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Restrictive and Non-Restrictive Environments
Anne K. Eskridge

The following article is reprinted by permission from the Georgia Journal of College Student Affairs, Vol. 3, No. 1, Fall, 1987.

“What conditions in a college environment enhance or inhibit student development?” There is little doubt that the environment of a college or university plays an integral role in shaping development. Implementing an intervention designed to change the institutional environment can serve as an effective catalyst for student development. Some student affairs practitioners suggest the use of environmental interventions over individual and group interventions because of the large numbers of students affected and the overall cost-effectiveness of an environmental intervention (Morrill, Hurst, & Associates, 1980).

Chickering affirms in Education and Identity (1969) that there are six (environmental) conditions that can retard or accelerate students’ development: clarity of institutional objectives and internal consistency; institutional size; curriculum, teaching, and evaluation; residence hall arrangements; faculty and administration; and friends, groups, and student culture. These six conditions are not mutually exclusive influences on students’ development in college.

One of the facets of the environment that cuts across three of Chickering’s conditions for impact on student development (clarity of institutional objectives and internal consistency, residence hall arrangements, and student culture) is the institution’s published student code of conduct. Codes of student conduct are designed by institutions to restrict or encourage specific behaviors

(Continued page 2)

The Different Drum
Scott Makin

Editor’s note: This article is a continuation of the article printed in the last issue of the Koinonia. In Part 1 Scott Makin reviewed Scott Peck’s book The Different Drum: Community Making and Peace. In Part 2 Scott Makin will describe how community building principles are used in educating Resident Assistants.

I have been intrigued by the process Peck uses to move through the stages of community development (pseudocommunity, chaos, emptiness, and community). While he does not specifically outline the steps, I did find thought provoking principles and intervention techniques woven throughout the first twelve chapters of his book. I have interacted extensively with the Foundation for Community Encouragement (founded by M. Scott Peck and based on his principles) and have personally attended two Community Building Workshops sponsored by the Foundation. The process begins when those who are interested in developing community agree to spend two intensive days together. Peck argues quite convincingly that community can be developed in large groups (25-60) as well as small groups. To begin the community-building time, a few ground rules are shared and “The Rabbi’s Gift” (see page 13 in book) is read. For the next 14 hours the group interacts on whatever issues they feel like discussing. In the six groups in which I have participated, nothing has been the same except the process and stages. The facilitator does not ask questions to get things going nor does s/he lead in experiential exercises to push the group in- to community. Rather, s/he comments only on what s/he sees happening in regard to how the group members
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The Effects of Leadership and Major Choice on the Career Maturity of College Students
Scott Preissler

How much influence do academic majors and participation in co-curricular activities have on students’ attitudes about future careers? Does major choice and involvement in leadership on-campus affect a student’s ability to make mature career choices? These questions were the basis for an exploratory research study conducted in conjunction with the University of Cincinnati’s Career Development and Placement Department. The study was sponsored by a grant to Scott Preissler by the Midwest College Placement Council.

METHOD

Four student groups completed the Career Maturity Inventory (CMI), developed by J. Crites, a measure of attitude maturity and competence in making career choices. Participants represented vocational majors (engineering and business) and non-majors (any major besides engineering and business). Student leadership on campus was also incorporated into the sample.

Eighty students participated from the junior class in the Colleges of Business Administration, Engineering, and Arts and Sciences. Additionally leaders were randomly selected from records provided by the Student Organizations and Activities Office on-campus.

Student were divided into groups representing student leaders in non-vocational majors (SLVM), students in non-vocational majors without leadership involvement (SNVM), students in vocational majors with leadership roles (SLVM), and students in vocational

(Continued on page 4)
within the institutional community, thereby shaping the institutional environment. Fouts and Hales (1985) suggest that colleges with controlled (restrictive) environments may be desirable for some students, but that any college environment should be evaluated by the effect it has on student development. The purpose of this study was to examine how restrictive and non-restrictive environments impact the development of students.

