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Legal Issues

Facing Student Development Professionals at Private Institutions of Higher Education

by Paul Lowell Haines

The materials that follow were first presented by Paul Lowell Haines at the 1992 National Conference of the Association for Christians in Student Development held at Huntington College, Huntington, Indiana. Lowell, formerly Vice President for Student Development at Taylor University, is an attorney at law with Baker & Daniels in Indianapolis, Indiana. Lowell specializes in working with tax-exempt organizations, with a special emphasis on college and university law. The materials that follow are intended for information only and are not to be considered legal advice.

INTRODUCTION

Within the past 30 years, both public and private educational institutions have faced increasing liability arising from the regulation and discipline of students. While private institutions of higher learning traditionally have had much broader authority to regulate student behavior than have public institutions of higher learning, the differences have narrowed. Consequently, it is important that private institutions of higher learning recognize their increased liability risks and take preventive measures. This outline first discusses, in summary fashion, constitutional due process requirements imposed on private institutions as they regulate student life and behavior. It then focuses on the constitutional requirements and potential liability concerns relevant to private institutions when searching residence hall rooms, intercepting student mail, and sponsoring school activities. Finally, general tort liability is briefly addressed.

I. Student Due Process Rights at Private Institutions.

A. The Constitutional Prohibition.
The United States Constitution provides that "[n]o State shall . . . deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law . . ." U.S. Const. art. XIV, § 1.

B. Historical Background.
Historically, institutions of higher education had broad authority to regulate their students' lives under the common law doctrine of "in loco parentis," i.e., "in the place of a parent." One court stated that: College authorities stand in loco parentis concerning the physical and moral welfare and mental training of their pupils, and we are unable to see why . . . they may not make any rule or regulation for the government or betterment of their pupils that a parent could make for the same purpose. Gott v. Berea College, 156 Ky. 376, 161 S.W. 204 (Ky. 1913) (emphasis added).

This broad authority, especially in private institutions, was not deemed to be limited by the Fourteenth Amendment's due process clause. Because the Fourteenth Amendment only restricted actions taken by the "the State," private institutions had a free hand to shape student policies as they wished. One commentator stated "[t]hat a student's constitutional rights are any limitation on his private college has not been established by any modern holding." Note, Private Government on the Campus - Judicial Review of University Expulsion, 72 Yale L.J. 1362, 1372 (1963). However, in the landmark case of Dixon v. Alabama State Board of Education, 294 F.2d Continued on page 2
If your fall semester has been anything like mine, you welcomed the Christmas break with open arms. I don’t know if it was something in the air or what, but it has been a busy and somewhat frustrating semester. But God is faithful, and it is in times like this that we realize how important our relationship with Him really is. I am also thankful that I am connected to a community of colleagues and friends who are supportive and willing to pray with me and for me when I experience times like this.

The executive committee conducted its fall meeting in Buffalo, New York this fall. We also spent a day with the Houghton College planning committee on their campus. Those of you who have not visited the Houghton area are in for a real treat. The campus and surrounding environment is beautiful. I was also impressed with their conference planning. I think you will find this conference to be very challenging and spiritually renewing.

In other business, the executive committee has approved a new professionals retreat prior to the Houghton conference. The retreat is being planned by an executive committee subcommittee and is being chaired by Miriam Sailers at Messiah College. Dr. Russ Rogers will be the resource person in addition to several student development mentors who will work very closely with Russ. The retreat is designed for professionals who have been in the field for one to three years. I think this is an excellent opportunity for new professionals to learn more about their roles as student development educators and the kind of opportunities for renewal and professional development that exist within the ACSD structure.

The executive committee also decided not to proceed with the election proposal. As you may recall, we discussed the possibility of changing the term of the officers so that they would only serve for a three year term. It seems like this is a nice idea, but implementation could be more difficult than any realized benefits. We agreed to permit Fuller Seminar to teach a student development-related course in conjunction with the Houghton conference. Bethel College (St. Paul, MN) was selected as the 1996 conference site, and we also discussed a membership fee increase and are formulating a recommendation to be considered at the Houghton conference.

I have really enjoyed working with the executive committee and felt that our time together was very profitable. I hope that we have been effective in advancing the mission of ACSD, but more importantly, I hope that our work will bring glory to our Father and God.

I wish for you and your staffs a blessed and Christ-focused New Year!

Norris Friesen
President, ACSD

150 (5th Cir. 1961), cert. denied, 368 U.S. 930 (1961), the court found that a state college had violated the due process rights of six students by expelling them. The university failed to give the students notice of their violations or an opportunity for a hearing. In so finding, the Dixon court established that students must be accorded due process in university proceedings. While Dixon involved a state institution, litigants have relied on its holding attempting to extend due process rights to students at private institutions of higher education.

C. What Constitutes Due Process Generally.

In Dixon, the court found that due process requires: (1) notice; and (2) some opportunity for a hearing before a student is disciplined for misconduct. Dixon, 294 F.2d at 158. The court explained that notice should specify the grounds that, if shown, justify expelling the student. Id. In discussing the type of hearing required, the Dixon court distinguished between a charge of misconduct and one involving a failure to meet academic requirements. Id. When the issue is student misconduct, the court envisioned an adversarial proceeding in which the student has access to the testimony of witnesses against him and may present a defense to the charges. Id. at 159. It suggested that such a proceeding was not required when academic failure was at issue.

Although the two basic requirements, notice and the opportunity for a hearing, are generally recognized as satisfying due process in institutions of higher education, some courts have required significantly more protection.
For example, in *Esteban v. Central Missouri State College*, the court held that procedural due process required the following:

1. A written statement of charges, for each student, made available at least ten days before the hearing;
2. A hearing before the person(s) having the power to suspend or expel;
3. The opportunity for advance inspection of any affidavits or exhibits that the institutions intended to produce at the hearing;
4. The right to have counsel present at the hearing to advise them;
5. The opportunity to present their own version of the facts, including affidavits, exhibits, and witnesses;
6. The right to hear the evidence against them and personally question adverse witnesses;
7. A determination of the facts of each case based solely on the evidence presented at the hearing;
8. A written statement of the hearing officer's findings of fact; and
9. The right to make a record of the hearing at their own expense.

*Esteban v. Central Missouri State College*, 277 F. Supp. 649 (W.D. Mo. 1967). Most courts, however, avoid the detail required by the *Esteban* court and, instead, focus on the more flexible notice and hearing concepts of *Dixon*.

These due process requirements also apply to academic misconduct such as cheating and plagiarism. Richmond, *Students' Right to Counsel in University Disciplinary Proceedings*, 15 J. College & Univ. L. 289, 305 (1989). Where students fail to meet academic requirements, courts have given great discretion to university decisions regarding appropriate sanctions. *Id.* at 304. In such situations, the due process rights of students are satisfied so long as administrators exercise professional judgment. *Id.* at 305. For example, in *University of Michigan v. Ewing*, 474 U.S. 214, 106 S. Ct. 507 (1985), the Supreme Court upheld the university's decision to dismiss a student with a poor academic history. The Court noted the appropriateness of granting deference to university decisions concerning strictly academic matters. The Court stated that such a decision must stand unless “it is such a substantial departure from accepted academic norms as to demonstrate that the person or committee responsible did not actually exercise professional judgment.” *Id.* (citations omitted). Thus, the distinction between student misconduct and failure to meet academic standards remains important in determining due process requirements.

