers*, *evaluation standards* and *professionally minded goals* to have a very significant impact on job satisfaction (Vroom, 1964; Bender, 1980; Pearson & Seiler, 1983; Price & Mueller, 1986; and Hutton & Jobe, 1985). This finding is worth mentioning because this study was conducted on an entirely new subgroup of student affairs professionals. The uniqueness of this particular subgroup of middle management student affairs professionals in Christian higher education could provide insight into the lack of significance of such standard facets that influence job satisfaction.
Practical Implications from this Study

Although job satisfaction has been an important topic for industry and education for more than fifty years, the investigation of job satisfaction in Christian higher education circles has only begun. While the results of this study show that the overall job satisfaction for the respondents was high, the results do not imply that nothing should be done to continue to create jobs in which the people fulfilling the responsibilities are content and satisfied. Moreover, the results do not imply that Christian higher education need not concern itself with the issue of job satisfaction. Christian higher education must continue to study the facets that influence job satisfaction both positively and negatively. The findings from this research are a start in this direction and serve as suggestions for practical implications for policy makers.

1. Recognize the crucial role ideological fit plays in the overall job satisfaction of middle management student affairs professionals and emphasize the importance of this factor in institutional policy making. The independent variable, ideological fit, emerged from the analysis of the data as the factor influencing the overall job satisfaction of the participants of this study more than any other variable. This variable was defined by Nestor (1988) as the degree of congruence between the organization’s ideology and the person’s ideology. The fact that ideological fit was so significant in predicting job satisfaction should influence policy makers to consider its importance in numerous ways. A primary way is to insure that an intentional effort is made to hire individuals who possess similar ideologies to those of the institution. Hiring individuals with ideologies similar to those of the institution will not only contribute to the satisfaction level of the individual employee but will also assist the institution in maintaining its desired standards. This statement, however, does not negate the need for institutions to maintain diversity, only that the ideologies of the employee and the institution be similar.

A second suggestion is to develop specific descriptions of the institution’s mission, philosophy of education and religious beliefs. These descriptions could be useful during both the hiring process and the orientation of new employees when prospective employees and new hires need to be certain of the ideological views of the institution, including the institution’s history, mission and purpose. Additionally, these descriptions could be useful as reference tools for current employees. Veteran employees could receive encouragement and direction during difficult times of the school year from reviewing these descriptions.

2. Recognize the crucial role that relationship with students play in the overall job satisfaction of middle management student affairs professionals and emphasize the importance of this factor in institutional policy making. Positive relationships with students proved to be a job facet that had an important influence on job satisfaction. In recognition of this finding, policy makers should consider its importance when creating policy in several areas.

The first area involves policies related to promotion. When an individual enters the student affairs profession at the resident hall director position, he or she is exposed to many students. As the individual is promoted through the ranks of the institution, his or her exposure to students diminishes tremendously or it involves interaction that is primarily punitive in nature. Many professionals
find themselves becoming the primary disciplinarian for the college or university. Promotion should not exclude middle management professionals from roles and responsibilities where they are able to have positive interactions with students. For instance, a person whose role is primarily disciplinary in nature must have responsibilities that also allow him or her to interact with students in positive ways.

A second area involves policies related to expected responsibilities. A middle management employee should be expected to develop mentoring relationships with several students every year. This will not only aid in the overall satisfaction of the employee but will also aid in the development of the students involved in the mentoring relationship. A third area involves policies related to the location of office space. As much as possible, a middle management student affairs professional’s office should be located in a high traffic area on the campus. The likelihood for developing positive interactions with students will increase as more students are found around the office area of middle management professionals.

3. Recognize that factors that influenced the overall job satisfaction in this project are in some ways similar to factors that have been shown to influence job satisfaction at other institutions and examine efforts made on other campuses to enhance job satisfaction for possible adaptation. Although many of the facets that are typically shown to influence job satisfaction in student affairs professionals did not meet the .05 cutoff level for significance, four did. Ideological fit and relationship with students were already discussed. The third and fourth variables were autonomy and age. This analysis led to the assumption that although there are differences, there are also some similarities between the job facets that affect job satisfaction in this subgroup and the job facets that affect job satisfaction in student affairs professionals in general. The practical implication for administrators and policy makers is that it could be beneficial to examine the programs and policies at other institutions aimed at fostering job satisfaction among their employees. If the job facets that affect job satisfaction are similar, then the programs aimed at fostering job satisfaction at one institution could be transferable to other institutions.