For this study, two different institutional environments were chosen. One institution was categorized as being restrictive and the other non-restrictive based on the scope of student behaviors the institutions sought to limit through their respective codes of conduct. The primary differences between the two institutions and their environments are illustrated as follows:

**College Y** (non-restrictive institution)
- **Visitation:** Members of the opposite sex are permitted to visit each others' rooms from 12 noon to 12 midnight on weekdays and 12 noon to 2 a.m. on Friday and Saturday.
- **Alcohol Possession or Consumption:** Does not encourage or discourage the consumption of alcoholic beverages. Takes responsibility as an institution to adhere to state and local alcohol laws.
- **Dress Code:** No policy.

**College Z** (restrictive institution)
- **Visitation:** Not permitted
- **Alcohol Possession or Consumption:** Prohibited
- **Dress Code:** Appropriate classroom dress is designated. When and where sports, swimwear, and casual attire can be worn on campus is designated.

**METHOD**

**Instrumentation**

The Student Developmental Task and Lifestyle Inventory (SDTLI) (Winston, Miller, & Prince, 1987) was used to measure students' psychosocial development. A self-report instrument consisting of 140 behaviorally stated true-false items, the SDTLI is designed to assess achievement of three developmental tasks (two of which are further defined by subtasks) and two scales. The three developmental tasks are: (a) Establishing and Clarifying Purpose; (b) Developing Mature Interpersonal Relationships; and (c) Developing Academic Autonomy. The two scales are the (a) Intimacy Scale and (b) Salubrious Lifestyle Scale. A third scale, the Response Bias Scale, is designed to indicate if the respondent was attempting to project an inflated or unrealistically favorable self portrait.

The University Residence Environment Scale, Form R [URES] (Moos & Gerst, 1974), was selected to provide quantifiable environmental measures of the residence hall environment at College Y and College Z. The URES is based on the assumption that a consensus among individuals characterizing their environmental climate exerts a directional influence on behavior (Moos, & Gerst, 1974). URES is composed of 10 scales: Involvement, Emotional Support, Independence, Traditional Social Orientation, Competition, Academic Achievement, Intellectualcy, Order and Organization, Student Influence, and Innovation.

In order to control for the possible influence religious beliefs might have upon student development, the participants of this study completed the Short Measure of Religious Dogmatism (Fagan & Breed, 1970). For the purpose of this study the instrument was renamed Religious Beliefs Checklist. The students were asked to indicate their range of agreement or disagreement (1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree) with twenty items that reflect traditional Christian beliefs. (All students in the study described themselves as "Christians").

**PARTICIPANTS**

A random sample of 35 males and 35 females who were classified as juniors between the ages of 19 to 23 living in the residence halls were chosen at College Y. A random sample of 30 males and 30 females who were classified as juniors between the ages of 19 to 23 living in the residence halls were chosen at College Z. The return rates were 34% from College Y and 38% from College Z. All participants were unmarried. Students living in the residence halls and classified as juniors were chosen to participate because it was believed they would have had previous experiences within their college environment that could have impacted their development.

**PROCEDURES**

College Y is a small, public, liberal arts institution, located in the Southeastern United States, with 875 students in residence. College Y holds no religious requirement for its students. College Z is a small, private, religiously affiliated institution, located in the Southeastern United States, with 435 students in residence. The three instruments were mailed to each subject along with a cover letter requesting his or her participation in the study.

**ANALYSES**

A one way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to analyze the URES data and the Religious Dogmatism scores. A one way analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) was used to analyze the SDTLI data, with the Measure of Religious Dogmatism scores used as the covariant.

**RESULTS**

As can be noted in Figure 1, the (continued on page 3)
Although differences in levels of development at these two institutions cannot be attributed directly to environmental influences, a relationship does appear to exist between the two factors. Students in the restrictive environment scored higher on the Establishing and Clarifying Purpose Task on the SDTLI. There was also a significantly greater degree of participation by students in cultural events within the restrictive environment along with a greater degree of attention paid to personal health and wellness issues. Life Planning and Life Management Tasks were also accomplished to a significantly higher degree at College Z. The students in the restrictive environment also exhibited higher levels of tolerance than did their public school counterparts.

There were no significant differences in the degree of influence students had at both institutions perceived they had on their college environments. Something unexpected was the discovery that the students in the restrictive environment, where visitation was not allowed, perceived their environment as having a significantly lower traditional social orientation than students in the non-restrictive environment. Innovation was found to be significantly higher in the non-restrictive environment than in the restrictive environment.