D. General Application of Due Process Requirements to the Private College and University.

As previously noted, the Fourteenth Amendment due process requirements only restrict actions taken by the State. Therefore, it generally is not applicable to private institutions in their dealings with students. See *Covenay v. President & Trustees of College of Holy Cross*, 445 N.E.2d 136, 140 (Mass. 1983) (“It is clear that because the college is a private institution, Covenay had no constitutional right to a hearing”); see also *Galiani v. Hofstra University*, 499 N.Y.S.2d 182 (1986) (finding that student accorded every right he was entitled to in context of disciplinary proceeding instituted by private university).

However, “[a] private university, college, or school may not arbitrarily or capriciously dismiss a student.” *Covenay*, 445 N.E.2d at 138 (citing numerous cases). School officials must act in “good faith and on reasonable grounds” if their decisions are to be upheld by the courts. *Id.*

It is suggested, therefore, that private institutions consider taking the following actions with respect to their disciplinary procedures:

1. Review disciplinary procedures to ensure they are fair and reasonable. Although not required, providing a student with notice, an opportunity for a hearing, and some right to appeal should more than satisfy the fair and reasonable requirement.

   a. Procedures should not be too restrictive (provide “wiggle room” for the institution).
   b. Procedures should not be too detailed (detailed procedures are often difficult to implement).

2. Take actions to inform students of such policies and procedures.

3. Implement disciplinary policies in good faith, balancing the best interests of the student and the institution.

4. Impose penalties that are not disproportionate to the offense (private institutions are given broad discretion here).

5. Follow published disciplinary procedures and requirements closely.

E. Violation of the Due Process Right by Private Institutions.

Under certain circumstances, students may bring actions against private institutions for violation of the Fourteenth Amendment’s due process requirement. Such actions may be brought when “state action” is involved in the disciplinary process or when the “contract” between the student and the institution has been breached by the institution.

1. The State Action Concern.

The requirement of state action remains the major hurdle to students in bringing suit against private institutions. In 1982, the Supreme Court attempted to clarify the state action doctrine in *Lugar v. Edmonson Oil Co.*, 457 U.S. 922, 102 S. Ct. 2744 (1982). The Court recognized that the Fourteenth Amendment does not address private conduct, regardless of its wrongful or discriminatory nature. *Id.* at 937. However, the Court established a two-part test to determine when a private entity’s actions qualified as state action. The Court specified that:

First, the deprivation must be caused by the exercise of some...
right or privilege created by the State or by a rule of conduct imposed by the State or by a person for whom the State is responsible. Second, the party charged with the deprivation must be a person who may fairly be said to be a state actor. This may be because he is a state official, because he has acted together with or has obtained significant aid from state officials, or because his conduct is otherwise chargeable to the State. 

In Albert v. Carovano, 824 F.2d 1333 (2d Cir. 1987), modified 839 F.2d 871 (2d Cir. 1987), the court found state action in an action taken by Hamilton College. Hamilton, a private university, suspended two students for violating campus public order regulations. Applying the two-part Lugar test, the court found the first prong of the test satisfied when Hamilton adopted public order rules and regulations because they were required under the New York Education Laws. Id. at 1336-37. Hamilton’s actions satisfied the second prong of the test because Hamilton enforced the regulations under encouragement from the state. Id. at 1341. Thus, the court found a significant nexus between the adoption and enforcement of the regulations and state involvement.

State action remains a significant hurdle to students who seek to invoke due process rights at private institutions. However, based on Lugar and Carovano, courts will find state action where private institutions have adopted regulations required by state law and have enforced those regulations against students with some state encouragement or involvement. Under those conditions, private institutions must accord due process rights to its students.

2. The Contract Concern.

Private institutions may be held liable to students under general contract law for explicit or implicit representations they make to students. As one court noted, “[t]he basic legal relationship between a student and a private university or college is contractual.” Zumbrun v. University of Southern Cal., 25 Cal. App. 3d 1, 101 Cal. Rptr. 499, 504 (1972). Where private institutions violate their own policies and procedures, courts have determined that student rights are violated. See Ryan v. Hofstra University, 324 N.Y.S.2d 964 (N.Y. Sup. Ct. 1971).

Given the difficulty of showing state action to invoke due process rights against private institutions and the relative success of recent student contract claims against private institutions, private institutions should take precautions against potential liability under the contract theory. Such precautions should include closely adhering to rules and procedures, established by the institution, that provide students with due process in disciplinary situations. Any failure to follow established policies and procedures can be viewed as a violation of the students’ due process rights under the contract theory.

II. RESIDENCE HALL ROOM SEARCHES.

A. The United States Constitution.

The Fourth Amendment was designed to provide protection to individuals from government action in criminal investigations and proceedings. The Amendment declares the following:

“The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no Warrants shall is-

B. General Application.

As a general rule, a student in a residence hall room has a reasonable expectation of privacy and is protected by the Fourth Amendment. Fox v. Board of Trustees of State University of New York, 841 F.2d 1207, 1211 (2d Cir., 1988); Commonwealth v. McCloskey, 272 A.2d 271, 273 (Pa. Super. Ct. 1970). However, the Fourth Amendment generally applies only to public, not private institutions. At public colleges and universities, searches, the results of which are used in criminal proceedings, can be conducted only by officials with search warrants. Searches at public institutions also can be made in situations involving emergencies, health and safety inspections, and (in limited cases) student security and discipline. In addition, where a student knowingly consents to a search, such a search can be conducted, as long as the search is limited to the area under the student’s control.

The remedy for violation of the Fourth Amendment is exclusion at trial of any evidence obtained in the illegal search.

C. Application to the Private College and University.

1. Generally.

Private colleges generally are not considered to be state actors and are therefore not required to adhere to Fourth Amendment restrictions. Russel v. Salve Regina College, 649 F. Supp. 391 (D. R.I. 1986). Therefore, officials of a private college or university may gain entrance into a student’s residence hall room without implicating the Fourth Amendment’s prohibition against illegal searches and seizures. Rea-
sonable searches may be conducted for disciplinary reasons, maintenance of an "educational atmosphere," or health and safety purposes. Morale v. Grigel, 422 F. Supp. 988, 998 (D. N. H. 1976); Moore v. Student Affairs Committee of Troy State University, 284 F. Supp. 725 (M. D. Al. 1968). As a general rule, searches involving illegal or disciplinary conduct should be based on a reasonable belief (less than probable cause) on the part of college authorities that a student is using a residence hall room for a purpose which is illegal or which would otherwise seriously interfere with campus discipline. Moore, 284 F. Supp. at 730. Any evidence obtained in a search conducted for such purposes may be used against a student in an internal disciplinary hearing.