4. Recognize that there are unique characteristics influencing job satisfaction within this particular subgroup of student affairs professionals and work with institutions within this subgroup to identify ways of increasing job satisfaction. Of the ten job facets that were regressed, six showed little or no significance. Peer/supervisory relations, evaluation standards, role overload, role conflict, professionally minded and working conditions all were shown to influence job satisfaction in other research. There is some difference in the makeup of the respondents of this survey and student affairs professionals in general. The practical implication for administrators is to examine programs and policies at similar institutions aimed at fostering and promoting job satisfaction among their employees. In similar institutions there are typically similar employees. Programs that are successful at one institution could be useful in similar contexts.

SUMMARY

The review of the literature showed that very little, if any research at all, had been conducted on job satisfaction among student affairs professionals in Christian colleges and universities. This study attempted to address this void. This analysis showed that
mid-level student affairs professionals at Christian colleges were highly satisfied with their roles and that the factors that most influenced their satisfaction were ideological fit, relationship with students, autonomy and age.

The findings of this study should be considered by senior administrators as they judge the impact policy decisions and practices have on the overall job satisfaction of these college or university employees. Student affairs middle management professionals at Christian institutions of higher education should also weigh the findings of this study as they decide where to work, where to invest their time and how to set priorities for their responsibilities.
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As student affairs educators we routinely meet with students in several different circumstances and who have many different needs. For most of us, that is the reason we chose the profession — because we enjoyed working with and helping students. Occasionally we interact with a student who has unique needs, unusual circumstances, or has created a situation that requires special attention — a classic case — one that if publicly shared could serve as a learning experience for others and help develop all of us into better professionals. Such is the nature of the cases found in Frances Stage and Michael Dannells’ Linking Theory to Practice: Case Studies for Working with College Students.

In the preface of the book, the editors hint that their purpose was “the application of the learnings of the classroom to practical reality.” To that end Stage and Dannels have accomplished their task. As a student affairs professional and faculty member in graduate programs in Student Affairs and Higher Education, I applaud their effort to transform theory into meaningful and practical learning experiences for how we work with students.

The book is divided into two parts with nine chapters. Part one is an overview of theories, practices and case-study analysis. The “case” for the importance of reviewing cases studies is presented. A brief overview of student developmental theory and theory clusters are provided. A favorite part of the book for me is at the end of chapter two where an annotated bibliography provides significant works in student developmental theory. The third chapter is a tutorial on how to analyze case studies.

The bulk of the book is in part two where 26 case studies are organized around six themes: organization and administration, advising and counseling, residence life,
student activities, academic issues, and legal and judicial matters. The individuals who prepared the case studies came from a variety of educational settings: large and small institutions, public and private educational instructions, practitioners and faculty members, academic and student affairs.

Most of the case studies are brief three to four pages, and provide the necessary components for the reader to analyze the case. Each case study is set in a community college, private college or state-supported university. After the characters and the facts of the case are presented, the reader is posed a question like, “What do you do?”, “How will you justice your involvement?”, or “How do you proceed?”

The chapter with residence life case studies was a favorite of mine. A student sending a threatening e-mail to floor mates leads into discussions on “The Internet and Student Affairs Practice.” A practical joke in a residence hall results in two students being suspended in “The Morning After.” Problems that arise as students mature and develop interpersonal relationships are presented in “Violence and Romance.” And, in “Fighting Words,” racists’ activity is encountered and addressed.

Obviously, this book will serve as a supplemental text in college student developmental courses. However, it can serve in other settings as well. Since the emphasis of the book is the application of theory to everyday campus activities, seasoned professionals will benefit from reading a case study and then reflecting on appropriate responses. A valuable application of this resource may be for staff development purposes. Since the cases are concise and relevant, student affairs educators could review together a case study and discuss possible actions to be taken.

To facilitate such usage, the editors provide two indexes for the 26 cases. The “case by case” index provides the constituents involved and the issues discussed. The “subject” index organizes the case studies by subject (e.g., student learning, diversity, student conduct, student organizations) and institutional type and size.

Working with and training new student affairs professionals to interact with college students is challenging and rewarding. This book takes new and seasoned educators back to the classroom to consider things that students face, the complexity of the issues at hand, and then encourages us to consider solutions together. Student Affairs staff engaged with students will find this a valuable resource. The lessons learned from Linking Theory to Practice could start some important conversations about the most important commodity on college campuses – students.
The title of this book has captured the essence of many conversations on college campuses. It hints at pertinent discussions that have circulated among Christians in higher education for some time. Because it is written by Martin Marty and published by Jossey-Bass, the reader can assume they will read an insightful and perceptive volume. Marty is a sound and wise observer of American Christianity. He has reflected deeply on issues that affect America and its people. Not hesitant to articulate his thoughts on a myriad of issues, Marty is a thinker who assists in shaping questions and challenges individuals to delve deeper into the issues they are facing. The publisher, Jossey-Bass, is a leader in tackling topics of education and leadership and typically provides extremely helpful resources for educators. Joining Jonathan Moore, they produced two volumes that stand alone, but compliment each another. The first, Politics, Religion and the Common Good, explores the importance of those with faith taking an active role in making and assessing the impact of political decisions. It explores the implications of mixing religion with politics for the community or “common” good. The other volume, Education, Religion and the Common Good, asks where education, religion and community should intersect. Conventional wisdom suggests that Marty and Moore may be venturing into an extremely volatile area. Their perspective is that those of faith and religion need to and should reflect, discuss and enlighten institutional, political and civic discussions on education. This small volume is meant as a primer for Americans of faith to reflect and act upon the implications of educational concerns facing their campuses, communities and nation. Religion and education do not naturally come together in American thinking. However, as Marty writes: “... where does religion not come into this? You will not get very far into any educational issues without somehow bumping into religious themes” (p. 23). For those followers of Jesus who have rooted themselves in higher education and care about education in general, the implications of this “big picture” conversation are important.