The differences found in the comparison of the two groups’ scores on the Short Measure of Religious Dogmatism were anticipated because of the strong religious orientation of College Z. It is uncertain if, or how, dogmatic religious beliefs influence students’ development or their college environment. However, the results of this finding do not lend support to the hypothesis that the development of students as individuals is hindered by adherence to dogmatic religious beliefs. As professionals committed to the psychosocial, intellectual, and moral growth and development of students, the discovery that none of the scores on the SDTLI had a corollary relationship with religious dogmatism has special import. This finding lends support to student affairs practitioners who wish to incorporate value-based education and experience objectives in their purposes, including the opportunity to foster students’ spiritual development. These findings should encourage student development practitioners in traditional Christian liberal arts institutions where spiritual development is routinely addressed.

LIMITATIONS

The generalizability of the findings of this study is limited because of several factors: (a) a relatively low response rate; (b) the predominantly white racial composition of the participating groups; (c) the traditional age and campus residence of the student samples; (d) the relatively small sizes and the regional locations of the colleges involved (875 or fewer students in residence and colleges located in the Southeastern United States); and (e) the fact that no provision was made to ensure that junior class student transfers were eliminated from the samples drawn. Since the pre-enrollment characteristics of each group were not determined before possible environmental impacts could have affected student development scores, it cannot be determined with certainty the extent to which sample score differences can be attributed to environmental influences or to initial differences between student bodies upon enrollment. Further research needs to be conducted that is specifically designed to control for pretest variations in the sample populations to determine if restrictive environments are indeed conducive to promoting student development, and to determine if religious beliefs are related to development.

Anne Eskridge is Director of Residential Life at Randolph-Macon Women’s College, Lynchburg, VA.
(e.g. fasting, solitude, footwashing) or any combination of the above at our fall leadership retreat. But each time I have come away feeling there must be a better way to develop a sense of community. After reading Peck’s book, attending the workshops and leading four retreats, I am convinced this unique process is the way to go.

As I look back over the results of these four retreats and the two I attended from Peck’s organization, I have seen the potential of what this process can accomplish in the lives of the participants. They can be taught how to:

1. relate to others with openness, trust, and honesty
2. heal prejudices, rigidity, and various defenses which interfere with human understanding, reconciliation, and peace-making
3. become more authentic and genuine with others
4. drop pretenses and risk sharing brokenness and woundedness as well as accomplishments and joys
5. create a safe place where others can be whoever they “really” are
6. acknowledge each other’s gift of self, celebrating and valuing individual differences and their common humanity
7. actively listen to others instead of giving advice or “fixing” their problem
8. be more comfortable with conflict and confrontation
9. be aware of personal behavior, feelings, and attitudes
10. know how others perceive you
11. encourage and help someone who is struggling with difficult problems
12. be comfortable with deeper levels of meaningful intimacy
13. deal with those wounded areas in your own life
14. endure ambiguity
15. understand group dynamics
16. facilitate other students in taking more leadership and ownership for the unit and what happens
17. not feel alone in a leadership position
18. exercise a tough, gutty kind of love instead of sentimental soft and idealistic notions of love

While this process is the central ingredient in our RA training program, it does not preclude other essential types of training. We have a one-hour course, during the Spring before their year of service, to teach the skills and mechanics of the RA position. We have a growth plan that each RA completes over the summer. This allows us to make the RA retreat essentially a community-building time.

I am convinced that Peck’s community building process is the most intensive and effective way to teach RAs the essential skills (as well as building the necessary support system) they will need as they are ministering to the residents in the halls. I do not believe the other teaching modalities I have used have had the impact, nor were they as comprehensive as is Peck’s system. I recognize that this process is not appropriate for every institution, and at times I wondered if it was even appropriate for ours. It has taken hard work to get to where it is a moderately successful process. Following are four areas you need to assess if you will are thinking of using this process with your residence hall staff:

1. Assess your program: Are you and your staff committed to the concept of community development as a means to Student Development? Are you willing to take the residence staff through this process? Are you and some of your staff willing to attend two Community Building Workshops sponsored by the Foundation for Community Encouragement?
2. Assess your RA training program: Do you have two full days to commit to community building in your RA Fall Workshop? Have you trained your RAs in the other essential skills and mechanics during the spring semester before they serve as an RA?
3. Assess your RA personnel: Are your RAs able to handle sitting around in a circle getting to know one another? Do they see the value of becoming more unified and committed to one another? Are they apprehensive about conflict and confrontation? Is intimacy difficult for them? How much homogeneity is there?
4. Assess yourself: Are you willing to engage in an intense and potentially volatile process that can bring about fantastic results in the lives of your RAs and in the Residence Hall community?