2. Searches Conducted by Private Institutions in Conjunction With Police or Upon Direction of the State.

A different rule exists where officials of private institutions assist police in obtaining entrance to a student's residence hall room. Police involvement in searches constitutes "state action" that implicates the right of privacy guaranteed by the Fourth Amendment of the Constitution. Therefore, Fourth Amendment violations may occur when college officials help the police gain entrance to or conduct a search of a residence hall room.

It should also be noted that college officials cannot consent to a search by police on behalf of a student. McCloskey, 272 A. 2d at 273. Furthermore, a student does not waive his or her right to be free from illegal searches and seizures by granting college officials permission to enter a residence hall room for legitimate university purposes. Piazzola v. Watkins, 442 F. 2d 284, 289 (5th Cir. 1971).

3. The Tort Concern.

Even though the Constitution does not prohibit a private institution's search of a student's residence hall room, the student may have a private tort action against the institution or its officials if such a search constitutes an invasion of privacy under state law. College officials should look to local counsel to determine if the institution could become liable in tort for certain searches.

D. The Residence Hall Contract.

The existence of a residence hall contract, signed by the student, that provides college or university officials with the right to enter a student's room under certain defined circumstances provides additional protection against possible student claims of constitutional or tort violations. Courts have been more willing to uphold searches of a student's residence hall room where a residence hall contract, executed by the student, grants university officials permission to enter the student's room. See Morale, 422 F. Supp. at 999; see also Moore, 284 F. Supp. at 728, 730 (court found reasonable a regulation which provided that the college "reserves the right to enter rooms for inspection purposes,") and student's rights must yield to the extent that they interfere with the institution's "fundamental duty to operate the school as an educational institution") (italics in original). It is advisable, therefore, that private institutions implement the use of such contracts. However, the fact that such a contract exists and has been signed by the student does not totally insulate the college or university from liability if the institution exercises its right under the contract in an unconstitutional manner. Morale, 422 F. Supp. at 999.

III. INTERCEPTING STUDENT MAIL.

A. The Statute.

"Whoever takes any letter, postal card, or package out of any post office or any authorized depository for mail matter, or from any letter or mail carrier, or which has been in any post office or authorized depository, or in the custody of any letter or mail carrier, before it has been delivered to the person to whom it was directed, with design to obstruct the correspondence, or to pry into the business or secrets of another, or opens, secrets, embezzles, or destroys the same, shall be fined not more than $2,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both. 18 U. S. C. A. § 1702."

B. The Case Law.

Several federal statutes have been passed "to protect the mails and correspondence moving therein from theft, embezzlement, obstruction, and meddlesome prying." United States v. Ashford, 530 F. 2d 792, 795 (8th Cir. 1976). Although there is some authority that extends this protection only to the point where a piece of mail matter legitimately passes out of the control and beyond the responsibility of the United States Postal Service, more recent authority extends the protection "until the mail material is physically delivered to the person to whom it is directed or to his authorized agent." Id.; see also United States v. Gaber, 745 F. 2d 952, 954 (5th Cir. 1984).

Furthermore, several courts hold that students living in college-owned residence halls do not appoint the college or its officials their agent for purposes of receiving mail. United States v. Brusseau, 569 F. 2d 208 (4th Cir. 1977); accord United States v. Cochran, 646 F. Supp. 7, 12 (D. Me. 1985). This is true even where the mail is first delivered to the college and distributed by the college employees to the student residence halls and student mailboxes. The Postal Service has "a continued . . . interest

Continued on page 6
in such mail even after it has been delivered to the school . . . ” 
*Cochran,* 646 F. Supp. at 12.

C. Application to the Private College and University.
Private colleges and universities should approach concerns involving the receipt and mailing of student mail cautiously. Student mail should never be opened and should be delivered once placed in an authorized mail depository. However, students can be addressed regarding the mail they send or receive if concerns are raised from information visible on the outside of the mail envelope. Even in such situations, the mail should be first delivered to the student.

IV. STUDENT ACTIVITY LIABILITY ISSUES

A. Institutional Liability During Supervised Student Activities.
Ordinarily, a student is considered an invitee of a college or university to whom the institution owes the duty of exercising ordinary care. *Stamberger v. Mathaidess,* 37 Wis. 2d 186, 155 N.W. 2d 88 (1967). Courts generally have held institutions or their agents liable for injuries that occur to students during the course of regular institutional events that result from:

1. failure to provide a reasonably safe environment;
2. failure to warn participants of known hazards or to remedy known dangers where possible;
3. failure to properly instruct participants in the activity; and
4. failure to provide supervision adequate for the type of activity sponsored.

The institution’s duty to provide supervision varies with the circumstances. Generally, no supervision is required where the institution has no reason to think any is required. *Baum v. Reed College Student Body, Inc.,* 240 Or. 338, 401 P.2d 294 (1965). Correspondingly, an institution generally has a duty to provide supervision if the institution’s officials could reasonably anticipate that supervision is required because of the nature of the activity. *Stockwell v. Board of Trustees,* 64 Cal. App. 2d 197, 148 P.2d 405 (1944).

B. Institutional Liability During Unsupervised Student Activities Off-Campus.
It is generally recognized that institutions of higher education have no duty to control the conduct of students engaged in off-campus activities not sponsored by the institution. Therefore, institutions generally are not liable for injuries that occur while a student is engaged in such activities. *Swanson v. Wabash College,* 504 N.E.2d 327 (Ind. App. 1987).

For an institution to be liable for injuries that occur in such activities there must be some evidence of a “special relationship” between the institution and the student whereby the institution could exercise some level of control or consent over the activity. *Id.*

C. Institutional Liability During Unsupervised Student Activities On-Campus.
Generally, an institution may be liable if a student is injured while using university facilities that have been negligently maintained or where the institution failed to operate its facilities with reasonable care. *Brown v. Florida State Board of Regents,* 513 So. 2d 184 (Fla. App. 1987) (cause of action for wrongful death exists where student drowned while attending a picnic at a lake maintained and controlled by the university).

D. Releases and Waivers.
The use of releases and waivers may help prevent private institutions from incurring liability for student injuries occurring during sponsored activities. The release forms and the disclaimer language used should be as clear and specific as possible so that the intent of the disclaimer is beyond dispute. In addition, release forms should advise participants of as many risks associated with the activity as possible. Forms should be tailored to each event and the use of standard forms is discouraged. Institutions should consult local counsel regarding local restrictions on such releases and waivers.

It is important to note that some courts hold that a form release cannot release a college from liability for its own negligence.