The volume begins with setting parameters for the discussion. The terms “education,” “religion,” and “common good” are loaded with presuppositions, images, meanings and emotions. Marty and Moore narrow the field by defining the terms for this particular discourse. While education can encompass things as diverse as grade schools,
apprenticeships, colleges, trade schools and mentoring, here the principal focus turns to “education that is transacted in institutions” (p. 8). Religion, with its multiple definitions, is distilled into that which gives us “ultimate concern” (p. 9). As Marty asks, “What guiding principle organizes and infuses your life with meaning?” (p. 10). While the discussion of education has been restricted to the institutional context, religion touches the individual as well as the community. These become the focus of the discussion.

The topics of education and religion can be highly volatile. As the authors write: “When nothing less than the common good is at stake, we want discussions to generate more light than heat” (p. 11). When education and religion are brought together, everyone has an opinion, everyone has an interest and the potential for combustible passion is high. The purpose of this volume is not to prepare an individual to win an argument or force a solution to a problem, but is to encourage the freedom found in conversation. An argument is essentially a defense of a position; someone must win or lose. A conversation is less combative, less heated and assists in the progression towards the common good. Ideally, conversation will begin to enlighten arguments, by bringing information, understanding and perspectives from unexpected sources. In short, Marty and Moore assert that: “this book is dedicated to fueling a conversation about education, religion and the common good.” (p. 16)

The strength of this volume lies in its brief historical discussion and cultural analysis of how religion, education and politics have affected each other in America. It is also very helpful in its exploration of worldview and factors that enlighten and impassion the discussion. From these foundations, they move into a discussion of grade schools, home schooling and moving to private and public institutions of higher education. In their examination of higher education, Marty and Moore limit the discussion for private colleges [or more specifically what they have identified as “church related higher education”] to the move away from institutional religious roots to the secularization of higher education. The primary concern discussed under public universities is the establishment of a religious studies department within secular institutions. The limitations of their discussion left this reader far from satisfied.

Marty and Moore are correct in that the discussion about religion, education and community must take place. It is essential to understanding American culture to discern how religion has shaped and influenced the worldview of Americans. All one has to do is scan the daily newspaper to see that at a certain level religion is a factor in countless newsworthy events. Fortunately, many of the conversations Marty and Moore encourage are increasingly taking place. As I opened this volume, my hope was that this book would clarify some of the questions and provide some reflections on the conversations that are taking place on public and private campuses. For those on Christian campuses there is disappointment that the myriad of issues that revolve around religion and education were ignored or rarely mentioned in this book. While discussing secularization is important, so are conversations regarding the roles of education, leadership, service, faith and learning, gender, multiculturalism, etc. These matters are shaped by worldview and faith, and are concerns for many on Christian campuses as well as those in public institutions.

In a final analysis, the book is a helpful primer for those who have not yet started to reflect on the relationship between education and faith or religion. At the same
time, the pertinent discussions are basic and cursory, especially for those who have already been wrestling with these matters. We need to acknowledge that religion does have a role in most issues we face and in many of the matters facing our educational institutions. We also need some strong tools to begin exploring these concerns. Marty and Moore provide a foundation and a plan for reflecting on these issues. However, that is as far as they go.

The significance of this book for those Christians in student development is in two areas. The first is that if we see ourselves as educators within the North American context we need to be able to grasp the issues with which our colleagues, students and faculty are wrestling. We need to be able to discern the implications our faith has on the concerns that our institutions encounter, whether public or private. With this competency comes the need to model to our students how to reflect deeply and demonstrate the significance of action and inaction in these areas. If our desire is to encourage the development of wise and discerning citizens of this nation and of the "Kingdom to come," we need to demonstrate how to learn, discuss and act on issues that have benefits for the community and "common good". Absorb this volume, but use it only as the beginning of a longer and essential journey.
Hypocrisy: Moral Fraud and other Vices

by James S. Spiegel
Reviewed by Jake Smith

While a review of the book Hypocrisy: Moral Fraud and Other Vices in this journal might appear out of place, the reader will quickly discover the usefulness of the information in this book. What follows is a short synopsis of each chapter.