For those who are interested in further details regarding the adaptation of Peck’s theory and process to your Residence Life program, please call or write Scott Makin at: Indiana Wesleyan University, c/o Student Development Office, 4201 S. Washington St., Marion, IN 46953, 317-674-6901 Ext. 202.
(continued from page 4)
determine the effects of working while going to school as well as other possible factors facilitating career maturity in students. For more information contact Scott Preissler at the Career Development and Placement Career Dynamics Center, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, OH 45221.

CONSTITUTIONAL REVISION
The following is a proposed revision to the ACSD constitution. The revision will be voted on at the 1989 ACSD annual conference at Moody Bible Institute, Chicago, IL.

ARTICLE II
Purpose
1. To promote professional growth and provide opportunity for Christian fellowship and exchange of ideas.
2. To integrate the use of scripture and the Christian faith in the student development profession.
3. To provide various services for the membership.

Article II currently reads:
The purpose of this organization shall be:
1. To stimulate fellowship, group study and to share mutual experiences.
2. To emphasize the use of scripture and scriptural principles in student development.
3. To keep abreast of trends and developments in the field of student development services and disseminate pertinent information.
4. To provide a united voice for recommendation to member schools.

ACPA PRAYER BREAKFAST
Over fifty student development professionals met at 7 a.m. during the recent ACPA convention in Washington, DC, for food, fellowship, and prayer. The breakfast was sponsored by ACSD and hosted by Ruth Bamford, Wheaton College, Wheaton, IL. Several attending the meeting were introduced to ACSD for the first time and indicated they would be interested in becoming members.

Karen Longman of the Christian College Coalition shared briefly some of the work of the Coalition and the importance of living out our faith in the world around us. Several participants shared prayer requests concerning future direction and service. We then divided into small groups and prayed for one another. Many who attended the breakfast expressed appreciation and a sense of encouragement, when they realized the number of other Christians involved in ACPA.

I was personally encouraged by ACPA’s interest in students’ spiritual development and concern for ethics on campus. The ACPA Convention theme for next year is “Creating an Ethical Climate on Campus.” This year several speakers described the personal concern they feel as they observe students who do not realize the seriousness of the societal crises facing them today (AIDS, alcohol and substance abuse, suicide, break-down of vital relationships, violence, etc.). The problems of our society are becoming crystal clear but the answers are illusive. We as Christians need to be asking God where and how He wants to use us in an effort to implement His answers to a needy world.
Meet the ACSD Nominees

President-elect

**Norris Friesen**  
Dean of Student Services  
Huntington College  
Huntington, IN

**Leadership:**  
Midwest Regional Director, ACSD

**Experience:**  
Admissions Counselor-3 years  
Asst. & Assoc. Dean-8 years  
Dean of Students-4 years

**Goals:**  
Communication is key to any administrative function. If I am elected I would spend time listening to our different constituencies. I would like to attend several different ACSD regional conferences and discuss how communication between the different colleges can be enhanced. I would also like to see ACSD reconsider its goals and mission, and determine how we can enhance our student life programs individually and collectively.

**Vision:**  
ACSD has a unique mix of colleges and professionals. In many ways, the organization has the potential for being very diverse, and I would like to see ACSD continue to develop its strengths, utilizing this unique mix. ACSD is a well-kept secret. I would like to see the organization do more to attract other Christian professionals and continue its involvement with national organizations like NASPA and ACPA by sponsoring prayer breakfasts and other forums for Christian professionals to discuss pertinent issues that impact us professionally and personally. I would increase the networking among the various member schools by coordinating ideas and resources. KIONONIA does an excellent job of keeping us informed, and I would like to see the newsletter continue to improve. I would also like to see the organization place additional effort on soliciting ideas and resources which could be shared with the broader organization.