V. POTENTIAL TORT LIABILITY OF PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION.
Private institutions may be liable in tort for certain injuries to students. Broadly speaking, a tort is a civil wrong, other than a breach of contract, for which the court will provide a remedy in the form of an action for damages, injunction, or restitution. Note that in tort there is no state action requirement; thus, private institutions are subject to liability to the same extent as public institutions.

Private institutions may be held liable for a variety of torts. Of those, the ones that may be of most concern, and the required elements of each, are as follows:

A. Negligence.
1. Duty — Did the institution owe its students a duty?
2. Breach — Did the institution fail to meet its duty?
3. Proximate Cause — Did the institution’s failure in meeting its obligation proximately cause injury to its student(s)?
4. Injury (or Damages) — Did the student(s) suffer injury that resulted in incurred costs?

B. Invasion of Privacy.
1. Intrusion upon Seclusion.
   a. Did the institution invade the student’s right to physical and mental solitude?
   b. Was the invasion offensive or objectionable to a reasonable person?
   c. Was the thing into which there was an intrusion entitled to be private?
VI. CONCLUSION

D. Other Relevant Torts.

C. Libel and Slander.

1. Did the institution say something about the student that was defamatory (tested by the reaction of an average person to the information)?
2. Was the defamatory information “published” (communicated to a third person)?
3. Was the defamatory information spoken (slander) or written (libel) about the student?
4. Was the institution highly offensive and objectionable to a reasonable person of ordinary sensibilities?
5. Does the public have a legitimate interest in having the information made available to it?

VI. CONCLUSION

It should be apparent from this outline that private institutions of higher learning may incur liability for a wide variety of activities related to regulating and disciplining students. In the past 30 years, courts have gradually encroached on the traditional distinction between the authority given private institutions in this regard and that given public institutions. Despite this trend, differences remain and a proper understanding and appreciation of a private institution’s ability to regulate and discipline its students is required. Indeed, by exercising ordinary care in the regulation and discipline of students, private institutions of higher learning can greatly reduce any potential liability risks.

New Professionals Retreat

by Miriam Sailer

If you are new to the field of Student Development, do you sometimes struggle to understand what “the big picture” is—what are we hoping to do and why? Do you wish that you could sit down and have a good conversation, asking questions and sharing ideas, with someone who is experienced? Or, if you have been in Student Development for several years, are you working with new professionals you are asking the above questions?

The first ACSD New Professionals’ Retreat is being planned to provide an opportunity to explore these issues. It will be held prior to the ACSD National Conference, June 4-6, 1993, on the Houghton College campus. This will enable participants to attend the national conference with starts on June 7.

The retreat is designed to enable new professionals to the field of Student Development to explore three main areas: task effectiveness, interpersonal effectiveness, and personal effectiveness. The retreat will utilize a variety of educational methods—short presentations, large group interaction, small group discussions, personal reflections, and mentoring relationships with experienced professionals.

Topic areas will include: History and Purpose of Student Development, College Students of the 90s, Christianity and Student Development, Conflict Management/Agreement Formation, Power and Influence, Supervisory Relationships, Balance Amidst Pressing Priorities, Managing Expectations, etc. Experienced professionals who will lead the retreat are: Janet Bates, Trinity Western University; Jerry Davis, Huntington College; Debra Lacey, George Fox College; Barry Loy, Gordon College; Russell Rogers, InterAct Associates, Inc., and Miriam Sailer, Messiah College.

Twenty-five participants will be chosen from application received before March 15, 1993. Although first priority will be given to new professionals (1-4 years in the field), both new and experienced professionals may apply. The cost, which is being underwritten by a grant from ACSD, will be $125 per person. Complete information and applications will be mailed to each ACSD member in January.

ACSD New Professionals’ Retreat

Flying Together—Flying Further

An opportunity to network with similar colleagues in order to interact and explore together issues pertinent to new professionals.

DATE: June 4-6, 1993 • Place: Houghton College, Houghton, NY • PARTICIPANTS: First Priority will be given to individuals with 1-4 years experience, who are currently employed in a Student Development position. Limited to 25 participants. • COST: $125 for ACSD members, $145 for non-members • FURTHER INFORMATION: Will be mailed to you in January or contact Dr. Miriam Sailer, Messiah College, Grantham, PA 17027-8000, 717/691-6041.
It has been said that too many cooks spoil the soup. While this may be true in the kitchen, it does not appear to apply to student activities. Traditionally, much of the responsibility for providing activities on campus has fallen on one primary group such as a Student Activities Council or Board. However, with the increasing need for diversity in programming, as well as quantity of programs, that responsibility can be overwhelming. It seems beneficial to have other "cooks", groups or areas, in addition to the primary programming board, present activities.

Indiana Wesleyan University has attempted to build this concept into our activities programming. The Student Activities Council (SAC) provides the most extensive and varied activities on campus. However, these activities are supplemented by events sponsored by The Student Center Activities Board (SCAB), Residence Life and other student organizations. The Student Center Activities Board programs different types of activities than SAC does. They sponsor coffeehouses and Student Center Nights (i.e. Family Feud Contest, Christmas Stocking party, Game Board Tournament, etc), as well as supplementing the movie program by showing movies in an informal setting in the Student Center.

The Residence Life program also provides a substantial amount of activities beyond the traditional programming of Resident Assistants. Each Residence Hall Council programs for their respective halls. However, the Hall Councils also program campus-wide events. For example, the Hall Councils coordinate the annual Valentine’s Banquet. SAC will have a representative on that committee and will provide monetary support, but the major programming responsibility lies with the Hall Councils.

The Residence Life staff is responsible for the Residence Life Weekend in September. This weekend is full of activities designed to communicate the Residence Life theme for the year. Each staff is also responsible for a month of Probe Seminar, which are educational programs based on the wellness components.

The benefits of decentralizing the responsibility for campus activities are numerous. To begin, it helps to keep one area/group of people from becoming overburdened or "burned out" from trying to meet the needs of the campus. Additionally, activities provided by various groups provides different perspectives which can produce more creative and varied programming. The different types of activities may also reach different students; for example, a student who would not choose to attend a Performing Arts event sponsored by SAC might attend a coffeehouse sponsored by SCAB in the Wildcat Express.

There are other important, though less tangible, benefits of having different groups on campus provide activities. It can serve to reinforce community values when students hear and experience a consistent message or value communicated from various parts of campus. Of significance also is the fact that additional opportunities for student leadership and involvement are created. For example, the students who serve on SCAB have an opportunity for involvement which does not require a significant amount of time as does the position of a SAC coordinator. Schuh, in Involving Colleges, discusses how Iowa State, in its efforts to make a large university feel small, emphasizes involvement almost "from the moment students set foot on the campus." They have developed approximately 5,000 leadership positions for students, so that potentially one out of every four or five students can hold a leadership position at any one time (Schuh, p.35-36). While the provision of activities for students to be involved with is important, the impact for students who gain leadership experience from providing the activities is even greater. Thus, it is to our benefit to provide as many opportunities for this involvement as possible.