Chapter one, titled "the mother of all vices," provides an informative historical background of the problem of hypocrisy. By looking at familiar examples from literature and scripture, the pervasiveness of hypocrisy is aptly illustrated. Later in the chapter, Spiegel presents a survey of philosophical and theological reflections, which communicate in much more technical terms the complexity of the issue. The chapter ends with an excellent overview of the previous discussion. The reader is left with the very questions Spiegel intends to wrestle with over the following chapters. How is hypocrisy precisely to be defined? Is there a single concept that will satisfactorily account for all its instances? Does hypocrisy always or ever involve self-deception?

In chapter two, titled "a lie told by outward deeds," the author offers his best attempt at a definition of hypocrisy. He begins by offering several examples of inconsistencies in human behavior. Most of us have either seen others behave in ways that match the examples, or have found ourselves behaving in ways that are inconsistent with our stated beliefs. From these examples three categories of inconsistency emerge: hypocrisy, moral weakness, and poor moral insight. An important distinction is drawn between the hypocrite and the ironical figure that intends to accomplish something morally and socially constructive through seemingly immoral behavior. For the student affairs professional, having a better understanding of what might be lying underneath the inconsistencies we see in the behavior of our students could prove to be exponentially helpful. Specifically in judicial matters, it could help steer us to more productive sanctioning.

A deconstruction of self-deception titled, "taking oneself in," can be found in chapter three. This chapter presents some of the toughest reading in the book. For those who enjoy philosophy, this is exciting material. For the rest, bear with it; it all pays off in the end. The primary question Spiegel addresses in this chapter is "how do people deceive themselves?" In other words, is it really possible to behave in ways that contradict stated beliefs or does a temporary lack of belief occur? These questions are as difficult to
answer, as they are interesting. Although the chapter does not leave the reader with a quick, pithy sort of response, the reader is left with a better understanding of what might be happening when a person behaves in ways that are inconsistent with stated beliefs. This chapter could prove to be particularly helpful in guiding an advisor as he or she confronts students in judicial matters.

Chapter four, titled “the spirit is willing,” provides an analysis of moral weakness. This chapter may prove to be one of the more helpful for student affairs professionals. We have all known students who make poor decision after decision and who don’t seem to be able to make better ones in their dating relationships, for example. These students know their behavior is risky, inappropriate or sinful, yet they consistently choose poorly. Such individuals, according to Spiegel, are morally weak.

Spiegel addresses the issues of sin, self-control and sanctification in chapter five, which is titled, “the now and the not yet.” Moral weakness is further discussed but in more explicitly religious or theological terms than in the previous chapter. A model for developing self-control is offered as well as a discussion of several different views of sanctification. The author does a good job of explaining the various positions with fairness. At no point in the book does Spiegel avoid expressing his own conclusions, but in this chapter he does so with great care to not misrepresent an opinion that he does not share. This chapter presents a sentiment that has been essentially missing from the book up to this point - hope. Without ignoring the efforts required of people and the “self” of self-control, Spiegel communicates hope for the morally weak.

“Cheating at the goodness stakes” is the title of chapter six, which contains a moral analysis of hypocrisy. Here Spiegel presents a surprising thought - the Bible states that hypocrisy is wrong, but does not say why. In an attempt to fill this void, a look at three broad schools of morality is undertaken. In his discussion of Utilitarian, Kantian and Aristotelian ethics, Spiegel is careful to not lose the reader with too many technical terms, yet he does not oversimplify these vast and complicated systems of thought. He concludes the chapter with a meaningful and pragmatic set of reasons for why hypocrisy is wrong.

Chapter seven, titled “at least I’m not a hypocrite: the apologetic problem of hypocrisy,” Spiegel describes the effect that hypocrisy has on the view non-Christians have toward Christianity and the ability of Christians to share their faith with the world at large. Here, an analysis of the philosophical arguments against Christianity via hypocrisy is given with ideas of how to address them in real dialogue with non-believers. For Christian colleges that do not require a faith confession for admission, this chapter could prove useful when talking with students who do not believe in Christ.

The conclusion of Hypocrisy: Moral Fraud and other Vices provides a succinct synopsis of Spiegel’s primary points and carries with it the author’s sentiment of hope that his work will help the reader live free of hypocrisy. Although Spiegel writes with the mind of a philosopher, he doesn’t distance himself intellectually from the common reader. His ability to meld the fields of philosophy, psychology and theology is helpful and encouraging in that he presents a well-informed template through which the problem of hypocrisy can be understood and addressed.

Many student development professionals have struggled to understand student behavior and reasoning. Hypocrisy may be just the text we need.
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