**Timothy E. Arens**  
Dean of Students  
Moody Bible Institute  
Chicago, IL

**Experience:**  
Director of Residence Life-3 years  
Associate Dean-3 years  
Dean of Students-2 years

**Goals:**  
Maintaining a high level of professionalism within the various functions of the organization would be an extremely high priority for me. Even more important would be my commitment to ensuring that our faith in Jesus Christ compel everything we seek to accomplish.

**Vision:**  
Organizations are always interested in growing numerically and ACSD could benefit by continued growth. I would like to see us strengthen relationships within the organization. This could take place through strengthened regionals, networking between staffs, and further crossover at national conventions. Through this enhanced comraderie we would have a basis for growth and support.

---

**SPECIAL PRAYER REQUEST**

Three Westmont College students were killed in a car accident in Ensenada, Mexico. They were working as missionaries during the college's Easter break. The students killed were Garth Weedman, Lisa Bebout, and Alan Voorman. Megan Harter and Patty Hallock were injured. Despite the deaths, Westmont students remained in Ensenada to finish the projects they had planned for this year.

Pray for the Westmont students, staff, faculty and the parents.
Secretary

Sharon K. Mejeur
Dean of Student Development
Fort Wayne Bible College
Fort Wayne, IN
Graduate:
Western Michigan University-BS
Western Michigan University-MA
Experience:
Residence Hall Director-3 years
Associate Dean-3 years
Dean of Students-4 years
Goals:
I would seek to be faithful and efficient in the responsibilities of the position. As part of the leadership team of ACSD I would look for ways to serve our membership and the extended Student Development profession.

David E. Erickson
Dean of Student Affairs
LeTourneau College
Longview, TX
Graduate:
Central Michigan University-BS
Michigan State University-MS
Fuller Seminary
Texas Women's University- PhD candidate
Experience:
Housing/Financial Aid-6 years
Director Financial Aid-3 years
Dean of Students-2 years
Leadership:
Regional Representative, Institutional Sector Representative, Program Review Office
Goals:
To assist the executive committee in insuring the growth and development of the association in meeting its organizational goals. Also, to bring Student Development professionals together for encouragement by participating in regional and national conferences, and activities such as the newsletter and informal networking.
Vision:
Continued growth development, new formats of exchange of ideas, support, continual expansion of membership efforts, assist in providing meaningful professional opportunities to allow members to come together in mutual Christian support.

The ACSD elections will be conducted by a mail-in ballot and not at the National Conference. This will give more members an opportunity to vote for these key positions.
Please choose one candidate for each of the following positions.
Mail the ballot to: Don Boender, Azusa Pacific University, %Student Affairs, Alosta and Citrus, Azusa, CA 91702
Mail by May 10, 1989.

President-elect
Timothy E. Arens
Norris Friesen

Secretary
David E. Erickson
Sharon K. Mejeur
RegISTRATIONS ARE NOW BEING RECEIVED FOR THE NATIONAL ACSD CONFERENCE, JUNE 5-8, AT MOODY BIBLE INSTITUTE IN CHICAGO. TO GUARANTEE YOUR PLACE AT THIS ANNUAL EVENT, MAIL YOUR REGISTRATION IN TODAY!

IN ADDITION TO THE KEYNOTE SPEAKERS: ALVARO L. NIEVES, JILL BRISCOE, TED WARD, AND WILLIAM E. PANNELL, THE PROGRAM WILL KICK OFF MONDAY AFTER LUNCH WITH THREE PRE-CONFERENCE WORKSHOPS ENTITLED:

| Presenter: Russ Wise Community Outreach & Media Coordinator of Probe Ministries | Presenter: Bill Romanowski Visiting Faculty Fellow, Calvin Center for Christian Scholarship | Presenter: Dr. Dick Pyle Career Center, University of Texas at Austin |

IF YOU DID NOT RECEIVE A REGISTRATION BROCHURE AND WOULD LIKE MORE INFORMATION, PLEASE CONTACT: TIM ARENS, MOODY BIBLE INSTITUTE, 820 N. LASALLE DRIVE, CHICAGO, IL 60610 PHONE: (312) 329-4191