Finally, it is strategic to involve other areas of campus in planning activities. Although SAC sponsors the Performing Arts Series, the Cultural Life Sub-committee (which consists of faculty members, students and Student Development staff members) assists in the planning of the Performing Arts Series schedule. This provides an opportunity to involve different people in a rapidly building program.

While the benefits of having various groups plan activities are numerous, it does require more cooperation and coordination. Indiana Wesleyan achieves this in part through the use of a campus day planner which includes all activities occurring on campus (athletic events, SAC events, SCAB activities, organizational meetings, chapels, Residence Hall programming).
The coordinator of the day planner sends out a request for all schedules. Cooperation is evident as SCAB then uses SAC's schedule to plan their events on open dates. Once the day planner is printed and distributed, the other organizations use it throughout the semester to plan their activities around what is already scheduled.

Early scheduling and increased communication is required as more groups on campus provide campus activities. While it will take additional energy for coordination and communication, the benefits, as we have experienced, are well worth that effort.


---

**HOT Promotional Tip**

**PIZZA PARTY for Residence Units**

For a recent concert, we ran a contest for every residence unit on campus (a total of 43). The prize was $20.00 towards a pizza party for the unit who bought the most pre-concert tickets. A football field was drawn on a large piece of poster paper & placed in a central location. Small cars with the name of each unit (Carmin Hall, 1st North) were created. Then as ticket sales came in, the different cars were placed on the football field in the correct order. This created a lot of attention to the concert and gave our ticket sellers a good excuse to encourage students to buy their ticket in advance. The Resident Assistants were communicated to by their immediate supervisors about this contest. Working together with the residence life staff also made this promotional technique very effective.

The Resident Assistants were good at advertising and encouraging their residents to buy tickets. It was an easy way for them to have a free unit activity. All the posters included information about the contest. The weekly campus newsletter contained the up-to-date results of who was winning. Our contest ended in a tie until a Resident Assistant bought a ticket (that broke the tie) for someone else on his floor to go to the concert.
Mandatory Community Service:
An Oxymoron That Needs Attention

by Cecilia Delve Scheuermann

Oxymoron: a rhetorical figure in which an epigrammatic effect is created by the conjunction of incongruous or contradictory terms...a clever remark, more pointedly witty for seeming absurd or foolish. (The American Heritage Dictionary, 1981)

This, the year of 1989, may be remembered as the year helping others was in fashion. In recent months the topic of national service has become a “hot” issue. Senators Nunn, Mikulski, Kennedy and Pell all have introduced or are planning to introduce new legislation concerning national service. President Bush based a good portion of his campaign on encouraging America to become a “kinder, gentler nation.”

In fact, in his budget proposal, Bush asked for $100 million over the next four years to fund the White House Office on National Service and his Youth Engaged in Service to America project. Even Ted Koppel got into the act by devoting an entire episode of his television show, “Nightline,” to the topic. Read the Washington Post, U.S. News and World Report or the Chronicle of Higher Education, and you will soon see that helping students regain a perceived lost sense of idealism, as well as an understanding of what citizenship means, is an issue whose time has come again.

Along with all the proposals and pontificating are the whispered rumors that the ulterior motive of introducing this idea is to make service mandatory. Even at Georgetown, whether based in fact or fiction, the idea of mandatory service is debated, written about and discussed with such fervor that one suspects the University president had just decreed it so. The truth of the matter is, mandatory service has never been seriously discussed as a possibility among faculty or administration. Regardless of whether or not one ever expects service to really become mandatory, raising it as an issue can be an important process in stirring people to action.

The last thing the community wants or needs is a student coerced by the oxymoron of mandatory community service.
Mandatory volunteering is an oxymoron. While I believe being engaged in the lives of others outside the Healy gates can be one of life’s most profound and exciting adventures, forcing those who have no desire to help others can have dire consequences on those who are to be served. Far from being of useful service, students who resent being made to care for others will, more often than not, make that point clear to the receivers of the service. It is unfair for the community to be subjected to anybody who has no desire to be there.

On the other hand, if it can be agreed that being an educated citizen carries with it responsibilities beyond paying off loans and finding a job, if it implies that one should look out for those less fortunate, if it means one should think less of themself and more of others, then we at Georgetown must do all we can to encourage community service and make it an ethic that cannot be ignored during students’ four-year tenure. At a university that holds true to the Jesuit ideals of service, the case becomes even more compelling.

The critical question then becomes: How can this service ethic be developed without mandating it? In many ways, Georgetown is already performing admirably in this area. From the Community Action Coalition to Best Buddies, to the Sursum Corda Adult Literacy Program and the Center for Minority Student Affairs’ Amateur Scientists Program, students are involved in meaningful ways in the lives of others.

More can be done. Public service can become as important a component in a professors’ tenure process as research and publishing. Professors can recognize the value of putting theory into practice by offering extra credit or innovative assignments to students to move them beyond campus confines. Students can request that classes have an experiential component to them. Professors can offer and students can request (except in the School of Foreign Service) the Fourth Credit Option for Community Service. In other words, while students are doing an excellent job recruiting other students, to serve in the community, professors can do their part, as some have, by providing ways in and out of the classroom for students and themselves to make a difference in the community at large.

Helping others is not a lofty calling. It holds little self glorification. Photographers and reporters are rarely around. In fact, serving others is often difficult, time consuming and requires a commitment that goes beyond the next fad. The community needs people with an attitude of compassion and a desire to serve. The last thing the community wants or needs is a student coerced by the oxymoron of mandatory community service.

---

Males’ Attributions and Expectancies About Potential Mates As a Function Of Sex Roles PART I
by Heather M. Helms-Erikson

Introduction

During the past several decades, there have been significant changes in marital patterns and family structure in the United States. Both divorce and remarriage have become more common in American culture. In addition, dual-earner couples are emerging as the norm, rather than the exception, in marital relationships. Currently, in just over 56% of all two-parent families both the husband and wife are employed (U.S. Bureau of Census [USBC], 1990). A particularly significant change of the past decade has been a trend of postponing marriage for those never married. While most young Americans both expect and continue to marry, they are doing so at a somewhat later time in their lives than did those cohorts immediately preceding them (Marini, 1987; Schoen, Urton, Woodrow, & Baj, 1985; Vanden Heuvel, 1988).

Along with the changes in the structure of marriage, there have also been shifts in attitudes and beliefs concerning family roles. In recent years there has been a notable movement toward the adoption of egalitarian sex-role attitudes and expectations (Thornton, 1989). According to Spence and Helmreich (1978), “the political, economic and social changes over the past decades have led to a blurring of the formerly sharp division between the roles of women and men” (p.10). Several studies, conducted with college student samples over several decades, have confirmed that the marriage-role expectations and aspirations for this population became increasingly egalitarian in the 1960s and 1970s and began to level off in the mid 1980s (Hoyt & Hudson, 1981; O’Neal Weeks & Botkin, 1987; O’Neal Weeks & Gage, 1984; Regan & Roland, 1982). Furthermore, in an examination of a broad range of national data sets, Thornton (1989) found marked increases in egalitarian attitudes in regard to sex roles and marriage in the 1960s, 1970s and early 1980s. While the trend towards Continued on page 12
egalitarianism appeared to level off in the mid 1980s, the data in Thornton’s (1989) study illustrate that between 1950 and 1985 a weakening in previously held societal norms concerning family life occurred. Although norms regarding family roles and life have not disappeared, people appear to be adopting attitudes which permit alternative behaviors. More specifically, the normative imperative to marry, to be sexually inactive outside of marriage, to remain married, and to preserve a rigid division of roles and labor between men and women appears to be relaxing (Thornton, 1989).

**Statement of the Problem**

It seems implicit that such changes in and the “relaxing” of these particular norms would affect the nature of relationships today. Some possible ways couple relationships may be affected are in mate selection, role behavior within and outside the home, and sources of dissatisfaction and conflict within couple relationships. While all of these areas merit attention, the focus of this article and the study conducted is on mate selection.

Over 90 percent of the population today take part in the quest for a mate (USBC, 1990). In our society the concepts of “falling in love” and finding “Mr. and Ms. Right” have all been used to explain the phenomenon called mate selection. Unfortunately, these ideas really explain very little or nothing about the nature of the process of relationship development. The way men and women relate and “find” each other has been a mystery and a puzzlement down through the ages. Several thousand years ago King Solomon, known for his wisdom, said, “Three things are too wonderful for me; four I do not understand: the way of an eagle in the sky, the way of a serpent on a rock, the way of a ship on the high seas, and the way of a man with a maiden” (Proverbs 30:18,19). The reality of the intense meaning this process has for so many has spurred social scientists over the past several decades to begin searching for concrete answers. Unfortunately, the literature is virtually devoid of information on how the societal and attitudinal changes of the past several decades may affect mate selection decision making and behavior. Furthermore, published research involving Christian college samples appears to be non-existent in this area.

While very little research exists on the relationship between sex-role attitudes and orientation with mate selection, there is a vast body of research addressing behaviors related to sex-role orientation in marital relationships which may be applicable to mate selection. There is little doubt that there have been substantial behavioral changes, particularly for women, in the extrafamilial realm. For instance, the number of women in the labor force and the number of female college graduates has nearly doubled in the last twenty years (USBC, 1990). Hence, it appears that fewer women are adhering to traditional role definitions. Behavioral changes have occurred in the lives of men as well. Research from the 1970s indicates that men at that time were becoming more involved in domestic work. However, that involvement appeared to be limited to the realm of “fun” activities such as child care (Meissner, Humphreys, Meisi & Scheu, 1975). More recent literature suggests that men in dual-earner relationships, specifically those men with higher education and young children, are increasing their participation in both housework and childcare (Leslie & Anderson, 1988; Pleck, 1985; Ross, Mirowsky & Huber, 1983; Yogev & Brett, 1985). Despite these findings, empirical studies suggest that women continue to be responsible for the bulk of housework, and to a lesser degree child care, even when employed (Blau & Ferber, 1986; Coverman & Sheley, 1986; Kalleberg & Rosenfeld, 1990; Roos, 1985; Spitze, 1988).

The findings cited above indicate that there seems to be a divergence between attitudes towards what family roles should be and actual roles played by men and women within the family.

**Sex Roles**

..there seems to be a divergence between attitudes towards what family roles should be and actual roles played by men and women within the family.
seem logical to ask how, if at all, the recent shifts in structural marital patterns and attitudes might affect marital choice behavior and the mate selection process of young adults in the 1990s.

This issue of choosing a marital partner is of particular interest to those who work with college students because, developmentally, traditional college-aged students are in the process of exploring and establishing permanent commitments apart from their families of origin. It is not surprising that college students in contemporary American society may encounter a considerable amount of confusion as they form and develop their romantic relationships. Partners are faced with balancing their beliefs in and assumptions related to contemporary egalitarian ideals with traditional behavioral expectations within the family. This confusion may be even more pronounced for the Christian college student whose religious heritage subtly (and sometimes not so subtly) dictates traditional family roles.

**Mate Selection Overview**

Much of the early empirical research on mate selection has dealt with the proposed role of personal characteristics in the overall process of relationship development (Leslie, 1982). A wide variety of individual traits such as physical characteristics (e.g. age, height, weight, eye-color, attractiveness), demographic traits (e.g. age, education, ethnic background, religion), attitudes, and personality characteristics have been studied extensively.

**Preference Studies**

In the study of individual characteristics and mate selection, one area of focus has been determining what qualities individuals desire in a spouse. Most of what we know about character preferences has been determined by means of lists generated by researchers on which respondents rank order their preferences. Hoyt and Hudson (1981) produced such a list replicating the work of earlier researchers and comparing their findings with those of the previous studies in order to identify any shifts in rankings of personal characteristics desired in a spouse among college students from 1939 to 1977.

In Hoyt and Hudson's (1981) study, students were asked to assign a weight of "zero" to characteristics irrelevant in mate selection, a "one" to those desirable but not important, a "two" to those traits important but not indispensable, and a "three" to characteristics which they believed were indispensable. The investigators then ranked the traits on the basis of mean values computed from the numerical weights and presented their results in the form of rank scores. Eighteen characteristics were considered; thus rankings ranged from one to eighteen with one being the highest rank. Results reveal that "dependable character" and "emotional stability" have been rated as highly desirable (being ranked either first, second or third on an 18 item scale) since 1939. "Mutual attraction," "sociability," and "education-intelligence" have become increasingly important over time for both men and women. "Chastity" showed the greatest decline in importance among the characteristics for both males and females, declining from tenth place in 1939 to seventeenth in 1977. Finally, while the males' rating of "good cook-housekeeper" declined in importance significantly (5 ranks) over the years, the importance of "good looks" increased at the same rate. The latter finding, males' high ranking of the importance of physical appearance, has been replicated in several other studies as well (Buss, 1989; Reis, Nezleck & Wheeler, 1980; Udry & Eckland, 1984).

In studies utilizing college student samples, results have suggested that college women are attracted to men who favor careers for women and sharing household chores (Holahan, 1984; Martin & Martin, 1984). Also, women, more often than men, appear to prefer mates who exhibit good earning potential and who are college educated (Buss, 1985; Hoyt & Hudson, 1981).

**Matching**

In addition to studies of spousal preference, a major theme running through much of the past research is that partners appear to "match" on a wide variety of variables (Casi & Herbener, 1990; Mehrabian, 1989). In a review of the literature, Buss (1985) pointed out several characteristics that appear to be highly assortative (highly similar) for most couples: age, education, race, religion and ethnic background showing the strongest correlations; followed by attitudes and opinions; intellectual ability; socioeconomic class; physical characteristics such as height, weight and eye color; and personality variables. Other studies of assortative matching support these findings indicating a strong tendency towards homogamous marriages on various indi-

*Continued on page 14*
exception of sex roles. This is particularly true with respect to religion (Glenn, 1982, 1984), ethnicity and race (Labov & Jacobs, 1986; Schoen & Wooldredge, 1989), education (Schoen & Wooldredge, 1989) and native language (Stevens & Schoen, 1988).

In several studies addressing sex role as a predictor of attraction, researchers have found that women, regardless of their sex role, tend to prefer androgynous men who are emotionally expressive and sensitive as well as forceful and assertive (Deutsch & Gilbert, 1976; Komarovsky, 1976; Orlofsky, 1982). The results for males are not quite as clear. In one study in which college students were asked to describe their ideal other-sex person using the items on the Bem Sex-Role Inventory (BSRI) (Bem, 1974), Deutsch & Gilbert (1976) found that males preferred a slightly feminine woman. Another study examining the “liking” of others as a function of the sex role of observer and observed revealed that androgynous males were more favorable towards androgynous male protocols than towards sex-typed males but did not show the expected preference for androgynous female protocols (Orlofsky, 1982; Pursell & Banikotes, 1978). Finally, in two studies using college student samples Orlofsky (1982) found divergent results for males. In the first study, a prediction that androgynous males would prefer similarly androgynous women was not supported. Instead, the androgynous males were evenly divided in their preference for feminine-typed and androgynous ideal female partners. Additionally, regardless of the sex-role orientation of the respondent, only 32% of the males preferred androgynous partners. The majority of male respondents (59%) preferred feminine-typed female partners. In contrast, in his second study Orlofsky (1982) found that for males sex-role egalitarianism was associated with androgynous or near androgynous ideal partners whereas sex-role traditionalism was associated with sex-typed choices.

As is illustrated here, research addressing the role of sex roles in attraction is quite mixed and sometimes contradictory for male samples, while results for females are more clear. Female observers, varying in sex-role type, appear to prefer androgynous males, while the results for male observers vary from study to study.

Hence, it can be concluded that individuals tend to select others for marriage who are similar to themselves on numerous individual traits, with the exception of sex roles. The most consistent findings in support of this idea of assortative mating are for demographic characteristics (e.g., age, race, religion and ethnicity) and attitudes. Where couples seem to vary the most is in personality characteristics.

While these studies do provide valuable information about what couples tend to “look like” in terms of various characteristics, they are limited in that they tell little about how partners actually “get together” or match. These studies reveal little about the information processing and decision-making that occurs in the matching process.

Filter Theory

Many of the studies involving assortative matching and homogamy assume that partners approach relationship development in a focused, conscious and rational manner. In addition to these selective mating studies, filter theories of mate selection assume that individuals actively choose their spouse through a series of sequential compatibility tests on various dimensions.

In an attempt to better explain how friendships form, Duck (1973) introduced the concept of filters. He proposed that individuals process information about people at a variety of levels in their search for similar others with whom to develop friendships. He called these levels “filters” and suggested that filters are arranged sequentially and friendships grow in a way that reflects the level of information available to individuals.

Duck (1976) postulated that the first set of filters would be somewhat external and would involve such sociological or incidental cues such as proximity, frequency of meeting and the likelihood of a second meeting. He suggests that once it becomes apparent that two individuals will indeed meet again and will do so often enough for an acquaintance to form, a second level of filters becomes active. The second set of filters would include observable physical cues such as height, hair color, clothing, physique, gestures, vocal tone and facial expressions. Again, if an individual is “filtered through” this second set of filters a third set of filters may be activated. These filters would be based on interactive cues and would consist of cognitive components such as attitudes, beliefs and opinions (Duck, 1976). What Duck proposes in this model is that people
form friendships by processing potential others through a series of filters. These filters serve to separate the acceptable from those who might appear to be less promising and either eliminate others from or include others in future interactions.

While the concept of filters more closely addressed how people form relationships than previous explanations, it does not specifically address the subjective reasoning that occurs as individuals move potential others through these supposed filters. For while Duck proposes that a potential other may be sifted through the filters involving observable cues, this model gives us no insights into the reasons why a given individual may pass through a filter while another does not. Potential others are simply filtered for "whatever reason" (Duck, 1973).

Cognition and Mate Selection

The assumption that spouses choose each other in a rational manner went virtually unchallenged in the mate selection research until this decade (Surra, 1990). Researchers have since begun to test this assumption through the study of spouses' subjective explanations for relationship development and termination.

The study of the subjective reasoning involved in mate selection is rooted in social psychology. In the study of information processing, a branch of social psychology, theory and research focus on the process by which individuals arrive at causes for events, form causal conclusions (attributions) and make predictions about future outcomes (expectancies).

Research directly related to the cognitive elements of mate selection is limited. Despite the implicit assumptions found in mate selection research of the use of cognitive processes in determining similarity and compatibility between partners, researchers in the latter half of the past decade have just begun to study the role of cognitions in relationship development (Cate, 1991; Surra, 1990).

Hence, in the present study, attention was given to how partners form relationships, not just what types of people tend to "get together." The researcher investigated how sex roles influence mate selection decision-making and thinking by examining attributions and expectancies that males made about potential partners who are perceived as having different sex-role orientations.

The discussion of the methodology and results of the study will be featured in the Spring, 93 issue of the Koinonia.

Partial funding for this research was received from the Association for Christians in Student Development, Research Grant Award (1991).
SENIOR YEAR:
Window of Opportunity —— or —— Door to Wilderness Wandering

by Dana Alexander

After staring at the numbers for the last few years, I finally had to face the fact that in our Christian liberal arts college, many of the graduating seniors were not moving right into career related employment. In fact, it would appear that they were doing everything but. “Well of course,” you say, “they’re going to graduate and professional school.” Not! The numbers there were also slimmer than we thought, although we did have reason to believe that many enrolled a year or two down the road. Like the children of Israel during their most painful times, there seemed to be considerable periods after graduation of what could be called wandering in the wilderness.

This was not particularly good news for the Admissions people who like to assure potential students and their parents that a liberal arts education is worth the cost. I believe it certainly is, but you might not guess that by looking at the surveys we got back from graduating seniors describing their futures. An awful lot of “No Specific Plan” boxes were checked, along with “Travel” (which I assume cannot be of indefinite duration) and “Non Career-related Job.” It appeared to us that a large number of our graduating seniors were sure of only one thing, and that was that they were unsure.

At one level I wanted to say “what else is new?” According to the reading I have done (reinforced by experience), liberal arts students have always had a hard time finding their niche in the work world, and that first job is especially difficult to find. There is reliable evidence that 50% of liberal arts students, within one year following graduation, are doing something different than what they started out in. The liberal arts line (and research supports it) is that there is ultimately just as great work satisfaction, and no less income for the liberal arts versus the technically or professional trained student. No liberal arts graduated I have talked with is sorry they went that route, though most would say that the path to their career was circuitous and even quirky, and often seemed to be longer than average.

But there are some added factors in today’s economy and marketplace that may make this even more true than in the past. The world is changing rapidly before our eyes, and no more obviously than in the arena of work. Instability in the economy, downsizing in major corporations, the “lean and mean” ethos in the workplace, the profound implications of technology and globalization, and simply fewer jobs, all play a part in causing most students uneasiness at least, and for some great apprehension, as they face the future. Avoidance and denial in career planning may be an even more common (and understandable) response than in the past.

For whatever the reason, we see a large number of students who are putting off deciding about the future in any substantive way. Many seem to want (and need) a period of “time out” in which they gather their thoughts and strength for the next phase. A common theme I hear (though not often said this straightforwardly) is that “right now it’s all I can do to get through my senior year; I don’t have the time or energy to think about what follows.”

Like the children of Israel during their most painful times, there seemed to be considerable periods after graduation of what could be called wandering in the wilderness.
It is my view that, in and of itself, this is not a bad place for them to be, if they have thought it through, evaluated their ability to cope, and have some plan for the year following (even if it is "travel, get a retail job and spend that time seriously considering my options for a next step"). In fact, many of them could sorely use other-than-school experiences to face some serious reality checks before they enter either grad school or the world of work.

But I am concerned about the bad reasons I see for this epidemic of "time out," and sense that many students are simply not ready to move on with their lives.

What are some of the reasons for career (and general decision-making) avoidance and denial? One is the phenomenon I have seen (and others have noted) of "liberal arts inferiority." This is the notion plaguing many liberal arts graduates that they are skill-less, inferior to their technically trained counterparts, and basically have nothing of value to offer. I see as one of my major tasks the dispelling of this false idea, while giving students the "handles" and constructs by which to think about and understand their valuable skills and abilities. There is no question that internships go a long way in providing significant input in this regard, and if I had my way, they would be required of all students. I also believe it would be most helpful for all student life professionals to think about ways they could not only encourage skill development (which they usually already do) but also discuss these skills and label them in such a way that they become "ammunition" in the confidence-building of students.

A second reason is fear. This takes many forms but perhaps it can all be summarized under the twin fears of (1) failure, and (2) the unknown. I don't know how else to explain the fact that I have to virtually break a student's arm to get them to interview alumni about their career. Although I have done everything but stand on my head (and I would do that if I could) to make the point of the importance of informational interviews, I have discovered that very few students actually do them.

The third reason involves more of a value judgment, and I say it with a certain trepidation, but I also see passivity and (perhaps more to the point) a certain sense of entitlement. Whatever the reason, this manifests in an inactivity or a naive and unrealistic expectation that someone, somewhere will decide, get a job, make the connections, do the research, etc., for them. There doesn't seem to be any effective antidote for this but confrontation with reality, which comes soon enough. Unfortunately, what accompanies that is usually considerable wasted time.

Though what I have written so far may sound negative, I actually have great empathy and appreciation for the seniors graduating from our institutions. Jobs are scarce, they are plagued with an over-choice of options, and the world in all its dimensions seems less certain, stable and understandable by the day.

Having said all of the above, and assuming for the moment that my analysis is accurate, what do we do about it? I would like to suggest some responses (not necessarily solutions) that might be helpful for us to consider as we encounter all students, but especially seniors:

1. **Let's not get critical and cynical.**

One of the ways all service professionals can disguise their own feelings of insecurity and sense of failure is by "attacking" their clients (I have seen this graphically in the mental health field where I once worked). Though it might be presented more subtly than this, the bottom-line attitude given off is, "well no wonder our programs and counseling aren't... we see a large number of students who are putting off deciding about the future in any substantive way."
The world is changing rapidly before our eyes, and no more obviously than in the arena of work.

"20 SOMETHING" GENERATION

**BIBLIOGRAPHY**


Young America is Looking Out for Number One, LOS ANGELES TIMES, B7, October 16, 1990.

Young Americans: The Under 30 Generation. BUSINESS WEEK, August 19,1991.

—Compiled by Dana Alexander

---

Dana Alexander is Director of Career and Life Planning at Westmont College in Santa Barbara, California.

---

3. **Let’s do our homework.**

The “twentysomething” generation (as *Time* dubbed them) are not like most of us working in student services. They are of a different generation with different forces having shaped them. While it is risky to overgeneralize, there do seem to be characteristic attitudes, behaviors, fears, motivations etc. that can be discerned in many of the students we touch. Do we know them? Have we really tried to understand them? I would commend to you the bibliography at the end of this article as a beginning point.

It’s easy to get discouraged (and sometimes even angry) when faced with seniors who don’t seem to do what we would hope, wish or plan for them. Our response should rather be understanding based on careful observation and analysis, and incisive programming which seeks to meet seniors where they are, not where we feel they ought to be. I believe this will help the senior year to indeed be a window of opportunity, and not result in a painful season of frustrating “wilderness wanderings”.
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Interested in a challenging but rewarding experience?

Consider hosting the 1997 ACSD National Conference.

A location in the east is preferred, but others will be considered. Applications are available from Norris Fiesen, Huntington College. Deadline: May 1, 1993.

Placement Service

ACSD is pleased to again provide a placement service to all ACSD members. There are two ways to utilize this service: 1) Listing yourself as a candidate and/or employer in our Placement Bulletin which is published four times during the Spring semester and 2) Utilizing the Placement Center at the ACSD National Conference. At the Conference, a listing of candidates and positions will be compiled and a system for interested parties to communicate will be available at the Placement Center. At ACSD there will be many opportunities to meet informally in the cafeteria at meals, or on the walkways between sessions. If you are interested in setting up an interview room at the conference, please notify Jane Higa.

Included in each Koinonia is a form which candidates and employers should use to submit any listings. (Notes: It is wise to just make several copies of this form now and keep in your files for future use.) Unless you notify us that you would like your listing withdrawn, your listing will continue to appear. A postcard acknowledging receipt of your listing will be sent to all persons listing with us.

The following are the deadlines for submitting a new listing to us for each of the Bulletins: Winter edition, February 1; Spring edition, March 8; Pre-Conference edition, May 3, 1993, and one is done at the Conference on-site.

We hope that this service will be helpful to you. All listings or questions should be directed to: Jane Hideko Higa, Vice President for Student Life, Westmont College, 955 La Paz Road, Santa Barbara, CA 93108. 805-565-6028.

1993 ACSD Lake Regional Conference Announced

Mount Vernon Nazarene College in Mount Vernon, Ohio has enthusiastically welcomed the chance to host our next regional conference.

Please mark November 5 and 6, 1993 on your calendar and plan now to attend!

More information will be forthcoming!
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**THE 1993 ACSD NATIONAL CONFERENCE**

**HOUGHTON COLLEGE, HOUGHTON, NEW YORK**

**UNDERSTANDING THE CHANGING FACE OF STUDENTS**

Please plan to join us June 7 - 10, 1993